

The Unattached Intellectual In State Government Agencies: Rainis In Two Stages Of Politically Relevant Activities

Inese Grumolte-Lerhe

The article deals with the role of unattached intellectuals in society, and transformation of this role after their involvement in state government agencies. The case of Latvian poet, playwright and politician, Rainis, is being explored. Analysis of his intentions in two stages of politically relevant activities, i.e. stage of unattached intellectual and the politician, reveal continuity. This continuity in combination with reluctance to set a new agenda for the new career contributed to the clash of identities. Furthermore, Rainis laid claim on holding the authority of leader which is related to the symbolic power.

Keywords: the political role and responsibility of intellectual, Rainis, unattached intellectual, politician.

I. INTRODUCTION

The subject of involvement of intellectuals, agents representing various artistic and aesthetic fields, in socially political processes of non-free societies, has earned an extensive scholarly attention in various contexts. One has to agree that fields of cultural and scholarly work provide a comparatively high degree of freedom under repressive regimes, thus their political relevance may be invoked *per se* (Cvijetic 1999).

However, empirical studies give evidence for the fact that intellectuals who were once fighting against the repressive regime, use to change the sides of entrenchment after the regime overthrow, and turn into state government officials or politicians under the newly-established or the restored democratic regime. Thus, the ground for discussions regarding both, normative and the empirical dimension, emerges on whether this is a suitable career development track for the intellectual. Jānis Pliekšāns (1865–1929, hereafter called Rainis, his pseudonym), a Latvian playwright and poet, is a typical case for such career model. The 150th anniversary since his birth was widely commemorated in Latvia, in 2015, and this article is a contribution to the program of *The Year of Rainis*, initiated and implemented by the Cultural Capital Foundation of Latvia.

The aim of this article is undertaking a critical appraisal of compatibility or antagonism of the roles of the unattached intellectual, on one hand, and that of the politician, on the other. For this reason, analysis of Rainis' intentions will be undertaken, in context of the functions of intellectuals, in two stages of the politically relevant activities. For the purposes of this article, I define these stages as follows:

- 1) stage of the *unattached intellectual*; by the unattached intellectual I mean here an opinion-leader interested in socially political processes while not being affiliated at state government agencies under repressive regime;
- 2) stage of the *state government agencies* or a stage in which person as a politician holds an elected or appointed position in legislative or executive power, in an independent democratic state.

I also employ the more general notion of *practical politics* in this article. It can be attributed to situations when person is, e.g. a member of a political party or a social movement, or strives to earn position in an agency or institution governing society, but is not yet affiliated there. My reading of the notions *the politics*, *the political* and *the power* is not confined solely to decision-making in state government agencies. It deals with a wider set of relationships, via which society comes to terms regarding binding norms, rules and incentives. These are not necessarily institutional measures. Thus one may argue that both stages imply fulfilling a political role.

On the basis of exploration of case of Rainis, I will seek response to two research questions in this article. First, is the role of the unattached intellectual compatible to subsequent involvement of the person in state government agencies, and how this compatibility/incompatibility may be explained? Second, what (if any) challenges did Rainis experience in terms of his self-identification, in the stage after his involvement in state government agencies?

II. METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES

I employ the methodological approach offered by Quentin Skinner for this study. The well-known expert put forward it primarily as a methodology for text interpretation. The key task for the researcher in its application is to detect by what intentions was the author guided in writing a text or voicing a statement. In this article, I apply the methodology on a broader scale. I.e., I look not only for the intentions which guided Rainis in writing certain

literary and non-literary texts, but also for those leading concrete practices and manoeuvres undertaken by him, such as choices made, involvement in particular activities or abstaining from them, etc.

The very creation of text, voicing a statement or practice undertaken by the agent, is related to a social act, the methodology envisages. This implies, first, to acknowledge that by creating a certain text or undertaking an activity, agents have strived to engage in a concrete action targeted at their audience, e.g. warning, informing, persuading, attesting, etc. (Skinner 1974). Detecting these intentions is the primary task for the researcher.

Second, detecting intentions is related not only to textual, i.e., a purely literal, interpretation of the given text or statement. A contextual analysis of various background factors is to be employed (Skinner 1972, 393). This implies that it is necessary to focus on the lexicon, socially political circumstances and mood, the portraits of societies, as well as the intellectual and political atmosphere persisting during the life of the author.

Before proceeding to the particular case of Rainis, I will first briefly outline the theoretical discussions regarding the role of intellectuals in society. The alternative concept *intelligentsia* will also be noted. Finally, I propose four functions of intellectuals in society as a point of departure for this study. The place of intellectuals in the system of social power will also be touched upon briefly.

I employ the following groups of sources and literature. First, published and non-published sources. The latter include archive funds and museum collections (from Museum of Literature and Music of Latvia, RMM; The State History Archive of Latvia, LVVA; and Stanford University Hoover Institution Archive, HIA), and non-published correspondence, personal notes and unpublished memoirs of Rainis' contemporaries. Published sources include publications in periodicals, published correspondence, diary entries, notes for literary works, memoirs of contemporaries, transcripts from the Parliament sittings. I also use literature which includes non-literary original works, analytic literature, such as monographs, monograph chapters and collected academic articles, scientific articles in academic and other periodicals, the literary works written by Rainis.

III. INTELLECTUALS, THEIR ROLE IN SOCIETY AND SOCIAL POWER SYSTEM

It is hardly enough to rely on purely sociological criteria for stating which members in society are to be labeled as intellectuals. The scholarly discussions related to the problem seem to suggest that it is not the educational background, nor the choice made by the agent in professional field, which makes somebody to qualify for the category of intellectual in a full sense. The main yardstick in identifying the intellectual among the rest of society members is a certain attitude and willingness to take upon oneself certain social functions. It is unsubstantial, how these persons provide themselves with material good, but their contribution to more general concerns of the society without earning financial rewards, is at stake instead (See Eyerman 1994, 27; Hofstadter 1963, 27; Coser 1970; Scott 1997, 59). They make judgements on matters exceeding the realm of their professional competence (See Benda 1955; Howe 1988, 196; Alatas 1977, 8; Emmerich, McIsaac 2003, 40; Scott 1997, 59). The category of intellectual is permanently open to anybody. However, there is still a good reason to scale down the circles of potential intellectuals (Kuvacis 1895, 170; Gramsci 1971). Here the tools used by the agents in their daily duties play a crucial role. Thus, I argue that the most appropriate persons in society for the role of intellectuals are those employing the written and spoken word as their primary tool of action. These are writers, poets, playwrights, experts in humanities, as well as journalists and teachers of certain fields (See Alexander 2009, 21; Emmerich 2003, 38; Eyerman 1994; Hayek 1949, 419; Nozick 1998). Activities in these fields envisage intrinsic resistance to the generally followed norms, a tendency to analyze processes in context of their mutual interconnections, and to make conclusions on them in general terms. This type of persons are inclined toward originality, instead of correctness. They enjoy identification in society, or have a potential to reach it (See Alexander 2009, 21; Emmerich, McIsaac 2003, 38; Eyerman 1994; Hayek 1949, 419). In this article, the concept of intellectual is being used when discussing a specific social role undertaken by concrete individuals in particular stages of societal development. This role envisages fulfilling several tightly intertwined functions. In doing this, intellectuals are guided by ethos. Necessity for persons occupying such role increases when society seeks to look through and modify the basic rules of its organization, mostly under non-free regimes. However, a pro-active stance of the intellectual is also a substantial component of the democratic process in established democracies. Such account introduces an academic debate on the challenges related to transformation of role in situations when a person chooses to carry on his/her career as an official in state government agencies.

