

**Chapter 1 : How Do People Feel About the Gramsci Monument, One Year Later ?**

*The Gramsci Factor: 59 Socialists in Congress [Chuck Morse] on racedaydvl.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. Mr. Morse is more than just another radio Master of Ceremonies for crackpots to call in and vent their spleens.*

Tweet The Gramsci Monument, Last summer , the art world flocked up to a Bronx housing project to see what Swiss artist Thomas Hirschhorn had made. Conceived of as a monument to Antonio Gramsci, the center housed a library filled with texts by Gramsci, Marx, and Civil Rights Movement-thinkers. But when fall arrived, the monument came down, the temp jobs vanished, the radio station and newspaper shut down, and computers and equipment were raffled away. The art world went back to our Manhattan galleries with our photo-ops, taking with us a glimpse of resources that the Forest Houses lack. Public opinion of the project was divided. Residents of Forest Houses expressed gratitude for the much-needed however temporary creative outlet for their kids, not to mention, a noticeable drop in shootings. Mostly, the art world cried colonialism. Dia, whose mission statement revolves around long-term and visionary projects, had passively opted to move on. They have found no educational partners who would help this project survive and have not mentioned a search to do so. The lawn at Forest Houses, former site of the Gramsci Monument In the end, I wondered, was this a productive collaboration? Or an ultimate reminder of what the Forest Houses lack? I went back a year later to find out whether residents still felt the same. As is the case in so many recent large-scale public artworks, it comes down to a question not of how to implement a better system, but how to make the ethical compromise for art. That principle is clear in Chelsea and the Bronx alike. All interviews have been edited for length. Well I thought [the reactions] would be a little more mixed, but mostly, everyone misses it. They wish it was back. Everyone keeps asking me Is it going to come back this year, is it going to come back? I had to tell them, nope, that was it, not again this year. So is anybody talking about some way to get funding to bring it back? It was really expensive. Do you know how much? I wish we could find someone to fund it. That would be incredible. Maybe not that magnitude, but something similar. Would you want something permanent, maybe? Yeah, something permanent for every summer? I would like that. Maybe not forty-something employees, even just ten employees. They can have the kids doing art and crafts, running a newspaper, stuff like that. And giving them another outlook on things. They like art now. Just keep their minds open a little bit. Have you kept in contact with Dia? Yeah, I talk to them all the time. We have a really nice rapport. Actually, the book should be coming out in September, October? the Gramsci Monument book. And the documentary will be coming out in October, November. The guys from Switzerland who shot it came about a month ago, and we edited it. The project is upkept by Dia, with support from Heiner Friedrich and David Zwirner Image courtesy of hamptons-magazine. Were concerns like these discussed in the planning stages? And one year later, do you think the longterm impact of projects like these justify themselves? I refuse to believe that art can only exist in the private sphere of museums, galleries, or homes. Gramsci Monument posed a serious challenge to the neoliberal politics of exclusion and segregation, opening up the possibility of a work of art in a public space without fences, pedestals and security cameras, a possibility of free access to poets, philosophers and scholars, it formulated a new form of monument, of public commemoration and mourning, and perhaps more importantly, it drew together a joyful spectatorship that included peoples from all parts of New York as well as hundreds of guests from abroad, who traveled to experience the work and remember Antonio Gramsci, his life and writings. I can only tell you in all honesty that it impacted my life. Do you think that Dia might continue to address some of the issues raised by this work? We learn a great deal from every project, and this was no exception. We need to wait and see how these issues surface again. A few days later I just have one follow-up question: But for many at Forest Houses, these issues? a lack of educational resources, and basic creative outlets, especially for children? are an inescapable factor of everyday life. Do you really think that Dia needs an artist to prompt that conversation anew, in order to address the issues again? Why does the conversation end with the art project? Gramsci Monument most certainly demonstrated the potential of art. Unfortunately, like many non-profit institutions, our resources are limited. Did Thomas teach you? Do you think it was a good thing? He kept looking off into the distance, and I

could tell I was making him very uncomfortable. A row of Hispanic guys a few benches down. Some whistle, others agree to talk. How have things changed since the monument was here last year? Not too many visitors like you that come by. Is anybody trying to get it back? But if somebody did! Joe Riveria: Maybe it could be. Guy further down the bench: They needed more salsa! I heard about that last year. I think I talked to you about it, actually. It remains a sticking point and was brought up multiple times after this]. But you do think the project was a good thing, overall? Oh yeah it was a good thing, but there was nobody like us involved. They must have thought we was dumb or something. If it had stayed up a couple more months, it could have caused some problems. You think maybe people just got their friends work? Yeah, now you got it! They always love art, so they find a way to do it in a different place. Just not around here. They just do a different type of art. They do graffiti or whatever. They express themselves in a lot of different ways. I wonder if somebody donated all the materials and supplies! you have enough people who know how to build here, right? Do you think that the community could do it [on its own]? Oh, yeah, most definitely. That would help out a lot. Louis hands me the keys to his garden around the corner. This interview has been edited. There are over 3, residents at Forest Houses, and yet, nobody seemed to feel empowered to do this again without an artist figure coming in and directing them. First of all, I am happy to learn that residents want the Monument back, because this means that the project was not a failure. I discovered a beautiful sense of dignity. What can you say to that? Do any of the reviews matter to you? I do not read reviews, because I have to make my artwork first, and I cannot analyze it when I am doing it. I do know exactly what I want, I do know exactly what I am doing and I do know exactly where is my position, so I do not learn [from] commentary on my work. No one wants to confront an experience with an uncertain outcome, openly, with sovereignty and confidence. Or an affirmation without the shield and self-protection of a critical attitude. This [skepticism], opposed to those who have no choice, is an exclusive and luxurious attitude. What kind of position do I want to take in this world? What kind of work am I doing in this World? And what Form can I give to answer these questions? Art calls for equality, and it is the weapon to build equality. There is no other mission.

