
READING GRAMSCI IN ENGLISH:
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE RECEPTION OF
ANTONIO GRAMSCI IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD,
1957-1982

Geoff Eley
University of Michigan

March 1984

CRSO Working Paper 314

Copies available through:
Center for Research on
Social Organization
University of Michigan
330 Packard Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

"Reading Gramsci in English:
Some Observations on the Reception of Antonio Gramsci in the
English-Speaking World, 1957-1982".

Geoff Eley
Department of History
University of Michigan

The Gramsci reception in the English-speaking world is one of the more remarkable intellectual phenomena of the 1970s. At the time of writing (Summer 1982) we seem to have reached some sort of staging-post in the seemingly never-ending stream of publication and discussion. A veritable explosion of books and essays has just taken place, but for almost a year there has been no new major intervention, and so far as I am aware none has been announced.¹ In that case, now may be a good time to take stock. Of course, there are already innumerable general introductions to Gramsci's thought. There is also no shortage of attempts to 'place' him in the Marxist, European and Italian intellectual and political traditions. By this stage yet another general essay attempting to summarize Gramsci's distinctive contributions to the latter would perhaps be hard to justify. Such essays will now show diminishing returns, and have started to serve more a process of personal political or intellectual clarification than the historical illumination of Gramsci's own career.² Everyone, it seems, has their own Gramsci, and the present author is certainly no exception to this generalization, as the following pages will no doubt reveal. However, my intention in this essay is rather different. It is to comment on the character of the Gramsci reception rather than (in the first instance at least) on the thought and career of Gramsci himself. In so doing I hope to distinguish some salient themes and to make a modest if largely impressionistic contribution to the contemporary sociology of knowledge.³

I.

The origins of the Gramsci reception are hard to chart very exactly. The earliest discussions were fragmented and (whatever their individual

qualities) not part of a coherent or unified discourse.⁴ At this stage knowledge of Gramsci was subsumed in the larger rediscovery of Marxism then getting under way: the singularity of his contribution was less important than his place in a general revolutionary pantheon of 'non-Stalinist' thinkers. Gramsci was only one of several continental theoreticians -- Georg Lukacs, Karl Korsch, and the Frankfurt School were the major examples -- who were being translated and discussed seriously for the first time (in the middle to late-1960s). The heterodox nature of their Marxism mattered more than the specific (and divergent) content of their ideas.⁵ This ecumenical approach to Gramsci prevailed during the first phase of his reception proper in the early-1970s, when a more informed and connected discussion became possible. As well as the Selections from the Prison Notebooks (1971) which provided the first adequate textual basis for an English-language discussion, we should mention the translations of Fiori's biography and Pozzolini's general primer (both 1970), the two editions of the famous prison letters by Hamish Henderson (1974) and Lynne Lawner (1975), and a general essay by Victor Kiernan in the 1972 Socialist Register.⁶ The essence of the early discussion was excavation -- reappropriating a buried Marxist tradition, nicely summarized in the title of an American anthology on Western Marxism as 'the unknown dimension'.⁷

At the same time it is clear that some individuals were approaching Gramsci with more specific questions in mind. One of these was John Merrington, whose exposition of Gramsci's distinctive conceptual vocabulary is the most impressive of the early treatments. Another was Harold Wolpe in a more general essay on the problem of 'revolutionary

consciousness'. In both cases Gramsci begins to emerge as the archfoe of 'economism', that cardinal sin of contemporary Marxism, replacing the reductionist vocabulary of base and superstructure with a more sophisticated stress on the organization of consciousness by different categories of intellectuals and political agencies, amongst whom the political party clearly held pride of place. This freed the possibilities of political action from the causal primacy of the economy and its movements and constituted ideology as an autonomous sphere of struggle (Gramsci's 'ethico-political realm', a term he adapted from Benedetto Croce), where the legitimacy and cohesion of a given social order could be secured and reproduced, or modified and even overthrown. As is now well-known, 'hegemony' was the concept Gramsci devised to express this process of political negotiation between dominant and subordinate classes, and he essentially reformulated the problem of the revolutionary party in terms of its ability to intervene creatively to influence the outcome. These matters were very much to the fore in Merrington's and Wolpe's accounts.⁸