In empirical academic discussions regarding the problem, related concepts also appear which use to cause miscomprehensions. There are authors arguing that the concepts *intellectuals* and *intelligentsia* may be used as synonyms. However, I consider that the latter is geographically, historically and professionally bound, and thus restricted by these aspects. This implies that it is less appropriate for research purposes. The concept *intelligentsia* originated in Russian Empire and Poland (See Seton-Watson, 1960, 41; Pipes, 1961, 1). The main problem related to use of this concept stems from the fact that persons who were regarded as members of *intelligentsia* in Russian Empire, at least in a particular period, i.e., the reign of Peter the Great, were largely

dependent on activities of legitimate state power agencies (Eyerman 1994, 20–21). This fact hinders to analyze them as independent agents. In Western countries, on the opposite, intellectuals were those sustaining a non-institutionalized opposition to the powers that be. Thus, their unattached character became one of the central features defining them. It is also an essential component of the portrait of agents which I am interested in. I perceive the role of intellectual in society in relation to performance of the functions listed below.

a) *Function of social mediation and sustaining a rational communication in the public sphere*

The contribution of the intellectual to sustaining continuity and cohesion in society, comes to the fore there. Intellectuals are able to put the value-orientations in society on a certain track, while at the same time renouncing claims to provide solutions for socially political problems and quests in a paternalistic manner. Society itself should be regarded as capable of finding solutions to the problems it faces – this ideal is not to be violated. Intellectuals should act as mediators. Namely, they would urge the public to engage in communication practice, according to the rules prescribed by intellectuals to a certain extent. Tolerance, the principle of the strongest argument in judging matters, and equality among the communication members in discourse, are decisive ideals. In setting this function as binding for the intellectual, I rest to a large extent on the communication and discourse theory developed by the prominent social theoretician, Jürgen Habermas (Habermas 1991).

b) *Support function*

Intellectuals refuse to depict reality as pre-given, predestined, and thus unchangeable (Hollander 1987; Lepenies 1991, 914). Such position bears impact also to the relationship persisting between intellectuals and their public. Intellectuals invite the latter to realize its potential in socially political realm. This function is thus related to facilitating the growth of the individuals' self-confidence, increasing conviction on their powers to govern their own lives, and to defend their rights, as well as to obtain large-scale socially political transformations via interaction and cooperation in framework of larger community (Eyerman 1994, 48–49).

c) *Function of social criticism*

One can distinguish between two approaches to the practice of criticism.

First, intellectual may act as an author of normative instructions. I imply here what can be labeled as the universalistic criticism. It envisages status and sources of justification for certain universal values. Truth, justice, reason, human rights, freedom fall into this category. The critic claims to fight for the individual rights, and, possibly, against the discriminatory power apparatus, in the name of these universal values. Devotion of intellectuals to the non-material aspects of life, their detachedness from the particular and devotion to the universal, as well as refusal to aspire for state government positions, is a disposition which, according to Julien Benda, manifests itself in a slogan 'My kingdom is not of this world' (Benda 1959. See also Zoila 1998, Said 1996, Collins 2011).

Second, intellectual as an analyst of the existing condition. In contrast to the afore-outlined model in which things and processes are evaluated against the background of generalizations, transcendental norms and values, an alternative point of departure for the practice of criticism is the already existing. One of the most explicit theoretical groundings for this approach is offered by poststructuralist theoreticians, and the name of Michel Foucault deserves a particular attention here. *Specific intellectuals*, as he labels them, act as genealogists in particular situations. They are thus bothered with the particular instead of the universal. Intellectuals offer a critical appraisal of an event, situation or condition by delving into its details and revealing why, how, and in what circumstances things and situations have established themselves as such. What seems obvious, may not be so (Foucault 1996, 407–415). This track of criticism envisages a lesser extent of intellectuals' public visibility, while their social significance does not decrease. The tasks of the intellectual are still criticizing, problematizing, and questioning. Foucault only repudiates the existence of any external criterion, in name of which such criticism is to be undertaken. The notable Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman also is to be mentioned here, as he similarly distinguishes between two types of intellectuals. According to him, *intellectuals the legislators* appeal to an epistemic authority, and the knowledge they claim to possess on the transcendental, the universal, the just and the true for all. *Hermeneutical intellectuals*, on the contrary, avoid such model of action, and focus on the already-existing (Bauman 1987, 1;3).

Michael Walzer has also touched upon the topic of intellectual the social critic in his works. The most appropriate role of critics, he argues, is to identify the morally defective aspects of their society, as well as to point at fallacious political practices or relations what facilitate them, and to offer solutions (Walzer 1985, 9–10). In any case, criticism is based on certain moral values. According to Walzer, the point of departure for criticism can be discovered, invented, or the critic may interpret the already existing. The author prefers the third option (Walzer 1985, vii). Discovering means appealing to the values which have always been present in society, while not being comprehended correctly. Social critics facilitate comprehension. Invention of values

means breaking with the previous value system; the critic undertakes creating it from scratch. The critic the interpreter works with design to reflect and practise criticism within the bounds of moral tradition already existing in her society, and this tradition of criticism is rooted in various contexts (Walzer 1985, 9–10).

d) *Function of monitoring directions of political developments*

Intellectuals weigh up the directions of socially political developments, their origin, and the potential consequences. This deals with, first, detecting alarming trends in societal consciousness. Second, intellectuals are concerned with undertaking analysis and producing conclusions on the foundation of legitimacy of the institutionalized state power agencies. This requires from intellectuals to avoid positioning themselves in framework of the ideological spectrum.

In this article, I depict the intellectual as a bearer of a symbolic power. Michael Mann, the power theorist, discusses four types of power – the political, economic, military, and the ideological. The ideological power is of interest for me here. Its application concerns the necessity of society members to search for the meaning of life, to be able to agree on binding norms and values with other members of community, as well as to “engage in aesthetic practices together with others” (Mann 2012, 6). This dimension of power is closely related to the functions of intellectuals. I will call it a *symbolic power* following Pierre Bourdieu. I attribute this term to the capacity of certain members of society to put the views and value-orientations on a certain track. Bourdieu, when reflecting on this matter, stressed the significance of the symbolic capital in shaping things and labels approved by the rest of the members of society (Bourdieu 1989, 21). Bourdieu thus sees symbolic power as a power to “shape the world” or to distinguish among different groups in society, to name them, and to assign labels to them (Bourdieu 1989, 22). In a wider sense, it is the authority to attribute denominations to things and processes (Bourdieu 1989, 23).

IV. RAINIS AS AN UNATTACHED INTELLECTUAL

At the 1948 International Congress of Poets, Essayists, and Novelists (PEN), Fēlikss Cielēns, a contemporary of Rainis and distinguished Latvian politician, expounded to the international community the role which culture in general, and literature and theatre in particular, has played in the Baltic region. He stressed that “in the Baltic zone, the culture is democratized” (HIAa), thus insisting that “writing is close to the population”. He also noted:

It by no means implies that literature turns trivial here in terms of contents, and vulgar in terms of style. For these peoples, writers and workers of the field culture, have managed to raise at least portion of the population, to refine its taste and the spiritual standards... Here... theatre plays a special role in the spiritual development of the population. Theatre is for Latvians not the art of masters, nor that of the educated segments of society, but a genuine art of the people. ... Only in a harmonious unity of culture and the people, a moral strength can originate, capable of overcoming all kinds of crises and all kinds of catastrophes (HIA a).

Intellectuals, the authors of literary works, should record their time and the general frame of mind in society, Rainis argued. The prevailing ideas, mood and social problems are to be reflected in works written by the authors of the corresponding era. Intellectuals should go along with the challenges their societies face. As one can learn from the notes of Rainis, he criticized the writing public for reproducing “a fraud romanticism in depicting the past, religious mystique, cheap secrecy and detachment from thinking of the time” (RMM, 59034). He thus tried to indicate that there is some social mission behind the purely aesthetic pleasure. In the early youth, he voiced opinion that “the task of the poetry is neither a beautiful shine, nor deceiving, but questing for and finding the true, the grave and the great in the everyday life, and particularly in the everyday life” (RMM 59034). In Western Europe, facilitation of realism in literature was a topical trend in the end of the 19th century. This trend was followed also by *Jaunā Strāva*¹ [*New Current*], a movement whose member Rainis was. The contribution Rainis brought to this movement was its ideological grounding. He was not among the active vanguard participants of the Revolution of 1905 (LVVA 3949). Cielēns named the literary works written by Rainis as his most significant contribution, in comparison to fulfilling the tasks related to practical politics which he sometimes undertook as a member of *Jaunā Strāva* (Cielēns 1955, 5). Writing and publishing the poetry collection *Vētras Sēja* [*Sowing the Storm*], 1903–1905, and the play *Uguns un nakts* [*Fire and the Night*], 1905, was an important contribution to the incentives of revolution, as indicated by the author himself, his contemporaries (Cielēns 1995, 5) and exponents.