**Chapter 2 : Gramsci on spontaneity, organisation and leadership - Counterfire**

*The Gramsci factor is at play in all of this. Antonio Gramsci, co-founder of the Italian Communist Party in , after spending time in Stalinist Russia, realized that a revolutionary Marxist/Stalinist approach to world socialism would fail in western societies.*

Based on Dutch control of credit and money. Britain to Glorious Revolution to Napoleonic Wars. Based on British textiles and command of the high seas. Based on British industrial supremacy and railroads. This, in turn, made possible the Amsterdam stock market and concomitant dominance of world trade. However, Jeremy Black writes that, because of Britain, France "was unable to enjoy the benefits" of this hegemony. Like the Dutch, the British Empire was primarily seaborne; many British possessions were located around the rim of the Indian Ocean , as well as numerous islands in the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea. Britain also controlled the Indian subcontinent and large portions of Africa. Bismarck defined the road ahead as "no expansion, no push for hegemony in Europe. Germany was to be the strongest power in Europe but without being a hegemon. France, the UK, Italy, the Soviet Union and later Nazi Germany" all either maintained imperialist policies based on spheres of influence or attempted to conquer territory but none achieved the status of a global hegemonic power. Following the war, the US and the USSR were the two strongest global powers and this created a bi-polar power dynamic in international affairs, commonly referred to as the Cold War. During the Cold War both hegemonies competed against each other directly during the arms race and indirectly via proxy wars. Reinhard Hildebrandt calls this a period of "dual-hegemony", where "two dominant states have been stabilizing their European spheres of influence against and alongside each other. The American political scientists John Mearsheimer and Joseph Nye have argued that the US is not a true hegemon because it has neither the financial nor the military resources to impose a proper, formal, global hegemony. In his view the transformation proved to be fatal and eventually led to the fall of the Roman Empire. His book gives implicit advice[ according to whom? In , author Zhu Zhiqun claimed that China is already on the way to becoming the world hegemon and that the focus should be on how a peaceful transfer of power can be achieved between the US and China. In the early 20th century, in the field of international relations , the Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci developed the theory of cultural domination an analysis of economic class to include social class ; hence, the philosophic and sociologic theory of cultural hegemony analysed the social norms that established the social structures social and economic classes with which the ruling class establish and exert cultural dominance to impose their Weltanschauung world view "justifying the social, political, and economic status quo "as natural, inevitable, and beneficial to every social class, rather than as artificial social constructs beneficial solely to the ruling class. Writing on language and power, Andrea Mayr says, "As a practice of power, hegemony operates largely through language.

Chapter 3 : Hegemony - Wikipedia

*Morse claims Gramsci is the cause of high taxes, the toleration of illegal aliens, gun grabbing, political correctness, "the dumbing down and drugging of children", divorce, homosexuality, "the norming of abortion", etc., etc. Morse attributes many things to Gramsci by quoting unknown secondary sources, but there is not one single reference to.*

The various factions of the Italian Socialist Party PSI , from right to far left, saw socialism, whether coming through parliament or revolution, as being delivered by the party – the dictatorship of the party rather than the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gramsci came to socialism in the immediate years before the First World War. These parties saw history as a progressive curve which would inevitably end at socialism. For those who still thought of the need for revolution, a revolutionary crisis would emerge at some point when the party had to lead the working class to overcome ruling class resistance. To match that there was an increase in industrial militancy and the rise of mass movements demanding suffrage for women, in opposition to war and conscription, and much else. Revolutions had also happened in Russia and Iran. In Britain the new Labour Party had reached an electoral pact with the ruling Liberals. This left it being a virtual appendage of the Asquith government as it used troops against strikers, force fed suffragettes on hunger strike and sanctioned troops to gun down Irish nationalists. Activists who had previously had high hopes in the new party had to look elsewhere. This generation of activists reacted to their specific context in a variety of different ways. Yet the most common form of rebellion was to adopt the ideas of syndicalism: The stress on the spontaneous acts of working class rebellion was a healthy reaction to the passivity of social democracy. The most inspiring example was probably the Industrial Workers of the World in the US - and it echoed across the global working class. Socialists threatened a general strike if world war broke out, suffragettes took direct action to the limit, and in Ireland nationalists armed themselves in response to Unionist military opposition to home rule. Yet in a year later in Italy when it finally entered the war they would virtually all rally to their nation state. Mussolini broke from the PSI along with a coterie of ex-syndicalists, anarchists and socialists to form an ultra-nationalist, pro-war grouping which would eventually become the Fascist Party most of the ex-leftists had dropped out by then. That was the extreme case but underlying it all were three problems. One was that just stressing action left activists shipwrecked when struggle ebbed. Third, individually it is difficult to react to massive global events like that of August 1914. One of the strengths of organisation is it can draw on the time-bank of working class experience and on collective discussion. By 1917, however, opposition to war was growing. By 1919, faced with a revolutionary crisis, Gramsci began to stress the need for a new kind of party. The first thing was to respond to spontaneous rebellion by throwing yourself into it percent. But he also stressed the need for leadership, a dirty word for many of the pre-war activists as it is for many today. For Gramsci there is never such a thing as pure spontaneity: On the other he rejects those who simply dismiss spontaneous rebellion: Among the effective causes of the coups must be included the failure of the responsible groups to give any conscious leadership to the spontaneous revolts or to make them into a positive political factor. In the Italian social democrats and trade union bureaucrats had sufficient organisation and support to subvert the revolution. Gramsci and his comrades were organised in one city, Turin, and won it to revolution, but were absent from Milan, Genoa and elsewhere. The force of tradition and common sense could overcome the scattered voices of good sense. This contradictory accusation, if one analyses it, only testifies to the fact that the leadership given to the movement was both creative and correct. It applied itself to real men, formed in specific historical relations, with specific feelings, outlooks, fragmentary conceptions of the world, etc. It was educated, directed, purged of extraneous contaminations; the aim was to bring it in line with modern theory marxism – but in a living and historically effective manner. This assertion was a stimulus, a tonic, an element of unification in depth; above all it denied that the movement was arbitrary, a cooked-up venture, and stressed its historical necessity. He sets the task of forging that into a systematic awareness of the reality of class society and of a popular collective will to action. For Gramsci there must be an active force working to develop it in both theory and practice. If you like, the creation of a collective which can disseminate revolutionary ideas, strategy and tactics linking in with and incorporating networks of resistance. A collective which can learn from them,