Of course, this aspect of Gramsci's writings was well-known to the earlier commentators. But Merrington's essay in particular raised the discussion to a new level of explicitly theorized consistency, in which the full repertoire of Gramsci's specific concepts -- the distinction between state and civil society, the different categories of intellectuals, the notions of 'collective will' and 'historic bloc', the 'corporate' and 'directive' functions of social classes, the juxtaposition of 'war of manoeuvre'/'war of position' -- are brought into play. While he only dealt explicitly with Gramsci as such somewhat later, the same

preoccupations are close to the fore in Perry Anderson's early work, particularly in the classic essays of the mid-1960s ('Origins of the Present Crisis', 'Components of the National Culture', and 'Problems of Socialist Strategy'), where the problem of hegemony is posed in the context of British intellectual and political culture, admittedly in an attenuated and over-formalized way.⁹ In a different vein we should also mention the work of Robbie Gray, who pioneered the introduction of Gramscian concepts into British historical writing, to address the bases of reformism in the nineteenth century working class.¹⁰

The interest in Gramsci fully blossomed into print in the middle 1970s. It was greatly eased by the better availability of his writings in English, for which Lawrence and Wishart's publishing program may take the credit: after the Prison Notebooks, two volumes of Political Writings appeared (unobtrusively but authoritatively edited by Quintin Hoare), together with related materials by Palmiro Togliatti.¹¹ This was accompanied by a more scholarly kind of exegesis. Merrington had already worked at the Gramsci Institute in Rome, and Davidson studied extensively in Italy, and henceforth it became increasingly difficult to join the discussion without serious historical work and some familiarity with Italian sources. Moreover, until now the published discussion had been conducted almost exclusively by the Left -- without, it should be said, ^(the sponsorship) of either the universities or a major political party.¹² The interest of the Left did not diminish (quite the contrary). But from the mid-1970s the Gramsci reception also attained academic respectability. Between 1975 and 1977 a flurry of important works appeared, some Marxist, some not: Gwyn A. Williams' Proletarian Order and the accompanying trans-

lation of Paolo Spriano's study of the 1920 factory occupations; Martin Clark's publication of his much earlier dissertation, on which Williams was heavily reliant; a typical tour de force by Perry Anderson in the hundredth issue of New Left Review; Alastair Davidson's intellectual biography; and James Joll's valuable 'Modern Master'.¹³

II.

By the end of this activity some distinct emphases were starting to emerge. I want to mention five of these, though other classifications might also be possible. First, Gramsci has been assimilated to a general category of 'Western Marxism'. The precise notations of this concept vary. In some hands it becomes little more than a residual category for any inter-war Marxist who set him/herself outside the fold of orthodox Communism during the period of bolshevization between the Twenty-One Conditions of 1920-1 and the ultra-left turn of 1928: not only Lukacs, Korsch and the Frankfurt School, but also the various council theorists and left-wing communists (the Dutch Marxists Hermann Gorter and Anton Pannekoek, the German KAPD, Gramsci and Amadeo Bordiga in Italy), various currents of philosophical radicalism in France (which developed after the 1920s), Rosa Luxemburg (as a precursor), and even (incongruously) Paul Levi.¹⁴ In Russell Jacoby's mind 'Western Marxism' seems identical with an anti-Leninist democratic impulse in the revolutionary activity of 1917-23 and with 'processes of class consciousness and proletarian subjectivity' which subsequent dissenting philosophers attempted to 'retrieve'.¹⁵ Without dismissing the significance of these heterodox currents themselves, I would argue that this conception of Western Marxism is heavily idealist and over-philosophical

in its terms of reference. It mistakes the neosyndicalist momentum behind much of the council communist activity in 1917-23, exaggerates the cohesion of the movement and the coherence of its anti-Bolshevik critique, and underestimates the force of the circumstances making for a Bolshevik or (as it became known) Leninist model of politics in the various countries. A more careful approach would recognize the popular volatility of the revolutionary years while focusing on the reflective endeavours of the leading Marxist thinkers in the stabilization that followed after 1923. Here Western Marxism becomes more a syndrome of the objective conjuncture, which constrained the imaginative capability of the Marxist theoretical tradition. It signifies a retreat from practical politics into abstract philosophical discussion sharply removed from the materialist concerns of the classical Marxist tradition before 1914. The best case for this second perspective has been made by Perry Anderson in Considerations on Western Marxism, where he suggests that the principal thinkers involved (Lukacs, Korsch, Gramsci, the Frankfurt School, Walter Benjamin, Henri Lefebvre, Jean-Paul Sartre, Lucien Goldmann, Louis Althusser, Galvano Della Volpe, Lucio Colletti) shared a common social background, an experience of political defeat or demoralization (at the hands of both fascism and Stalinism), and a common indebtedness to 'successive types of European idealism'.¹⁶