In December 1905, after suppression of the revolution, Rainis and his spouse, Aspazija (real name Elza Rozenberga) made their way to Switzerland. Initially they stayed in Zurich, and later moved to Castagnola, Canton of Ticino. The exiles sought refuge there from the potential persecutions which might have been targeted at them for cooperation with *Jaunā Strāva*. During the long period of Switzerland exile, 1905–1920, as he was remote from any matters of practical nature and processes in socially political life going on in territory of Latvia, Rainis repeatedly confirmed and demonstrated in practice his conviction that it would be best for him and his audience if his activities bearing socially political relevance would be confined to literary work

solely. Any managerial arrangements were a burden for him (Rainis 1916). For one year, Rainis was a chairman of *Latviešu Komiteja Šveicē* (LKŠ) [*Latvian Committee in Switzerland*], organization uniting Latvians in this country. Rainis felt as if these obligations prohibited him from “breathing freely;... working in my own way for the great Latvian matters, and turning again to literature” (Rainis 1969, 23).

Analysis of Rainis’ correspondence and diary gives evidence for the fact that he reflected on his social role and tasks in society. He concluded that the best way he can contribute to society is creating his literary works. At the same time, he noted that the readiness of the public to receive messages of the intellectuals is also at stake, and he was not optimistic in this respect regarding Latvians. (Rainis 1911a).

Rainis attempted to avoid activities in practical politics and detach himself from this field, partly due to the reason that he saw it as disreputed. Such assessment was related to his personal experience and frictions with the colleagues in *Jaunā Strāva*, and it made a considerable impact on Rainis’ views in the years to come. The beginnings of the conflict dates back to 1897, the interrogations, arrests and banishment of the *Jaunā Strāva* members accused for anti-state propaganda. Rainis was also banished to Vyatka province, and he blamed his colleague, Janis Jansons-Brauns, for giving testimonies against his comrades which caused the reprisals (Blanks 1994, 60–64).

Rainis was not able to reconcile himself with what he witnessed at *Latvijas Sociāldemokrātiskā Strādnieku partija* (LSDSP) [*Latvian Socialdemocratic Workers’ Party*]. Therefore he set himself again on the other side of entrenchment; it is obvious in his notes and correspondence, although he held a party membership. One can read his disappointment in a letter to a close friend, Pauls Dauge, written in February 1916. He made clear that disagreements between him and the party arose from the choice made by the latter to lay emphasis on “economy” matters rather than the “ethical” and the “spiritual” dimension (RMM, 244383). As an exile, Rainis emotionally labeled the activities of his party fellows as “the lowest function of life”, “an organized conquest of nutrition” (Rainis 1912c). These commentaries were targeted at persons who, according to him, had turned “the idea into a bargain”, made factions (Priedītis 1996, 24), and put the party discipline in a place of decency (Rainis 1912b). Interests, he argued, had replaced the idea (Rainis 1913a). Clash between the non-compromising ideals of the unattached intellectual, on one hand, and the reality requiring to tolerate compromises and interpret principles, on the other, comes to the surface here. Rainis intentionally chose tactics to stress “the ethics, the spirit, the heroism” in his works due to the fact that he saw lack of these qualities in the party he represented (RMM, 244383). He did so using the tools available exclusively to him. Literary works written during the Castagnola exile, reveal his reflection on these problems. Disagreements between Rainis and his fellow in the party, Pēteris Stučka, are reflected in the unaccomplished play *Nodēvējs* [*Betrayer*] (Grīnuma 2001, 105) which was written mostly in 1913, however it was first published only in 1996 (Rainis 1996, 144–84).

Taking into consideration all the above-mentioned, his diary entry in 1913, seems self-evident: “Politics seems too puny for me; I have another task, a task of the poet which I see as greater, my politics is reflected in my poetry works May others carry on my politics” (Rainis 1913c). Few months later Rainis demonstrated that he was still struggling between the roles of the unattached intellectual and that of the politician: “Am I to be a politician or a poet? ... I have to stick seriously to one, and it will be poetry” (Rainis 1913b). Nevertheless, reflections and activities of the years to come provide ample evidence that this question was not unambiguously set for Rainis.

One can find a bulk of evidence that the playwright and poet maintained – the literary work is no less significant in the socially political process than the pragmatic dimension of it. As an exile, he commented upon processes in motherland by stating: “The political poetry is dead, politics itself has taken in its place” (Rainis 1908). By this Rainis might have implied that both realms are to be separated, and one can not take upon itself the duties of the other. The practical activities in politics require their ideological foundation which, on their turn, can originate in various realms of art.

Rainis also touched upon the necessity of citizens to manifest their democratic rights and will via mechanisms which guarantee exclusively for them the prerogative to accept or repudiate who and by what means govern them on a state government level. The notion of democracy and the democratic principle in politics was related for him to a direct involvement of citizens in discussing decisions affecting the whole community. He also did not question the ability of individuals to produce an informed view, what makes such involvement meaningful. The unaccomplished play *Kajs Grakhs* [*Kai Grakh*], 1913–1923, deserves a particular attention in this respect. Although its story has mainly been derived from the Roman Republic, Rainis stressed in this work the values cherished by the Ancient Greeks as well (Rainis 1981, 329–34). He was interested in their interpretation of democracy with the firm emphasis being put on a direct involvement of citizens in socially political processes. He was enraptured with the idea of political equality and government by the people. Period spent in Switzerland deepened these feelings. On the other hand, he sympathized the Roman republicanism, as well as the idea of popular sovereignty nurturing it. Rainis was convinced that overtaking these elements would be crucial also for organizing societies of his time. It would contribute, he argued, first, for securing a full realization of individual rights, and, second, for establishing a truly legitimate political practice and

agencies governing society. The nonexistent experience of democracy in that-time territory of Latvia did not make him worry. In this respect, Rainis was too optimistic and disregarded the negative side-effects caused by the authoritarian rule.

Rainis was concerned for derogation of the individual element accompanying the efforts to put into practice the idea of socialism. His personal perception of socialism was more demanding, i.e., the individual played a crucial part in it. (Rainis 1985, 88). Rainis' conception of socialism can be seen as a more fully elaborated form of his 'philosophy of the individual'. This idea appeared for the first time in notes written in the eighteen-nineties, where the young Rainis touched upon the road from the individual to the society, from the self to the community. The autobiographical sketch *Mans ceļš uz sociālismu* [My Road Towards the Socialism], written later, after 1905, deals with this matter as well (Viese 1982, 141). Cielēns pointed out in this respect: "Rainis was a socialist, although not a dogmatic Marxist: as a free thinker, he placed the spirit and the will higher than the material conditions, the human being higher than the class division, and the humanity higher than the people. He tried thus to reconcile contrastive principles, and was appreciating the role and freedom of the individual". (HIA b).

Socialism is an indispensable stage adding up to the individualism, its more elaborated stage of development. The individual without the masses is for Rainis "powerless, a voice without the sound, a spirit without the self" (RMM, 120861). A genuine and absolute vehicle for individual is the community. There is a feedback between the individual and the society; one stems from the other, and one supplements the other (Rainis 1896). Rainis refused to justify sacrificing the individual for the generality. It is, according to him, a nonproductive trend threatening freedom. The best way how the individual can serve the generality, is to fulfil her duties in framework of the community, and vice versa. Any benefit for the entirety implies the rise of the good of each separate individual. For Rainis, it was a specific sense of "egoism" instead of "altruism" (Rainis 1896). Vigorous individuals who undertake a motivated work of self-completion, are protagonists of the plays written in Castagnola. Rainis' individual is a pro-active agent who, owing to his initiative, will and work, is able to initiate and implement changes in the world (See Rainis 1896; Rainis 1980, 244). At the same time, the boundary between a self-motivated growth of personality and the growth promoted by external stimulus, remains quite vague. Paternalism which Rainis aspired to escape, sometimes seems sneaking in through the backdoor. Rainis was struggling with a problem of imperfection of his audience. He seemed to require more than an average politically educated individual. He was dreaming about an ideal community in which members of society are on the same level of perfection as its leaders. He contemplated the society of geniuses. One can identify in sources his messianistic commitment to counterbalance the imperfections of his contemporaries by the greatness of his own personality, or at least to contribute to the growth of others (Rainis 1911b). This topic was explored in detail in the unaccomplished play on Īls. In his notes, Rainis used to call this protagonist *Īliņš* or *Kurbads*. He worked on this play during the Slobodsk exile (1897–1903), and these problems returned to his agenda with new emphasis during the Revolution of 1905, as well as during the Castagnola exile. Rainis planned to develop a conception of the New Faust who was supposed to be Īls:

I do not contend that the geniuses shape history, that such unique geniuses are to be raised, as Renan and Nietzsche declare, but opportunity has to be opened for everybody to become a genius, the development of the individual is required, so that we may help the generality.... An outstanding person together with others outstanding persons streaming for perfection (RMM, 23090).