## DOWNLOAD PDF THE GRAMSCI FACTOR

engage with them and fight with them. The party Gramsci had built prior to his arrest and incarceration was a Leninist one, which combined rigorous theoretical and organisational discipline with tactical flexibility. Help us launch Counterfire Media Support our Crowdfunder.

Chapter 4 : Antonio Gramsci - Wikipedia

*Via Antonio Gramsci, the main road to the Central Train Station in Cefal 1, on the northern coast of Sicily, Italy is also named after Gramsci. Additional streets named after Gramsci are found in the cities of Naples, Lascari, Pollina, Collesano, and Palermo Sicily, Italy.*

The Materialist Base of Marxism 1. Base and superstructure in Gramsci 3. Dialectics the key Chapter II. The Politics of Marxism-Leninism 1. The state, democracy and parliament 2. Dictatorship of the proletariat 4. Gramsci and revolutionary strategy Chapter III. Proletarians and intellectuals 3. The international Communist movement Foreword This pamphlet was first published in under the title Was Gramsci a Eurocommunist? More recently, the text of the pamphlet has been used as the basis for political education classes about Antonio Gramsci. Not surprisingly, the worldwide renewal of interest in the ideas of Karl Marx also extends to others in the same political tradition. But why has Antonio Gramsci – a revolutionary Marxist of impeccable credentials – been resurrected and recruited into the Eurocommunist fifth column? Anyone familiar with his life and ideas should regard him as an unpromising candidate for such a mission. However, on reflection, a number of other circumstances combine to facilitate his kidnap by the ignorant or the unscrupulous: Several decades ago, these factors facilitated a major effort by the Communist Party of Italy PCI to portray Gramsci as the forerunner of their break with Marxism-Leninism. This is the same revisionist crusade which Roger Simon carries on in a British context. In theory and practice, economism stems from an exclusive or overwhelming concentration on economics and economic factors. This, the practitioners of economism believe, will generate the desire, the organisation and the leadership to fight and defeat capitalism. Matters of politics and intellectual activity are very much secondary to the economic struggle, a mere adjunct to it, while issues and movements outside the traditional concerns of the labour movement are scorned, neglected or treated as inferior satellites. Ideologically, economism directly and simplistically reduces all political, social, cultural and ideological questions to economic causes and content, to their real or imagined economic base. In the tradition of Marx, Engels and Lenin, Gramsci argued and fought against the various forms and features of economism. With them he insisted that the political battles on many fronts and many issues – including theory and political organisation – are essential for the development of the working class movement, for the growth of Marxism within it, and for the winning of allies. Marxist theory has from the beginning suffered from a major defect: This has prevented an adequate understanding of the nature of capitalist domination, and of the strategy required to end that domination and advance to socialism. The significant developments are understood to be those taking place in the economic base, whereas political struggles are considered only part of the superstructure erected on the base. Whether this acceptance is out of ignorance or deceit must remain for now a matter for speculation. But we can be certain of one thing: The key section from the Preface, as utilised by Gramsci and attacked by Simon, is this: In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in