Whichever framework we prefer, the argument is least convincing in the case of Gramsci, whose formal relationship to politics (in both theory and practice) was quite different from the rest, as to his credit Anderson accepts.¹⁷ Such distinctions (e.g. Gramsci retained his Communist Party affiliations, he was mainly interested in matters of political

theory rather than formal philosophy or aesthetics, he arrived at his positions through comparative historical enquiry, he tried to produce historical explanations for the contemporary predicament of the Left) are shown far less respect by other proponents of a 'Western Marxist' framework. This is preeminently true of Gramsci's principal commentators on the American Left, Paul Piccone and the grouping around the journal Telos (in which Russell Jacoby has also been an important participant). Here Gramsci is coopted to a radically Hegelian Marxism which derives from an uncritical affirmation of the achievements of the Frankfurt School ('the only remaining Marxist tradition of any political and social import', as Piccone puts it).¹⁸ But ultimately this is to take a specific problem of Gramsci studies -- his precise relationship to Croce's philosophical idealism at different stages of his career -- and to elevate it in a manner which subsumes all other facets of his mature political thought. Piccone's writing on Gramsci is obscurantist, obsessively anti-Leninist, and at times breathtakingly insensitive to the real historical circumstances after say 1921. By contrast with Anderson's account, there is no effort to evaluate Gramsci's thought by its complex historical determinations -- within Italian intellectual culture, within the Marxist theoretical tradition, within the international Communist movement, and within the period of victorious fascism. Something of the same syndrome also disfigures Carl Boggs' introduction to Gramsci's Marxism, where the concept of hegemony is bluntly assimilated to the characteristic Marcusean rhetoric of the North American New Left.¹⁹

Secondly, by the end of the 1970s Gramsci was firmly installed at the centre of 'cultural studies'. Raymond Williams, an excellent guide

to these developments, was responding creatively to Gramsci by 1973 at the latest.²⁰ But the main scene of activity in this respect has probably been the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham University, which through a series of collective working projects -- on youth sub-cultures, on ideology as such, and on working class culture -- generated some of the most rigorous and challenging commentaries on Gramsci's salient ideas.²¹ Of course, cultural studies provided natural ground for the exploration of Gramsci's ideas, with his stress on the importance of intellectuals in the organization, affirmation and withholding of popular consent to the dominant social and political order. The hegemonic capability of a social class in Gramsci's sense rests very much on its ability to build a commanding position of moral leadership for itself in the sphere of culture -- through the institutions of education, religion and the law, more informally through the arbitration of taste, manners and acceptable behaviour, and finally through the arts, the press and the formal intellectual culture of the universities -- so that other social groups come to acknowledge its claim to rule.

In fact, in view of Gramsci's increasing popularity and the vogue for radical educational theory in the early-1970s, it is surprising that he was not taken up much earlier by writers interested in mechanisms of subordination and domination in the educational system. But on the whole this was not the case.²² The explanation is an interesting one, to do mainly with the reception of Althusser, whose ideas for a key period (say from 1972 to 1977) displaced other sources of theoretical inspiration from the active centre of Marxist theoretical discussion in

Britain. Whether we look to fields in education, literary studies, film theory, or the larger sociology of culture, we find British Marxists in the mid-1970s registering advances through the (frequently tortured) appropriation of 'Althusserian' concepts. This was true above all of the Birmingham Center, whose main exponents arrived at Gramsci via an elaborate, rigorous, and (I would argue) extremely fruitful Althusserian detour. How exactly the transition took place is too complicated for this discussion. But in the event recourse to a freshly accessible Gramsci helped free British discussions from a potentially constricting Althusserian cul de sac.²³

Thirdly, in the course of the 1970s a certain Gramscian vocabulary permeated the discourse of British and to a lesser extent North American social historians. Edward Thompson (as always) has been a key influence in this respect -- by directing attention to the study of popular culture, by enquiring into non-coercive forms of political domination, and by adopting the formal concept of 'hegemony' for his analysis of eighteenth century society.²⁴ But aside from Thompson himself, the most striking thing about this appropriation is really its unreflected and casual nature. The term 'hegemony' has in many usages been blithely severed from the complex tissue of concepts which for Gramsci himself constituted its full theoretical status. As Nield and Seed observe, even the best historical appropriations have 'tended to abstract the concept of hegemony from its locus within a much broader analysis of power which, in the Prison Notebooks, is concentrated on the state and the organized institutional structures of civil society'.²⁵ The major exception here is Robbie Gray, who apart from his work on the labour aristocracy has att-

empted an ambitious deployment of Gramsci's central concepts for an understanding of Victorian Britain.²⁶ But otherwise hegemony tends to be divested of its specific theoretical content and assimilated to superficially similar theoretical paradigms, so that (for example) it functions as a practical equivalent of social control perspectives or the older Marxist conception of an imposed false consciousness. In the more extreme versions it can be 'reified into a kind of functionalist maintenance of social equilibrium' or can simply signify a general system of ideological domination.²⁷ It is these assumed correlations between concepts which actually possess very different potentials in the context of their originating theoretical problematics that has permitted the incorporation of hegemony into the 'common sense' vocabulary of historical analysis. A certain kind of knowing reference to the term has become very fashionable. I will return to this problem below.