The ideal cherished by Rainis is a community consisting of equal individuals who have all grown in excellence, and thus reached the level of genius. His idea on the "man of the future" is based on notion of a distinguished individual among equals. Writing many of the literary works of Rainis was guided by the intention to make the ethnic Latvian nation see itself as an independent entity. Rainis used to note with pathos that "a will to life" (Rainis 1915b) of the Latvian nation is related to the memories it bears from the "great, splendid past" (Rainis 1915b). The reality, however, provides much more unpretentious sight. He aspired to revive the myths of the nation, and to evolve them. For this reason, he cherished the idea of writing a cycle of historical dramas (Rainis 1983, 577). This life-long project was carried out in different periods of his creative career. In the first plays, he intended to trace the rise of the self-confidence of Latvian nation. The subsequent works were aimed at touching upon the matters of the statehood of Latvia. This endeavour, as well as its main tasks and accomplishments, were explicated in the introduction by the author for the play *Indulis un Ārija* [Indulis and Arija], 1911 (Rainis 1983, 577). During the World War I, the poem *Daugava* [The Daugava], 1916–1919, was written. Rainis stated the idea behind its creation in introductory words to one of its reissues: "Daugava is a work which had a historical task; it has accomplished this task, and it remains now as a document in the history of formation of our country" (Ģermanis 1990, 16). In this poem, Rainis dared to claim the statehood for Latvia in situation when only the most imaginative minds did afford that.

Rainis was a firm defender of idea of Latvia as equal member in a constellation of equal, free and independent countries. He was, however, sometimes concerned for the maturity of the nation which is a crucial precondition for formation of independent state. This concern was voiced, for instance, in letter to his friend, J.

Krauze, in 1915: “The main thing remains: to arouse in Latvians awareness that they can be independent people which needs independent life as well, spiritually and politically, because if there is no political independence, the spiritual life will also be suppressed. We have to get rid of the vision that we can subsist only from the pity of the Russians or the Germans” (Rainis 1915a).

V. RAINIS AS AN OFFICIAL IN STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES: ISSUES PROBLEMATIZED AND CHALLENGES FACED

After the Independence Struggles waged in the territory of Latvia were ended, Rainis returned home, to the newly established, independent and democratic State of Latvia, in April 1920. A little while before departing from Switzerland, in 1919, he stated his programme. He depicted himself as potentially affiliated at state government agencies, however he was unspecific, and the plans were outlined with an exaggerated pathos. He mixed up the desired personal achievements with successes in the field of literature and practical politics which he also hoped for. He sums up in a diary:

...to be strong, to defeat all my enemies, to defeat circumstances unfavourable for me, to defeat all the evil, I need a permanent revival, I have to grow young, strong, healthy and ineffably happy, I always have to go together with progress, I have to become and to be the leading spirit of whole world literature, I have to make happy my dear Inīņa

²*,my dear people, my whole dear world, my dear friends, (...) I have to make my dear Latvia free, a politically and economically independent state this very year, I have to make it the first state of the world of future, I have to make it happy (Rainis 1919).*

Nevertheless, only three months later, he formulated his commitment as follows:

A while later he stated: “All my activity is purely of literary nature. And I have so much to say in literature, all the unsaid what had been accumulating within me for years, it lies so heavy on me that I cannot even think about other activities” (RMM, 18459). He also voiced a concern for the fact that the forthcoming social and political involvement might disturb his literary work: “I am not ready Now the politics will come. Shall it not knock me out of the track? Will I be able to turn to the great work again? ... Shall politics give entertainment or the repose?” (Rainis 1920a).

He got none of these. The still life of the former exile turned imbued with various duties after return from Castagnola, including managerial obligations he disliked so much. The period he spent occupying different positions in state government agencies was not long, from 1920 to 1928. However, he managed to serve as a member of the provisional Parliament of the Republic of Latvia, *Satversmes Sapulce* [*Satversmes Convention*], and its heir, the regular Parliament, *Saeima*. Rainis was elected for convocations of the years 1922, 1925, and 1928. He was also a Head of Department of Art at Ministry of Education in 1920. He held a position of Manager of the National Theatre from 1921 to 1925. Besides these official offices, Rainis was also assigned for several honorary positions. He concluded his career of the politician as a Minister of Education. He served in this position only a little more than one year, from 1926 to 1928. However, he did not manage to gain the positions for which he desired the most, i.e., the President of the Republic of Latvia and the Speaker of the Parliament.

Return of both famous litterateurs, Rainis and Aspazija, to their motherland, Latvia, on April 10, 1920, turned triumphant. Crowds of welcomers, including members of political parties, the highest government officials and representatives of interest groups, greetings on the first pages of the most important newspapers, dedications in forms of poems (see Wirsa 1920) and a special concert in the National Opera House (RMM, 77834) – Rainis was welcomed as a great contributor to the formation of the independent Latvia, and everybody wanted to show their appreciation for this fact (RMM, 20250; Mikše 1920). This warm welcome encouraged high expectations for the returned exile regarding his prospective status in society, as well as caused a sorrowful disappointment soon after (Rainis 1921b).

The initial phase of building the independent Republic of Latvia was at all events a socially contested process. Many parties claimed to get credit and recognition for winning the independence of Latvia, and tried to gain the upper hand over political rivals. I will leave aside this by-product of each parliamentary democracy, and will not focus on the power struggles among political parties and groups, as well as within the Social Democratic Party. Not only due to this rivalry did his colleagues in the party want to see him remaining in the role which he had successfully played before – that of a poet and ideologist. The published and unpublished writings of the social democrats Fricis Menders and Bruno Kalniņš contain ample evidence for that (Kalniņš 1993, 60). I argue that a great deal of challenges the playwright and poet faced after taking upon himself as position of politician, were even more dramatic due to his inability to reconcile the identity of the unattached intellectual with the new situation, role and obligations.

Rainis was immediately asked to set firmly his affiliation in terms of ideological spectrum and constellation of political forces. Questions such as “Where does Rainis belong?” (*Dzejnieks, Tauta, Partija* 1920) were asked after his first appearances in public in which he was praising the role of the individual no less

than that of the masses. As an unattached intellectual, he was free to shape his personal utopia fusing elements which proved to be conflicting in the activities of a politician.

Rainis was far from a bright politician. His name appeared rarely among the most active members of LSDSP, taking part in work of the party, participating in debates, voicing views, proving themselves as impressive speakers (LUABRRGK). He anticipated that the esteem which he was enjoying as an intellectual, may be transferred automatically to other realms, including state government agencies. He took himself for deserving figure to earn the highest positions of the newly-established state. For him, it was a reward for contribution to formation of this state, for providing its ideological foundation, for rising the human awareness for its necessity. However, he undervalued the essentially different nature of the realm in which he manifested himself as an unattached intellectual, and the vibrant everyday life of the parliamentary democracy politician. Each of them requires another type of resources. Rainis was not endowed with the rhetorical skills and spontaneity which are crucial for the politician of parliamentary democracy. His contemporary, Pēteris Birkerts, analyzed in detail the addresses written and delivered by Rainis. Birkerts approved their qualities in terms of the content, while performance was being conceded by him as poor (RMM, 26355). The emotional playwright did not indeed display an expert manner of speaking involving control of voice and gesture.

The messages included by Rainis in his speeches, contained the same interests, concerns and intentions which he had cherished during the stage of the unattached intellectual. Throughout the career of the politician, Rainis stressed the responsibility of the individual in sustaining the political regime established, and its further moulding. He addressed the matter of role of individuals as cornerstone agents of functioning democracy, and voiced regret on drying up of their voluntary engagement. Activities of each particular individual, as well as their common efforts, are substantial in small states, he argued (Rainis 1993l). Citizens interested in the public life is a trump of such countries. In the period prior to formation of independent state, Rainis was worried for not enough motivated members of society, and lack of their support to the idea of establishing their own country. After this target was successfully achieved, the motivation of individuals is still of no less significance, he tried to indicate. He stressed the self-determination rights of nation before formation of the state, and in the new situation, this emphasis was further evolved by him. Citizens have to be willing to defend their rights, and he implied the rights of the individual and the citizen now. It matched up to Rainis' vision on "demokrātisms" (*democratism*) (Rainis 1993n). He used this notion for featuring a stock of norms and habits characteristic to democracy on various levels.