which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social formation is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the course of formation. Base and superstructure in Gramsci Gramsci, on the other hand, interpreted and utilised the Preface " and its central metaphor " in a correct and productive way. The level of development of the material forces of production provides a basis for the emergence of the various social classes, each one of which represents a function and has a specific position within production itself. This relation is what it is, a refractory reality By studying these fundamental data it is possible to discover whether in a particular society there exist the necessary and sufficient conditions for its transformation " in other words, to check the degree of realism and practicability of the various ideologies which have been born on its own terrain, on the terrain of the contradictions which it has engendered during the course of its development. According to the materialist view of history, the determining factor in history is, in the final analysis, the production and reproduction of actual life. More than that was never maintained either by Marx or myself. Now if someone distorts this by declaring the economic moment to be the only determining factor, he changes that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, ridiculous piece of jargon. The economic situation is the basis, but the various factors of the superstructure This is because, Gramsci argued, Marxism is a system of ideas and a world-view derived from forces and contradictions in the base that had yet " except in peculiar conditions in one country Russia " to transform the superstructure in reality. Leninism is the political science of the proletariat which teaches us how to mobilise all the forces necessary to demolish bourgeois dictatorship and to set up the dictatorship of the proletariat. For some, there is no such thing as a leninism different from marxism. This is not true. Leninism contains a unique world-view without which Marx today could not be understood. Furthermore, Gramsci argued that mechanistic determinism would wither as subordinate elements e. Dialectics the key What, then, lies at the root of economism? Hence the application of the metaphor in a crude, one-sided, reductionist i. Gramsci illustrates this when dealing with the interaction of economic forces and political ideas; again, he begins from a criticism of Economists who underrate politics and depend on economic forces alone to lead the drive onwards to inevitable victory: An appropriate political initiative is always necessary to liberate the economic thrust from the dead weight of traditional policies. In these and related matters such as reform of consciousness, concepts of ideology etc. For Gramsci, a key question is: He cannot conceive of any relationships other than formal and mechanical ones. In fact, his one-sidedness is on the other side. He inflates one half of the metaphor into the whole, urging Marxists and the left to concentrate almost entirely on politics, culture and ideology with only the most general, bland and cursory acknowledgement of economic factors. It was in his struggle against idealism that Karl Marx began laying the philosophical foundations of Marxism. The Politics of Marxism-Leninism The state, democracy and parliament In his prison cell, Gramsci pondered the strategic question of how the working class in developed capitalist Europe could win power to replace capitalism with socialism. According to Roger Simon, the position arrived at by Gramsci can be summarised as follows: Power was highly concentrated in the state of Tsarist Russia and the capture of power in a single historical moment was possible. Revolution is a process of expanding the hegemony of the working class " of the building up of a new historic bloc " and is not a sharp rupture at a single moment when state power passes from one class to another. Thus the transition to socialism consists of two distinct processes, interacting with one another: This tract, Simon claims, has little or no application outside a specific time in a specific place Russia. After the period of Chartism, however, the British bourgeoisie was particularly successful in achieving leadership in the process of broadening parliamentary democracy and in strengthening its hegemony by this means. A socialist revolution, according to this view, requires the replacement of parliamentary democracy by direct democracy,

rather than a combination of both. In consequence a whole sphere of democratic struggle is surrendered to the other side. Instead, parliament and everything associated with it should be seen as a vital terrain, on which the struggle for political and ideological hegemony takes place. Then, it is alleged, the Communists were caught in the contradiction of defending what they had previously berated as an instrument of bourgeois rule viz. This is, of course, impeccable formal logic: Rather, they are a terrain for political struggle between the two major classes – the working class and the capitalist class. In order to advance to socialism, the labour movement has to find the way to link these popular democratic struggles with its socialist objectives, building an alliance which will enable it to achieve a position of national leadership hegemony. They add up to a hideous caricature of Lenin, to the conversion of Gramsci into a parliamentary cretin, and to the liquidation of Marxism-Leninism and the very basis of Communist politics. Lenin himself did not deny that certain features of the Bolshevik Revolution were specific to Russia, that they might not recur – and could not be artificially recreated – in other revolutions, in other countries and under different conditions. Ultra-left romantics believe otherwise. But the Marxist theory of the state and revolution in capitalist society, which Lenin elaborated and defended with unrivalled power and clarity, is in its essentials of general application. Quoting Marx, he argued that the state in capitalist society – with its army, police, bureaucracy, judiciary etc. This popular consent is usually obtained by fraudulent or oppressive means. State secrecy, capitalist ownership of the press, the massive inequalities of wealth, the techniques of parliament and so on: No such restrictions prevented the bourgeoisie from taking any steps necessary to protect its interests. On the contrary, the Bolsheviks had made effective use of the Tsarist Duma as a propaganda platform, and Lenin sharply admonished ultra-leftists in the British and German Communist movements who sought to elevate the boycott tactic to be used in special circumstances to the level of an eternal principle: In Western Europe, the backward masses of the workers and – to an even greater degree – of the small peasants are much more imbued with bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices than they were in Russia; because of that, it is only from within such institutions as bourgeois parliaments that Communists can and must wage a long and persistent struggle, undaunted by any difficulties, to expose, dispel and overcome these prejudices. Only an ignoramus or a deliberate falsifier could claim otherwise. This did not preclude the use of bourgeois parliaments before and during revolution, and thus only in a propagandist sense rather than an immediate, practical one did he counterpose direct democracy to bourgeois democracy during these phases, as the superior system which would be established under a proletarian dictatorship. Such a system would ensure a massive extension of real democracy in substance for the vast majority, while suppressing the resistance of the dispossessed minority. There, he pinpoints the source of his differences with the Roger Simons of his era: The petty-bourgeois democrats, those sham socialists who replaced the class struggle by dreams of class harmony, even pictured the socialist transformation in dreamy fashion – not as the overthrow of the rule of the exploiting class, but as the peaceful submission of the minority to the majority which has become aware of its aims. This petty-bourgeois utopia, which is inseparable from the idea of the state being above classes, led in practice to the betrayal of the interests of the working classes Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is what constitutes the most profound distinction between the Marxist and the ordinary petty as well as big bourgeois. This is the touchstone on which the real understanding and recognition of Marxism should be tested. And it is not surprising that when the history of Europe brought the working class face to face with this question as a practical issue, not only all the opportunists and reformists, but all the Kautskyists people who vacillate between reformism and Marxism proved to be miserable philistines and petty-bourgeois democrats repudiating the dictatorship of the proletariat. But where did Gramsci stand in relation to these disputes?