Fourthly, the assimilation of Gramsci's ideas by cultural studies, social history, and British Marxism is paralleled by certain new departures in British sociology during the same period. This obviously makes more sense of the formal correspondence mentioned above between certain practical usages of 'hegemony' and similar applications of the concept of 'social control'. In fact, it seems clear that the same people who were attracted by Gramsci's ideas were also reading certain cognate discussions in British sociology in the early-1970s, where there was some independent interest in the ideological basis of social cohesion in liberal democracies (to adapt the title of a much cited essay of 1970 by Michael Mann).²⁸ This was definitely true of Robbie Gray, for instance, and could probably be demonstrated biographically for other figures in

the Gramsci reception too.²⁹ In the longer view this sociological radicalism goes back to discussions of 'affluence' and 'relative deprivation' in the mid-1960s and receives its strongest further development in the work of Frank Parkin.³⁰ As well as Parkin and Mann, Steven Lukes and Howard Newby deserve special mention in this respect.³¹ How exactly this work differs from work of a 'Gramscian' provenance is an interesting question, not made any easier to answer by the apparent indifference of its authors to Gramsci's ideas.³² However, at least one individual -- Bob Jessop -- whose work originated within the 'sociological' problematic, so to speak, has since moved very creatively in what is recognizably a 'Gramscian' direction.³³

Fifthly, and perhaps most importantly, the Gramsci reception has received a decisive boost from the Eurocommunist turn in the British Communist Party (CPGB). Tendencies of this kind could already be extrapolated on the party's reaction to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and are not inconsistent with British Communism's deeper formation, at least since the Popular Front period after 1935. But the inner-party discussion got properly under way in the mid-1970s and the adoption of a new version of 'The British Road to Socialism' in 1977 registered the formal victory of the new perspectives.³⁴ Although for a time attention focused on Santiago Carillo's direction of the Spanish Communist Party (PCE), there can be little doubt that the main intellectual influence on this development has been the Italian Communist Party (PCI), whose experience received increasing prominence in the CPGB's deliberations from around 1976.³⁵

For our purposes (aside from the basic translation and discussion of Gramsci himself) three manifestations of this process are worth mentioning. First, from around 1975-6 the annual Communist University of London (CUL) increasingly served as a general intellectual forum for the Left and played an important part in crystallizing the concepts of the 'broad democratic strategy'. While discussions of Althusser and Nicos Poulantzas were initially an important stimulus here, by 1977 Gramsci was already coming to define the primary theoretical orientation.³⁶ Secondly, during the same years Eric Hobsbawm emerged as a major exponent of the 'Italian Road', elaborating a broadly conceived historical perspective in a series of essays, lectures, and interviews.³⁷ Thirdly, by 1979 and the aftermath of the Conservative electoral victory similar discussions were also starting on the edges of the Labour Party. In some ways this is the most interesting feature of this overtly political dimension of the Gramsci reception, with origins that are complex and diverse. It is clear, for instance, that much of the Left intellectual discussion now oriented towards the Labour Party owes little direct inspiration to Gramsci's ideas, if any. This would be true of the circle around Paul Hirst and Barry Hindess, of the discussions recently taking place in New Left Review, and a fortiore of the more orthodox Labour and Left-Labour currents. On the other hand, the launching of the New Socialist and the Socialist Society, certain intellectual cross-currents through the grouping around Tony Benn, and talk of promoting 'a general ferment of socialist ideas', betray distinct 'Gramscian' traces. There is now an interesting stretch of intellectual common ground linking Eurocommunists, independent Marxists, and Labour Party currents (some Marxist, some not) within a shared problematic of rethought socialist

strategy. The coherence of this broad left-intellectual milieu, I would argue, is decisively indebted to the discussion of Gramsci's ideas, both directly and indirectly.³⁸

III.