As a member of provisional Parliament, Rainis was still discussing the national question. He did not renounce the vision voiced before, regarding the forthcoming stages in the dialectics of society organization levels, i.e., he was a firm defender of the idea of voluntary association of nations. Emphasis on a teleological cycle of organizing society remained as important for him, as it had been before. Individual is a member of nation forming a state. The latter, on its turn, is involved in voluntary cooperation on supranational level. Considerations voiced by Rainis in 1920 on the causes of failures of the Russian Empire, are illustrative in this respect: "...Russia was not a country of the people, but an amalgamation of a number of peoples, and these were not unified into Russia voluntarily, but by force" (Rainis 1993c).

The role of ethics in state government agencies was also among the matters Rainis was concerned for (See Rainis 1993a; Rainis 1993b; Rainis 1993e). He saw himself as a prophet representing the realm of decency, and thus felt obliged to advocate it. In those rare times when he mounted the platform of the Parliament, Rainis denounced the efforts of colleagues to gain benefits by using dishonest methods and tools. He called upon replacing such customs with a principled or "great" politics, as he put it (Birkerts 1931, 13). He claimed to be a legitimate outsider, and he did not renounce this stance also in the years to come. In 1925, he voiced from the Parliament tribune: "I always grasp the politics in totality, and I am a politician only in this sense, otherwise I belong as a writer to the life which is specifically spiritual" (Rainis 1993k).

The agenda outlined above did not provide immediate solutions to the problems the new country faced, although politicians are normally expected to be able to do so. Therefore Rainis often felt resentful for he saw his ideals not being shared by other community members. Due to his personal characteristics, such as lack of sociability (Birkerts 1912, 488), elocution and charisma, excessive emotionality, inability to accept imperfections of actual human beings, and woundability, he failed to turn into a profound defender of the above-mentioned ideals in the public sphere, although he did sometimes stress their significance in front of various audiences. After returning to the native country, Rainis launched the career of politician guided by expectations to be not only a poet and playwright enjoying the recognition of people, but also a high-calibre politician to whom people would listen in the same way as they appreciated his poetry and plays. This scenario did not come true, and Rainis regarded moving aside himself to the periphery of the socially political life as inability of society to detect and implement large-scale ideas which, as one can guess from his commentaries, he was still willing to deliver (Rainis 1921b).

The daily *Latvis* [Latvian] published an apt description of Rainis' incentives after his death: "*Uguns un nakts* and *Daugava*¹ induced Rainis to regard himself as a founder of the independent Latvia. Therefore, after return home, not due to the place-hunting, but by treating the matter in a very noble fashion, he was expecting to be elected the President of the independent Latvia..." (*Latvis*, 1929). One can agree with this statement to a great extent, and there are no grounds for guessing that Rainis did not mean what he maintained, i.e., he was indeed willing to contribute to the further growth of his country. However, this did not fully consider the routine side of the positions he was striving for.

The routine activities in state government agencies did not give satisfaction for the former unattached intellectual (Rainis 1921a). *Saeima* sittings made him bored (Rainis 1920b), and he looked for shelter in the practice of literary work. Antonija Lūkina (pseudonym – Ivande Kaija), his close friend, contended shortly after Rainis' return to Latvia, that the environment in which immediate pragmatic solutions are being looked for, is unsuitable for the kind of figure Rainis was (Kaija 1931, 119). He was indeed oversensitive towards the critique, unwilling to reconcile himself to the fact that one kind of relationship may persist among persons in the private realm, while guided by other principles in the professional field, i.e., the allegiance and respect enjoyed in the former may not be automatically conveyable to the latter. Rainis was by no means convincing as a negotiator, persuading partners did not come easily to him, and solving unexpected situations was a true challenge as well. He was emotionally inconsistent personality; Frīdis Menders, his acquaintance, characterized him as a "man of influences of a moment" (LUABRRGK).

In a conversation with Pēteris Birkerts, Rainis voiced a conviction that "a poet can also be a politician" (RMM, 26366). The same was pointed out by him in a speech on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the social democratic press (Rainis 1993i). The French culture, according to him, provides a model worth imitating in terms of integrating the intellectual in socially political processes. Rainis praised the figures who maintained the qualities and carried on with fulfilling the functions of intellectual as stated in this article, notwithstanding taking a position of the politician, e.g. Anatole France who not only declared his preferences in the realm of practical politics openly, but was also, as Rainis put it, a "worker of the publicity". Victor Hugo earned his appreciation as well, for he was "a genuine poet, and a genuine politician" (Rainis 1993m). The ambiguous figure of Voltaire was for Rainis a personality "on which all the European culture rests" (Rainis 1993m). However, the question remains, whether the playwright and politician was himself willing to play this double role. In the very beginning of his career of the politician, Rainis made an entry in his diary regarding his party fellow Rūdolfs Lindiņš: "Not a trade politician. When the political work is done, he will turn to another – the cultural one. As so it is for many of us. Politics – it is only a necessity for a while" (Rainis 1920d). This directs to thoughts that Rainis himself considered his involvement in state government agencies as a short-term solution. Also in the years to come Rainis maintained this conviction. He did not provide an unequivocal answer, though, to the question, whether it is expected from persons taking a position of politician for a while, to develop the responsibility and manner of action of a combatant politician. At the same time, these considerations show that Rainis approved the intrinsically different nature of both roles, although humane ambition made him underestimate this aspect in his own case. These differences, on their turn, follow from some pre-given character of environment in which these roles are being played, one might argue.

Rainis still believed that persons occupied primarily in the realm of culture, of art, bear the responsibility for reflecting and problematizing the social and political processes of the era (Rainis 1993d). He defied the principle "l'art pour l'art", i.e., a view that any social functions are beyond the tasks of art, and that the latter should confine itself to providing a purely aesthetic pleasure for the audience. He, on the contrary, argued that "art must have its intention, for if intention is removed from art, a mere technique remains ..." (RMM, 26132). Art, in various its manifestations, by using the tools being at its disposition, can contribute to the increase of the general level of culture in society, in a broad sense. It concerns the political culture, culture guiding relationships between groups in society, culture in arranging the public matters, and culture as an ability to appraise critically the processes. The more developed the culture, the higher level of the individual's self-reliance. Last but not least, culture is to be present in international affairs (Rainis 1993f).

These, according to Rainis, are inalienable traits of democracy, and intellectuals play a significant part in building them up. He called "the artists" not to avoid the responsibility of taking upon themselves a "public work" (Rainis 1993m). Addressees of these appeals were members of the writing public, representatives of the theatre circles, teachers, journalists and students. Rainis invoked their resources of the symbolic power, the "spiritual means, not the means of power" (Rainis 1993j). He placed emphasis on the mobilizing, the educating and the socializing facet of various cultural institutions, as he had done prior to undertaking position in state government agencies. Theatre, according to him, deserves a particular attention, as it promotes activity and initiative (Rainis 1993h).

¹The play *Uguns un Nakts* and the poem *Daugava* can be listed among his the most famous writings.

He regarded the relationships between the socially political process, on one hand, and the artistic endeavours, on the other, as a mutual refinement. At the same time, he pointed out that there has to be a certain demand for the added value of these endeavours, readiness of the public to accept what the representatives of realm of art, culture, can provide. In other words, pre-existing value-orientations and modes of action are required. In 1923, when Rainis explained his choice not to continue writing the play of a patriotic content, *Imants* [Imants], he referred to the loss of interest on these issues in the audience (RMM, 26366).