**Chapter 5 : Talk:Ugo Foscolo - Wikipedia**

*time, Gramsci's work was unfamiliar in England: the articles in question were generally contested. 2 By , Gramscian themes and notions of a similar tenor were ubiquitous.*

During this period, while his teeth fell out and his health failed, Gramsci filled 3, notebook pages with reflections on anything and everything he believed was relevant to Italian history and politics, and the prospects for the left in Europe. To get past the prison censors, he did so in coded, sometimes enigmatic abstractions. In , still in Fascist custody, he died never having seen one of his two sons. At the time, he was mourned by his Communist comrades but by few outside those circles, and certainly fewer outside of Italy. View our Spring Books Issue. Today, Gramsci is a household name; one no longer hears it pronounced as if he were Polish. In college courses devoted to intellectuals, or Marxism, or political theory, students routinely learn of his insistence that consequential political action happens in realms, like culture, that had not heretofore seemed politically consequential. In this scheme, intellectuals become particularly important for Gramsciâ€”not because he thinks attention should be paid to noncelebrities as well as to the talking heads in mass media, though he does, but because, as he understands power, the work of intellectuals is essential both to maintaining it from above and to taking it from below. The exercise of hegemonic leadershipâ€”a leadership by consentâ€”can never occur without some element of concession to those who are led. In emphasizing the role that culture and civil society play in politics, Gramsci was telling the left that it had to leadâ€”or ruleâ€”in a social landscape that seemed alien to it and that could easily be dismissed, then and now, as apolitical and even toxic to genuine left-wing commitments. To an extent that remains remarkable, given that he lived under Fascism and we live under various styles of liberal democracy, his landscape has become ours. The first, a long essay on Gramsci originally published in in the New Left Review, emphasizes the importance of hegemony to the revolutionary Marxist tradition of Lenin and company, from which Gramsci borrowed the concept and to which, Anderson argues, he remained more loyal than his modern admirers want to think. It begins with Herodotus and Thucydides, spends some time on Confucian theories of wise rule, returns to Lenin and Gramsci, and carries the story forward to take in newer Gramscians like Stuart Hall, Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe, and more recent theorists of international relations. Anderson believes Gramsci never abandoned it entirely. But what Gramsci is known for is the boldness with which he moved away from it. Conditions had changed he was not the only one to notice this between the revolutionary Russia of and the liberal democracies, some years later, of a relatively stable and prosperous Western Europe. In the West, power had entrenched itself in civil society as well as in a more modern, more democratic, more politically attractive form of the state. The storming of the barricades was no longer going to work. At the same time, for socialist militants, the deeply undemocratic history of how liberal democracies had come into being, with their structural neglect of in the case of Italian unification the peasants of the South, like the Sardinians Gramsci had grown up among, had provided opportunities as well as challenges. It made less sense to exercise dictatorship over other classes and more sense to seek alliance with them. Politics, for him, had to be respected as a relatively autonomous activity that was irreducible to class identity. Working-class militants would have to make a cultural and ideological appeal to groups that did not share working-class interests or values. The capitalist class had consolidated its power in much of Europe by making that appeal in reverse: It had learned to say at least some things that the working class wanted to hear. The result was too much social stability and not enough political dynamism. What, then, was to be done? As Gregory Elliott notes in Perry Anderson: In the preface to his edition of his Gramsci essay, Anderson conveniently forgets his own early concurrence with Eurocommunism, but he does note with satisfaction that the compromises with liberal and social-democratic parties turned out to be suicidal for the Communists in Italy. Critics like Nicos Poulantzas complained at the time that the Anderson-Nairn theses gave excessive importance to subjectivity: They cared too much about, say, the aristocratic ethos in which the mill owners wrapped themselves, underplaying the fact that, beneath that ideological camouflage, the new industrial bourgeoisie was in fact running the show. One might have expected that in his criticisms of Gramsci and the Gramscians, a Marxist like Anderson would

have shifted the emphasis back from the cultural superstructure to the economic base. What both books set against culture and ideology is not economics but physical coercion: Questions of how glaring a deviation this is from Marxist orthodoxy if such a thing still exists will certainly be of interest to those who look up to Anderson as a Marxist guru. How much of a sacrifice should be made to the values of the capitalists or the peasants? Gramsci flipped the concept so that it could also describe the means by which the bourgeoisie came to rule over other classes, again via compromise or concession—but, Anderson says, he nevertheless got it from Russia. Put in an international context rather than a domestic one, hegemony is, or at least appears to be, less a matter of consent—its big political selling point for liberal democracies—and more a matter of coercion. As Anderson shows, ancient Greek authors sometimes used *hegemonia* as a synonym for *arkhe*, or rule, and sometimes allowed it to suggest the existence of another sort of rule—perhaps morally superior—that involved some degree of common interest and therefore consent. Anderson is cynical about this second kind of rule, *hegemonia*—the variant most commonly associated with Gramsci—and the context of Athenian empire and military alliance provides support for his cynicism. Here and later, Anderson tends to see hegemony in this less than completely coercive sense as a moralistic disguise masking the will to dominate and, if necessary, to destroy. It leans on an undoubted reality—there is no doubting the exercise of military and police violence—but does nothing to explain, for example, how, why, and when certain agents gain or lose their coercive power: Anderson has never had any time for sociology, but perhaps the sociologists of power and violence could have been of use here. What appeals to Anderson about Carr is that he is also a realist about international power, refreshingly cynical toward those who seek to moralize that power by calling it by some other, more pious name. It also hints at the darkly seductive appeal of a supposed realism that would give up on leftist commitments entirely, leaving behind a resigned sense that the world will continue to work, as it has always worked, on the model of playground bullying. After all, he might say, what social forces are visible on the scene today that might give some other shape to all the bullying and change my mind? Man is and always will be a wolf to man. In the absence of a revolution that might transform power into something else, one must accept it for what it is. Or was the US government pushed into these expensive fiascoes by economic or geopolitical imperatives that follow from its attempt to maintain its global hegemony? Realism, properly conceived, demands that we know whether there is another coerciveness for example, economic behind physical coercion. In his analysis of stoicism in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel suggested that the stoic was willing to think of the world as a chaos of meaningless, unrelated particulars because, by so doing, he was able to safeguard his inner freedom, his aloofness from the world. Stylistically, Anderson is a sort of anti-Orwell, disdainful of the rhetorical shortcuts and complacencies of common sense. At moments when others might feel obliged to attend to the *vox populi*, he is likely to send his regrets. Politically, this position has obvious drawbacks. But it does not deliver the goods even as history. What matters is not changing the world, only interpreting it cogently. One might also add that his focus on physical coercion even prohibits him from interpreting the world with the cogency he desires. Violence, like the new social movements, is simply too contingent. The buck of explanation cannot stop there. Thompson is incapable of imagining this possibility, but Anderson is right to ask: Why should the intersection of rival collective wills not produce the random chaos of an arbitrary, destructured log-jam? Having now lost patience with the pace of this march, Anderson opens his violence-centered historical vision to a similar critique. On the question of how much of a cohesive program can emerge from the diverse progressive voices making the most noise of late, the jury is still out. But the noise level itself at least argues against preemptive melancholy. And that includes voices raised against, say, US militarism and for the victims of global economic inequality. As a habitual de-provincializer, Anderson should be able to see that. Since the 1950s, when he forced the English to read Gramsci and factor the existence of empire into their analyses of class, he has always been ahead of the curve on international issues. In order to save his or her intellectual self-respect, the writer need not sacrifice solidarity with those who have had little access to higher education and may not therefore follow all of the references. As in erotic relationships, that position seems less an objective reflection of how things are than a self-fulfilling prophecy. Luckily, it is far from all one will take away from reading him. The contradictions are not random, but structural and intelligible. More important, this is true of the historical reality that both

## **DOWNLOAD PDF THE GRAMSCI FACTOR**

Gramsci and Anderson have done so much to illuminate. To submit a correction for our consideration, [click here](#). For Reprints and Permissions, [click here](#).

**Chapter 6 : Perry Anderson's Long Goodbye | The Nation**

*Underpinning this lack of confidence by Gramsci in the ability of a majority to self-organise is a factor little commented on but particularly significant - and that is his view of what may be called 'human nature'.*

High taxes, government regulations, the toleration of illegal aliens and possible terrorists, the erosion of national defense, gun grabbing, political correctness, the dumbing down and drugging of children and the deliberate corruption of their morals, the anti human element pervading in the environmental movement, the norming of abortion, euthanasia, divorce, homosexuality, and other issues, are manifestations of the Gramsci factor. Gramsci called for a gradual transfer of legislative power from elected bodies to appointed bureaucracies where un-natural and authoritarian international socialism could be quietly implemented by force. The natural outgrowth of this has been a sense of loss of control expressed by such phenomena as voter apathy. Americans are surrendering their G-d given rights without knowing it. We are encouraged to think of ourselves as members of proscribed groups with pre-determined values rather than as individuals. America is gradually becoming a subsidiary of a one-world government, which goes by various euphemisms such as "the international community. He realized that the western democracies appreciated the benefits of individual rights, patriotism, and faith in the creator and that these ideas were deeply engrained and would not be easily surrendered. Instead of violent Marxist revolution, Gramsci would advocate a "long march through the institutions before socialism and relativism would be victorious. Wildly popular amongst leftists but not widely known in the broader culture, Gramsci would author over 33 books while in an Italian prison where he died in Gramscian ideas differ from those of a 19th century British Fabian socialism that called for a creeping conquest of the free world through the gradual changing of the letter and meaning of the law. Fabians established the devastatingly successful ACLU for that purpose. Gramsci took communism a step further by advocating a literal change of human consciousness itself. This would be accomplished through the infiltration and gradual control of dominant western cultural, educational and media institutions. The Frankfurt School invented "critical theory" which is based on the premise that there is no such thing as objective reality. Everything is "perception" according to critical theory, and perception is controlled by ruling elites who decide what is real. The Gramscian actually believes that he is morally obligated, based on an overarching sense of superiority, to control others and enforce change. While Marxism, calls for the fomenting of violent conflict between classes, races etc, and Fabian Socialism seeks control over the system of justice and the literal language of the law, Gramscian communism seeks control over culture, established religion, media, education, and other areas where intellectual discourse takes place. Psychiatry, with its pretensions to knowledge of the innermost being, is a major bailiwick for Gramscian communists. It should be noted that the regressive theories of socialism, when enthroned, have already led to the liquidation of over million human beings and a Holocaust against the Jews of Europe. How can we fight this ever-encroaching behemoth as it colonizes our minds and casts dark clouds over our future? The difficulty lies in the fact that Gramscian communists are not bound to the same objective standards of truth as the rest of us. Given that communism is nothing more than a quest by power-hungry elitists toward the attainment of power for themselves, communists will do virtually anything, whether overt or covert, to achieve their goals. We need to state that we are answerable to a creator of the universe, not to "enlightened" elites who seek to refashion reality in their own image while attempting to overthrow the Creator. Marx was not as much an atheist as he was anti-G-d. We need to state that our freedom is predicated on the recognition of individual sovereignty and that the individual, in order to enjoy the fruits of freedom, is capable of discerning objective morality and fashioning his life within the limitations of nature. We must insist that our children be taught in such a manner that they will be able to develop the cognitive abilities that will enable them to function as sovereign individuals rather than what they get now which is political propaganda meant to create confusion, dissonance and docility. We must insist that our culture protect the innocence of our children. We must return a sense of honor and privilege in American citizenship and insist on standards of behavior for guests within our borders. We must re-assert the sovereignty of our federation of states and dis-entangle ourselves from involvements that sacrifice

our freedoms and its accompanying prosperity on the alter of world socialism.