In chase of the highest positions in government of the country of which he, as Rainis himself believed, was co-founder, he was guided by ambition to maintain the role of spiritual leader of society. Position of the Head of State might have been indeed the most appropriate for that, in many respects due to the representation functions as established by provisions of the Constitution of 1922. However, he did not display consistent enthusiasm on being a politician in any capacity. Exhaustion, grievance and inability to see the realization of his normative vision in practice, as well as frequentative disappointments due to inability to gain positions he strived for, provoked commentaries which were indicative of weariness. He described his work in state government agencies as an unworthy waste of vigour. On December 23, 1922, shortly after the presidential election in which LSDSP did not even put forward Rainis' candidacy, he was contemplating the possible gains from his further career as a politician both for himself, as well as for the society and the state:

Is it worth it? ... Have not there been enough sacrifices for the idea of the state? Is it not necessary to go further? Have I not worked and given enough? If it is possible to evolve the idea, may they develop it according to the track I have given; if no, I can not help either. I have to go further, the time has come (Rainis 1922).

Rainis lacked a clear program and comprehension on the nature of positions which he aspired to gain. Fēlikss Cielēns was delegated by the party to elucidate for the resentful Rainis the reasons for not putting forward his candidacy. The latter settled for the explanation, approved the tactical manoeuvres applied by party, but he passed a remark that it still should have put forward his candidacy for the Speaker of the Parliament. By not doing so, he argued, party tried to "encapsulate" him, and prohibited him from serving the people and the state (Cielēns 1998, 194). This position, which Rainis would have been delighted to receive as a compensation for not electing him the President, was related to a good deal of managerial tasks, and he undervalued this aspect. Rainis' party fellows took actions according to the generally accepted practices, i.e. they compromised and made political deals, while Rainis, on his turn, saw this matter in a simplistic way – it was for him an undignified behaviour. His diary gives evidence in this period for his deep mortification and efforts to accept situation in which the desired has not been obtained. At the same time, he expounded voluminous projects regarding his plans in the literary field (Rainis 1922).

Despite the above-mentioned, in 1926, the playwright politician took a new challenge, i.e., he became a Minister of Education. Due to the administrative nature, narrow focus, and the executive functions accompanying this position, it became ever harder to make it compatible with the commitment to seize the political process "in totality" (Rainis 1993k). During the short period Rainis served in this position, his identity of the unattached intellectual became evident again. He voiced willingness to return to writing. In April 1927 he wrote in a diary:

I have now served as a minister for three months. It is enough, I want to live now, and to write again. I am tired of standing idle, out of thoughts. Tired of everything, not sure if I will be able to write something ... I have just proved that I have delivered speeches four days in a row. I proved that I can force myself, although I wanted to run away so much (Rainis 1927).

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I will sum up and compare Rainis' intentions in two stages of his politically relevant activities, in context of the functions of intellectuals. The poet and the playwright Rainis was guided by the intention to continue contributing to the development of his society and country after return from the exile, by taking upon himself a role which was essentially different from the one he had played before. He claimed to carry on fulfilling the functions of the intellectual in framework of this new role, and it caused unforeseen challenges, a great deal of disappointment, confusion, lack of resilience, and sorrowful conclusions regarding compatibility of the role of unattached intellectual, and that of the politician.

If one settles for the assumption that those who have facilitated certain social transformations, are welcome, not to say obliged, to work in favour of consolidation of their effects, his aspirations and choice to engage in state government agencies can be easily justified. Rainis looked at this opportunity right from this perspective, and he was guided by a sense of mission.

a) *Function of social mediation and sustainig a rational communication in the public sphere*

In the initial period of the stage of the unattached intellectual, while Rainis still lived in the territory of Latvia, any experience of the civil society practices, or the tradition of cooperation between the leaders and the masses was poorly developed. Movement of the so called "tautībnieki" (*Lettophiles*) was too elitist, according to

Rainis' account. Notwithstanding this, he dared to contemplate and favoured conditions in which people themselves decide matters concerning them not only in the private sphere. In a wider sense – his intention was to persuade the population on necessity to ground the society governing structures on the consent of the governed. This emphasis became more explicit during the Castagnola exile, as Rainis witnessed the achievements of Switzerland in introducing mechanisms guaranteeing that. After return from exile, this matter remained at the top on his agenda. He insisted that the idea of democracy should be nurtured by *democratism*. Its essence is individuals interested in the socially political matters, who together form a vibrant community.

The stage of state government agencies also inherited his intention of fostering the development of “cultural” politics, i.e., politics in which values are cherished, and principles are not being violated. Such politics manifests itself in various ways and on different levels. Relationship between the various groups in society is one example. He encouraged people to adhere to decent principles of coexistence, particularly among various ethnic groups.

b) Support function

As a politician, Rainis faced the legacy of the repressive regime which became apparent as an inability of individuals to grow used to their role of agents of influence. When searching for solutions, he pointed at Switzerland democracy and decentralization. However, he rather voiced disappointment and regret for the backwardness of the population of Latvia, and its inability to call into being structures and attitudes persisting in a country where democratic traditions trace back to the Middle Ages, than came forward proactively with solutions for vitalizing the socially political life in the existing conditions. Besides, according to the Constitution adopted, Latvia had chosen not to introduce instruments of the direct democracy. The representative democracy does not provide extensive possibilities for citizens to demonstrate their will on a regular basis.

As an unattached intellectual, Rainis did not hesitate to stress the fact that writing his literary works was guided by intention to facilitate the level of responsibility in society. This endeavour was directly related to the national question. Although one of Rainis' intentions was identifying the group in society which would be the most appropriate for cherishing the national emancipation incentives, and he named the proletariat as such (reasons for that are worth a separate discussion), he also stressed the individual element against this background. In this respect, he was guided by the intention to invite individuals to acknowledge their responsibility for the processes in the world. To put in more general terms – to urge the public for acknowledging the social restrictions characteristic to their time, and taking proactive measures in order to surmount them.

Both – prior to, and after involvement in state government agencies, Rainis' intention was vindication of the role of individuals and their rights, by demonstrating that the development of the individual is a vital precondition for development of the social whole, and vice versa. Rainis stressed the significance of the individual as the propelling force of history. This matter occupied a considerable part in his unattached intellectual's agenda, and it did not disappear from the agenda of Rainis the politician as well.

Rainis' wish to engage in state government derived from his intention to contribute to the further growth of his society. However, he had not elaborated a clear-defined program in this respect. Rainis' perception of what can be accomplished in framework of parliamentary representative democracy by occupying a concrete position as a politician, was too idealistic and incomplete.

c) Function of social criticism

Although it is not an unequivocal conclusion, the way Rainis acted and reacted to various situations under the repressive regime, corresponds in many respects to the model of critic the author of normative instructions, and the invented criticism. His primary channel of social criticism was literary works. Via these works and using the written word, Rainis reflected upon the social problems he regarded as topical, and invited other representatives of this and related fields of art to join him in fulfilling this mission.

Rainis kept on doing literary work after undertaking career of the politician. He still regarded as his duty enriching his works with socially political relevance. However, this activity was then not so much a tool of social criticism, as a strategy of taking shelter from the everyday professional life which did not lead him to the expected fruition. Rainis complained for the absence of pre-existing value-orientations in society which could be further articulated by the artistic aspirations of the intellectual. The demand from society for such activities of the intellectual were vanishing, according to Rainis. Still, these emphasis can be read as a turn towards the interpretative criticism. Previously, a great deal of Rainis' lexicon was occupied by notions such as “teaching”, “bringing the light of spirit”, he praised Voltaire, who is thought to be the prototype of the ‘Universal intellectual’ in social theory. Willingness to serve as a prophet, the leading spirit in society thus contributing to its transformation, was permanently characteristic to him throughout the stage of the unattached intellectual. Even in the beginning of the stage of state government agencies, he referred to these aspects when trying to justify his endeavours as a politician. Although Rainis as the unattached intellectual, as mentioned above, stressed

the principled role of the individual initiative, he was concerned for the slow formation of the awareness of majority of members of society, their inability to comprehend the messages elaborated by the vanguard intellectuals. He therefore contemplated the desirability of situation in which each member of society has attained a level of a genius. Thus, the gap between the leaders and the masses would cease to exist, they would share common concerns and commitments, would be possessed of the same level of comprehension. By setting forward this expectation, he also tried to define preconditions for a large-scale social transformation in which one or few leaders would not suppress the mass. Still, such disinclination to take the existing individuals with their imperfections as point of departure for criticism, entails problematic implications.

d) *Function of monitoring directions of political developments*

Rainis was worried for the fact that the habits of human beings might undermine sustainability of changes and opportunities already embraced by the society. As mentioned above, his reflection on this matter intensified during the stage of state government agencies. He acknowledged now the consequences caused by the repressive regime. The reproaches he heaped upon individuals in the stage of unattached intellectual, were mainly related to the national question. Then, he did not dedicate a great deal of attention to consequences which dictatorship might cause for the behaviour and way of thinking of the individuals in future. Instead, he tended to flatter the potential accumulated in the spiritual properties of the people. Moreover, as an unattached intellectual, Rainis did not discuss in detail the nature of the regime existing in the Russian Empire. Lack of its justification was reduced by him to the shortcomings of power that be in solving the national question. Rainis did not hesitate to discuss the role of the moral obligation in socially political process on various its levels. It was his intention to urge society and its representatives not to undervalue its significance. Via examples of concrete historical personalities, he pointed at qualities which honourable politicians should possess. They should adhere to moral principles, act in a just manner, restrict lust after power for its own sake, and to avoid building career using the tools which might harm others. Practical politics in general and the state government agencies in particular is a field where ideals can be pursued in the interest of whole of society. A vigorous politician, endowed with a high level of self-confidence, would not seek using dirty methods in the political struggle, Rainis maintained.