**Chapter 7 : The Gramsci Factor**

> *Antonio Gramsci was an Italian Marxist. His concept of hegemony was a result of the question as to why western Europe did not see the kind of revolution Marx had predicted.*

Early life[ edit ] Gramsci [3] was born in Ales , in the province of Oristano , on the island of Sardinia , the fourth of seven sons of Francesco Gramsci â€” The senior Gramsci was a low-level official from Gaeta , in the province of Latina in the Central Italian region of Lazio , who married the Sardinian Giuseppina Marcias â€” For decades, it was reported that his condition had been due to a childhood accidentâ€”specifically, having been dropped by a nannyâ€”but more recently it has been suggested that it was due to Pott disease , [12] a form of tuberculosis that can cause deformity of the spine. Gramsci was also plagued by various internal disorders throughout his life. Gramsci completed secondary school in Cagliari , where he lodged with his elder brother Gennaro, a former soldier whose time on the mainland had made him a militant socialist. Gramsci was in Turin as it was going through industrialization, with the Fiat and Lancia factories recruiting workers from poorer regions. Trade unions became established, and the first industrial social conflicts started to emerge. His worldview was shaped by both his earlier experiences in Sardinia and his environment on the mainland. Gramsci joined the Italian Socialist Party in late , where he would later occupy a key position and observe from Turin the Russian revolutionary process. Together with his growing political commitment, these led to his abandoning his education in early , at age By this time, he had acquired an extensive knowledge of history and philosophy. At university, he had come into contact with the thought of Antonio Labriola , Rodolfo Mondolfo , Giovanni Gentile , and most importantly, Benedetto Croce , possibly the most widely respected Italian intellectual of his day. Labriola especially propounded a brand of Hegelian Marxism that he labelled "philosophy of praxis ". In , he became co-editor of the Piedmont edition of Avanti! In October the same year, despite being divided into various hostile factions, the Socialist Party moved by a large majority to join the Third International. For Gramsci, these councils were the proper means of enabling workers to take control of the task of organising production. By the time of the defeat of the Turin workers in spring , Gramsci was almost alone in his defence of the councils. Gramsci supported against Bordiga the Arditi del Popolo , a militant anti-fascist group which struggled against the Blackshirts. In , Gramsci travelled to Russia as a representative of the new party. Here, he met Julia Schucht, a young violinist whom he married in and by whom he had two sons, Delio born and Giuliano born Such a front would ideally have had the PCI at its centre, through which Moscow would have controlled all the leftist forces, but others disputed this potential supremacy: Many believed that an eventual coalition led by communists would have functioned too remotely from political debate, and thus would have run the risk of isolation. At the end of , Gramsci travelled from Moscow to Vienna , where he tried to revive a party torn by factional strife. Togliatti, in Moscow as a representative of the party, received the letter, opened it, read it, and decided not to deliver it. This caused a difficult conflict between Gramsci and Togliatti which they never completely resolved. The fascist police arrested Gramsci, despite his parliamentary immunity , and brought him to the Roman prison Regina Coeli. Over 11 years in prison, his health deteriorated: He was due for release on 21 April and planned to retire to Sardinia for convalescence , but a combination of arteriosclerosis , pulmonary tuberculosis , high blood pressure , angina , gout and acute gastric disorders meant that he was too ill to move. Thought[ edit ] Gramsci was one of the most important Marxist thinkers of the 20th century, and a particularly key thinker in the development of Western Marxism. He wrote more than 30 notebooks and 3, pages of history and analysis during his imprisonment.

**Chapter 8 : Was Gramsci a Eurocommunist? by Robert Griffiths**

*Conceived of as a monument to Antonio Gramsci, the center housed a library filled with texts by Gramsci, Marx, and Civil Rights Movement-thinkers. It also employed residents at \$12/hour to run children's art classes, a local newspaper, a radio station, a library, a computer lab, and a grill.*

However fragmentary the passages of the notebooks are, they compose a totalizing system of thought in which a major focal point is the question of strategy. There is no section dedicated to the historical bloc, only a couple short passages: That is to say the complex, contradictory and discordant ensemble of the superstructures is the reflection of the ensemble of the social relations of production. If I may take the liberty to flesh this out somewhat, in light of my reading of the prison notebooks, the historical bloc is the organic but contradictory unity between the dominant and subaltern social groups in a given historical period, the relations of which are historically emergent and need to be understood as such in order to understand the nature of the relations among these social groups in the present. Of particular importance for Gramsci, and for any communist movement, is a comprehensive study of the oppressed and exploited classes within their own historical bloc. Hence it is necessary to study: The objective formation of subaltern social groups, by developments and transformations occurring in the sphere of economic production; their quantitative diffusion and their origins in pre-existing social groups, whose mentality, ideology, and aims they conserve for a time; 2. This schematic outline for studying the subaltern is a major component for understanding the historical bloc. This method of historical analysis is the means by which a communist formation ultimately determines whether or not a favourable situation exists for the subaltern social groups to accumulate revolutionary forces and whether the situation is favourable to them becoming the ruling class at a given conjuncture of history; in other words, the essence of this historiographical method reduces to the question of whether the situation is favourable for revolution in the present historical bloc. As Gramsci reiterates in his outlining of the concept of the passive revolution, No formation disappears as long as the productive forces which have developed within it still find room for further forward movement; 2. It goes without saying that these principles must first be developed critically in all their implications, and purged of every residue of mechanism and fatalism. A proper analysis of a situation is a precondition for revealing the objective conditions for or against the revolution. Such an analysis of the situation, Gramsci tells us, is the basis for formulation of the strategic plan with a strategy and tactics, for propaganda and agitation, for developing the command structure, organization of the armed forces, and resolving other questions pertaining to organizational structure. What this reconstruction consists of is a determination of the immediate relations of force that define the situation. Gramsci defines three levels of relations of force, beginning from the most structural and proceeding into the superstructural. The first is the relation of social forces, which is closely linked to the structure, objective, independent of human will and which can be measured with the systems of the exact or physical sciences. By studying these fundamental data it is possible to discover whether in a particular society there exist the necessary and sufficient conditions for its transformation. The development of any clash of political or military forces will originate from contradictions at this level. Despite the overthrow of immensely popular liberation theology priest Jean-Bertrand Aristide twice in a decade by U. But Aristide never supported arming the people during his term, nor after he was overthrown. The third moment is the relation of military forces, which Gramsci breaks down further into military forces and politico-military forces, which become decisive for the subordinate social classes if and only when all three levels of relations of forces exist in the favour of the subaltern social classes and are seized upon by the social, political, and military actors they have constituted. Of course, oppressed people can take armed action without the social and political relations of forces being favourable. But these are always defeated and are easily dismissed as acts of terrorism no matter the actual content of the armed act if the political forces are not sufficiently capable of defending the armed actions. But if the social, political, and military relations of force are indeed favourable and sufficiently mature, then what it means for a situation to be seized upon is as follows: The decisive element in every situation is the permanently organised and long-prepared force which can be put into the field when it is judged that a