Criticism targeted by Rainis the politician towards the state government agencies and his newly gained colleagues, was mainly accusatory by its nature, and he remained devoted to a normative account of the politician. At the same time, one of his intentions was to warn society for the threats furthered by paternalistic tendencies emerging. People are discouraged from following the current events in high politics and taking part in directing them. It obstructs society from organizing socially political life in a way which would be most acceptable to everybody, he maintained.

Analysis of the case of Rainis indicates that after involvement in state government agencies, the former unattached intellectual tends to remain as an outsider for these agencies, claims to be their critic and conscience. Intellectuals are inclined to derive their authority on resources of the symbolic power, accumulated before returning a politician. Playwright the politician experienced a considerable personal drama, a clash of identities, as he crossed the border between the two stages of politically relevant activities. It was related in many respects to the continuity of his intentions in both stages, keeping pursuing ideals in situation when pragmatic solutions are expected and required. This case shows that there is a good reason to keep the intellectuals in the public sphere, where they are able to contribute to the political process no less than as agents in state government bodies.

Notes

¹*Jaunā Strāva* was a reform movement, targeted at social modernization. It operated in the Baltic provinces of the Russian Empire in the end of the 19th century.

² A nickname which Rainis occasionally used in his correspondence and notes for his spouse Aspazija.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Alatas, S. H. 1977. *Intellectuals in Developing Societies*. London: Frank Cass.
- [2]. Alexander, J. C. 2009. "Public intellectuals and civil society." In *Intellectuals and their Publics: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*, edited by C. Flek, A. Hess and E.S. Lyon. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 19–27.
- [3]. Bauman, Z. 1987. *Legislators and Interpreters: on Modernity, Post-Modernity, and Intellectuals*. Ithaca; NY: Cornell University Press.
- [4]. Benda, J. 1959. *The Betrayal of Intellectuals*. Boston; MA: The Beacon Press.
- [5]. Birkerts, A. 1912. "Rainis: biogrāfiska skice." *Domas*, 25: 481–590.

- [6]. Birkerts, A. 1931. "Raina mūža pēdējais cēliens." In *J. Rainis: Dzīve un darbi, XI sēj.*, 5–23. Rīga: A. Gulbja apgāds.
- [7]. Blanks, E. 1994. *Latvju tautiskā kustība*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- [8]. Bourdieu, P. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory*, 7 (1): 14–25.
- [9]. Cielēns, F. 1955. *Rainis un Aspazija: Fēliksa Cielēna atmiņas un pārdomas*. Vesterosa: Ziemeļblāzma.
- [10]. Cielēns, F. 1998. *Laikmetu maiņā: atmiņas un atziņas. 3. grāmata*. Stokholma: Memento.
- [11]. Collins, R. 2011. "Who has been a successful public intellectual?" *European Journal of Social Theory*. 14 (4): 437–52.
- [12]. Coser, L. A. 1970. *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*. New York; NY: Free Press, 1970.
- [13]. Cvijetic, S. 1999. "Ten Years on: the Unbearable Lightness of Being an Intellectual." Accessed October 1, 2015. http://www.ce-review.org/99/22/best22_cvijetic.html
- [14]. "Dzejnieks. Tauta. Partija (Epiloga vietā Raiņa-Aspazijas dienām)." 1920. *Brīvā Zeme*, 84.
- [15]. Emmerich, W., McIsaac, P. 2003. "German writers as intellectuals: strategies and aporias of engagement in East and West from 1945 until today." *New German Critique*. 88: 37–54.
- [16]. Eyerman, R. 1994. *Between Culture and Politics: Intellectuals in Modern Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [17]. Foucault, M. 1996. "What our present is (Interview by A. Berten)." In *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews 1961 – 1984*, edited by S. Lotringer. New York; NY: Semiotext(e), 407–15.
- [18]. Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- [19]. Grīnuma, G. 2001. "Es vairāk negribu – tik taisnību. Raiņa aizsāktās lugas "Nodevējs" tapšanas un publicēšanas vēsture." In *Rainis radošo meklējumu spoguļi*. Rīga: Zinātne, 102–51.
- [20]. Ģermanis, U. 1990. "Nacionālpolitiskās domas Raiņa "Daugavā"." In *Ceļā uz Latviju: Raksti par mūsu vēsturi*, edited by U. Ģermanis. Rīga: Memento.
- [21]. Habermas, J. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge; MA: The MIT Press.
- [22]. Hajek, F.A. 1949. "The intellectuals and socialism." *The University of Chicago Law Review*. Spring: 417–33.
- [23]. HIA [Stanford University Hoover Institution Archive] a. Collection "Felikss Cielēns", Box. No. 2.7, Folder "Speeches and Writings". "Starptautiskais rakstnieku kongress".
- [24]. HIA [Stanford University Hoover Institution Archive] b. Collection "Felikss Cielēns", Box. No. 2.7, Folder "Speeches and writings". Cielēns F. The Latvian Drama.
- [25]. Hofstadter, R. 1963. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York; NY: Vintage.
- [26]. Hollander, P. 1987. "American intellectuals: producers and consumers of social criticism." In *Intellectuals in Liberal Democracies: Political Influence and Social Involvement*, edited by A. Gagnon. New York; NY: Praeger, 67–86.
- [27]. Howe, I. 1988. This Age of Conformity // Quoted from: Scialabba, G. "What are intellectuals good for?" *Grand Street*. 7 (3): 194–211.
- [28]. Kaija, I. 1931. *Mana dienasgrāmata*. Rīga: Zelta Grauds.
- [29]. Kalniņš, B. 1993. *Latvijas sociāldemokrātijas 50 gadi (1904-1954)*. Stokholma: Memento.
- [30]. Kuvacis, I. 1985. "Intellectuals and power structure." *State, Culture, and Society*. 1 (2): 152–72.
- [31]. Latvijas Republikas Saeima. 1923. *Latvijas Republikas Saeimas stenogrammas. I. Sesija*, compiled by H. Kārklīš. Rīga: Latvijas Republikas Saeima.
- [32]. Latvijas Republikas Saeima. 1927. *Latvijas Republikas II Saeimas stenogrammas. V sesija*, compiled by H. Kārklīš. Rīga: Latvijas Republikas Saeima. 1929. *Latvis*. 18.09.1929.
- [33]. Lepenies, W. 1991. "The failure of the interpreting class or intellectuals in the two Germanies." *New Literary History*. 22 (4): 914–16.
- [34]. LUABRRGK [Latvijas Universitātes Akadēmiskās bibliotēkas Rokrakstu un reto grāmatu krātuve]. Fonds: Frīcis Mendērs. Inv. Nr. Rk2225; Rk 2217. Nēpublicēts materiāls. Mendērs F. *Domās, darbi un dzīve. 8. daļa*.
- [35]. LVVA [Latvijas Valsts Vēstures Arhīvs]. Fonds Nr. 3949, Apraksts Nr. 1, Lieta Nr. 15. Mendērs F. Atmiņas par attiecībām starp Raini un buržuāziskās Latvijas sociāldemokrātiem.
- [36]. Mann, M. 2012. *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 3: Global Empires and Revolution, 1890–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [37]. Mikše, V. 1920. "Raiņa un Aspazijas atgriešanās Baltajā Latvijā." *Krievijas Cīņa*, 44.
- [38]. Nozick, R. 1998. "Why do intellectuals oppose capitalism?" Accessed November 3, 2014. <http://www.libertarianism.org/publications/essays/why-do-intellectuals-oppose-capitalism>.
- [39]. Pipes, R. 1961. *The Russian Intelligentsia*. New York; NY: Columbia University Press.