situation is favourable and it can be favourable only in so far as such a force exists, and is full of fighting spirit. Therefore the essential task is that of systematically and patiently ensuring that this force is formed, developed, and rendered ever more homogeneous, compact, and self-aware. We support the people armed – but armed by who? At their own initiative and with their own resources, or backed and armed by the imperialists? But winning in a military balance of power is not a revolution. What social classes and which political forces are animating the civil war from within Syria? Or is the temporary military balance of power being propped up by imperialism? What we have here, in an abstract and simple outline, is an historical-materialist analysis of how to determine if and how to make a revolution and under what conditions can the conscious intervention of the vanguard forces of the historically progressive classes be successful in providing leadership to a revolution. Revolution does not consist of the momentary numerical superiority of the masses in a mass strike or an insurrection – that is, momentarily favourable military relations of force – but relations of force that correspond to every level of relations of force. Lenin defined a revolutionary situation as one in which the ruling class could no longer go on ruling the same way, when the suffering of the masses had reached an intolerable level, and when, consequently, the masses burst into political activity.

Dominant social groups maintain their power in two distinct ways: So long as the productive forces still have room for greater development under a given mode of production, the dominant social groups can maintain their hegemony by making leadership primary and domination secondary. But an organic crisis – which consists of the shifting of the social composition of society, the classes and the relations among them – will engender crises in leadership as the dominant social groups rely more heavily upon coercion to subdue their antagonists and even formerly allied classes. Gramsci understands that there is not a direct correspondence between the ruling social groups and its intellectual functionaries, but that the latter are dependent on the former for their existence and serve them accordingly: Gramsci includes the work of such intellectuals within the overall operation and power of the ruling class, not outside of it. It should be said at this point that Gramsci sees each and every person as a philosopher, albeit whose capacity to think independently relates to the dynamics of the overall situation, the most important question of which is: Has a given class produced the political forces to think and act independently, and to what extent are these forces developed? Gramsci sees each human being as a philosopher, since every person has a conception of the world. As for those philosophies that are disconnected from the people, elite intellectual cultures of and in support of the dominant social classes, Gramsci asks: The intellectual work of such an intellectual-moral bloc includes: This can only be taken up by the Party, or a Party of sorts. Generally, the word Party invokes the idea of an electoral formation, united by a program sufficient to unite its functionaries, candidates, elected members, rank-and-file membership and sufficiently united to present itself to a wider electorate. But this is only a very specific form of a Party – the electoral Party – and not the general sort that Gramsci brings our attention to. The history of the political party is not the history of electoralism or the party construed in such narrow terms, but rather the history of the social classes themselves. With politics theorized at a superstructural level as being a reflection of contradictions in the fundamental structure of society, parties appear all throughout history where we find basic class contradictions in the structure of society. The history of political parties is not the history of its founders or leading intellectual thinkers, but rather the intricate network of relations with which the party is attached to and organizes its social class. This schematic outline of the Party form is offered as a matter of objective historical fact, one that the communist party must observe if it is to succeed in its task. The distinction with the Communist Party is that it represents a class whose historical mission is to abolish class distinctions altogether. That Gramsci had a distinctly Leninist view on the party, but a Leninist view nonetheless, is evident from this hierarchical structuring of the Party and the tasks that it must be prepared to confront. Of particular interest to Gramsci concerning the various strata of the party is how these strata must be organized to guard against destruction. Gramsci argues that firstly, an iron conviction must prevail amongst the various strata that a solution has been found to the historical problems faced by its class. But this philosophy of praxis, as we have seen in the foregoing analysis on philosophy, is not a simplified Marxism. Gramsci was a harsh critic of crude materialism and economism, and understood the dangers of such an articulation of Marxism included losing its connection with a top layer of intellectuals that it needed to bring

under its hegemony The State and Civil Society.

**Chapter 9 : Gramsci's Prison Notebooks: Towards a "War of Position" " Revolutionary Initiati**

*Gramsci explores factors which might play a role in arresting historical change as he (Gramsci) shifts his attention away from the material, economic and objective factor of Marx dialectic to the theoretical, subjective or supernatural factor and Holub Renate calls this shift as the "beginning of western Marxism" (50) because on the basis.*