- [40]. Priedītis, A. 1996. *Mans Rainis*. Daugavpils: A.K.A., 1996.
- [41]. Rainis. 1986. "1896. gada piezīmes. Ieraksts 22.05.1896." Accessed May 3, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Piezimes/1896piezimes/I.html>
- [42]. Rainis. 1897–1903. "Slobodskas laika radāmās domas." Accessed October 12, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Kurbads/domas.htm>
- [43]. Rainis. 1908. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 23.01.1908." Accessed December 2, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1908.html>
- [44]. Rainis. 1911a. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 24.02.1911." Accessed July 16, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1911.html>
- [45]. Rainis. 1911b. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 30.10.1911." Accessed April 16, 2014. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1911.html>
- [46]. Rainis. 1912a. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 23.04.1912." Accessed October 12, 2014. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1912.html>
- [47]. Rainis. 1912b. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 07.12.1912." Accessed May 12, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1912.html>
- [48]. Rainis. 1912c. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 09.12.1912." Accessed November 12, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1912.html>
- [49]. Rainis. 1913a. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 17.03.1913." Accessed December 12, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1913.html>
- [50]. Rainis. 1913b. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 18.09.1913." Accessed April 16, 2014. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1913.html>
- [51]. Rainis. 1913c. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 17.07.1913." Accessed November 16, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1913.html>
- [52]. Rainis. 1915a. "Vēstules. J. Krauzem 1915. gada 22. jūnijā." Accessed September 23, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Vestules/1915.html>
- [53]. Rainis. 1915b. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 03.11.1915." Accessed November 8, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1909.html>
- [54]. Rainis. 1916. "Vēstules. F. Cielēnam 6. Oktobrī." Accessed December 11, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Vestules/1916.html>
- [55]. Rainis. 1919. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 10.07.1919." Accessed September 21, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1919.html>
- [56]. Rainis. 1920a. "Kastaņolas periods. Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 04.01.1920." Accessed September 21, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1906-1920/1920.html>
- [57]. Rainis. 1920b. "Dienasgrāmata (1920. – 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 25.11.1920." Accessed February 17, 2014. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1923.html>
- [58]. Rainis. 1920c. "Dienasgrāmata (1920.– 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 07.12.1920." Accessed September 21, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1923.html>
- [59]. Rainis. 1920d. "Dienasgrāmata (1920.– 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 08.12.1920." Accessed September 21, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1923.html>
- [60]. Rainis. 1921a. "Dienasgrāmata (1920.– 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 21.01.1921." Accessed April 16, 2014.
- [61]. Rainis. 1921b. "Dienasgrāmata (1920. – 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 19.04.1921." Accessed November 16, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1923.html>
- [62]. Rainis. 1922. "Dienasgrāmata (1920. – 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 23.12.1922." Accessed November 16, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1922.html>
- [63]. Rainis. 1927. "Dienasgrāmata (1920. – 1929.). Ieraksts dienasgrāmatā 04.04.1927." Accessed October 12, 2015. <http://www.korpuss.lv/klasika/Senie/Rainis/Dienasgr/1923.html>
- [64]. Rainis. 1969. "Par tautības un kosmopolītisma jautājumu: atskats uz kādu neizdevušos sabiedrisku mēģinājumu." In *Raiņa un Aspazijas gadagrāmata 1970. gadam*. Vesterosa: RAF, 22–25.
- [65]. Rainis. 1980. "Indulis un Ārija." In *Kopotī raksti, 10. Sēj.* Rīga: Zinātne, 5–306.
- [66]. Rainis. 1981. "Kajs Grakhs. Radāmās domas." In *Kopotī raksti, 14. sēj.* Rīga: Zinātne, 329–434.
- [67]. Rainis. 1983. "Priekšvārdi savu darbu izdevumiem. Indulis un Ārija." In *Kopotī raksti, 18. sēj.* Rīga: Zinātne, 575–79.
- [68]. Rainis. 1985. *Kopotī raksti, 21. sējums*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- [69]. Rainis. 1993a. "Runa Satversmes sapulces priekšvēlēšanu sapulcē 1920. gada 11. aprīlī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 1993, 113–14.

- [70]. Rainis.1993b. "Runa Satversmes sapulces 1.sesijas 27. sēdē 1920. gada 1. septembrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 9—19.
- [71]. Rainis.1993c. "Referāts Raiņa klubā par Baltijas valstu konferenci 1920.gada 18. septembrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 127 –32.
- [72]. Rainis.1993d. "Runa LSDSP studentu sekcijas sapulcē 1920.gada 1. decembrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 134–36.
- [73]. Rainis. 1993e. "Runa Sociāldemokrātiskās jaunatnes savienības Rīgas nodaļas biedru vakarā 1920. gadā". In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 193—200.
- [74]. Rainis.1993f. "Runa Satversmes sapulces 4.sesijas 5. sēdē 1921. gada 28. septembrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 24–31.
- [75]. Rainis.1993g. "Referāts Latvijas skatuves mākslas pulciņā 1921.gada 31. oktobrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 164–74.
- [76]. Rainis.1993h. "Referāts lauku pašvaldības darbiniekiem 1921.gada 20. novembrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 184–91.
- [77]. Rainis. 1993i. "Runa Sociāldemokrātiskās preses 30 gadu jubilejā 1922. gada 7. janvārī". In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 201—03. lpp.
- [78]. Rainis.1993j. "Runa Pirmās Saeimas 2.sesijas 36. sēdē 1923. gada 13. jūlijā." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 50–63.
- [79]. Rainis. 1993k. "Runa Pirmās Saeimas 7. sesijas 9. sēdē 1925. gada 17. februārī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 83–87.
- [80]. Rainis. 1993l. "Runa Pirmās Saeimas 8. sesijas 19. sēdē 1925. gada 20. Maijā." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 88–95.
- [81]. Rainis. 1993m. "Runa savas 60 gadu jubilejas vakarā studentu biedrības „Zemgaliņa” un „Klints” 1925. gada 10. oktobrī." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 253–255.
- [82]. Rainis. 1993n. "Runa Kultūras svētku priekšvakarā 1929. gada 8. jūnijā." In *J. Rainis: runas un intervijas*, edited by V. Hausmanis. Rīga: Latvijas ZA Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts, 359–62.
- [83]. Rainis. 1996. "Nodevējs." *Karogs*, 9, 144–84.
- [84]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 18459.
- [85]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 20250.
- [86]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 23090.
- [87]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 26132.
- [88]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 26355.
- [89]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 26366.
- [90]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 59034.
- [91]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 77834.
- [92]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 120861.
- [93]. RMM [Rakstniecības un mūzikas muzejs], Inv. Nr. 244383.
- [94]. Scott, A. 1997. „Between autonomy and responsibility: Max Weber on scholars, academics and intellectuals." In: *Intellectuals in Politics: from Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie*, edited by J. Jennings, A. Kemp and T. Kemp-Welch. London: Routledge, 45–64.
- [95]. Said, E. W. 1996. *Representations of the Intellectual: the 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York; NY: Vintage Books.
- [96]. Seton-Watson, H. 1960. "The Russian intellectuals." In *The Intellectuals: a Controversial Portrait*, edited by G. Huszar G. Glencoe; Il: The Free Press of Glencoe. 41–50.

- [97]. Skinner, Q. 1972. "Motives, intentions, and interpretation of texts." *New Literary History*, 3 (2): 393–408.
- [98]. Skinner, Q. 1974. "'Social meaning" and the explanation of social action. In *The Philosophy of History*, edited by P. Gardiner P. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 106–126.
- [99]. Viese, S. 1982. *Jaunais Rainis*. Riga: Liesma.
- [100]. Walzer, M. 1985. *Interpretation and Social Criticism*. Cambridge; MA: Harvard University Press.
- [101]. Wirsa, E. 1920. "Dzejnieka atgriešanās." *Latvijas Kareivis*, 42.
- [102]. Zola, E. 1998. *The Dreyfus Affair: J'Accuse and Other Writings*. New Haven; CT: Yale University Press.