Where does this leave the current crop of books?³⁹ If 1967-75 was a phase of initiation when notice of Gramsci was first properly taken, and 1975-7 a phase of consolidation when a range of essentially biographical studies started to appear, then 1978-82 has been the phase of mature Gramsci scholarship, when an adequate basis has been laid for the first time for a discussion of Gramsci in English. For some time it has been possible to discuss Marx, Engels, Lenin, Luxemburg, Trotsky, Lukacs, and the Frankfurst School (though, interestingly enough, not Kautsky) without a knowledge of their original language. The same can now be said of Gramsci. The absence of a complete edition of the Prison Notebooks in English (which would be a luxury indeed) is now made good by a large body of detailed and extremely sophisticated exegesis. This comes partly from the accumulated momentum of professional intellectual discussion, which (given the interlocking structures of university scholarship, Ph.D. production, and academic publishing, and the notable colonization of the educational system by Marxists since the early-1970s) might have been expected eventually to generate a sizeable literature of this kind. In this sense the current books are also partly a generational phenomenon, a coming to fruition of an interest originating earlier in the reception, sometimes as a Ph.D. dissertation. Anne Showstack Sassoon was previously the translator of Pozzolini, while her own book and those of Joseph Femia, Leonardo

Salamini, and Walter Adamson began as dissertations undertaken in the late-1960s and early-1970s. The feasibility of translations (which are otherwise not a compelling necessity of intellectual life in the English-speaking countries) likewise presupposes this kind of academic infrastructure.

To some extent, then, we are seeing the arrival of 'Gramsciology' in English-speaking scholarship, and if the examples of Marx and Engels, the Frankfurt School, and Lukacs are anything to go by, we should expect a steady stream of additional publications in the years to come. In general Gramsci is definitely 'in'. For example, the strength of this intellectual fashion has to explain the title and formal 'Gramscian' focus of Gramsci and Italy's Passive Revolution, because with the exception of John A. Davis's cogent Introduction and Paul Ginsborg's valuable discussion of bourgeois revolution, none of the individual essays engage with Gramsci's historical theses or salient concepts in anything but the most perfunctory of ways. The point of the volume (at least according to the editor, as the others barely mention Gramsci themselves, with Ginsborg's exception) is to confront Gramsci's generalizations with the findings of some dense historical scholarship, concentrated on the unifying problematic of the agrarian question. Beneath this rubric the authors explore the definition of the Southern Problem, the nature of social relations in the countryside, the changing basis of the industrial-agrarian bloc, the regional diversity of the Italian class structure, and the fragility of the liberal state's social cohesion. They do so by means of wide-ranging general discussions (the editor and Adrian Lyttleton) and three regional studies (Frank Snowden on Tuscany, Anthony

Cardoza on the Po Delta, and Alice Kelikian on Brescia). These are introduced by Davis's brief exposition of 'passive revolution' and Ginsborg's longer critique, which thoughtfully reposes the problem of bourgeois revolution. The volume concludes with an essay by Paul Corner on the Fascist economy.

In their main aim, which is to test Gramsci's view of the Risorgim-
ento against their own impressive expertise, the authors succeed very well. But as Nield and Seed say, 'Gramsci is not challenged directly through conceptual argument but is held at a distance and subjected to partial revision via narrowly selected empirical data'.⁴⁰ To say that the fashion for Gramsci was just an excuse for bringing these essays together would be grossly unfair, for they meet the highest standards of empirical excellence, with a thematic coherence which is quite unusual for the genre. But they shed more light on over-particularized historical problems of a mainly 'local', technical and professional character, than they do on the actual potential of Gramsci's concepts. A straightforward exposition of 'passive revolution' by the editor is deemed to be enough, so that the others (with Ginsborg's key exception) can simply get on with the detailed story. A chance to clarify, extend, or reconstitute Gramsci's theoretical terms has been missed, and with it the chance to form concepts adequate to the comparative analysis of other societies. The theoretical promise of the book's title and Ginsborg's initial agenda remains unfulfilled, because 'Actively to engage with Gramsci requires more than a web of empirical illustration; it demands a theoretical engagement with and against Gramsci'.⁴¹ To this extent, and for all its qualities, the Davis volume remains more a symptom of the interest in

Gramsci than a fully developed contribution.

What can we say in general about the other books? Those by Femia, Adamson, Salamini and Harold Entwistle are prime examples of Gramsciology. They lack the openly political purpose of much discussion of Gramsci, but still possess a political integrity of their own. Indeed, it is impossible to write about Gramsci without facing a range of political implications, Gramsci's place in the continuing Marxist tradition and the PCI's current policies chief among them. The latter are right to the fore of the other texts directly under review -- the books by Paolo Spriano, Christine Buci-Glucksmann, and Anne Showstack Sassoon, and the two readers, Gramsci and Marxist Theory and Approaches to Gramsci. The dominating perspective here is clearly Eurocommunist, an affirmation in theory of post-Stalinist -- but also post-Leninist -- strategic possibilities for the Left. One function of these books -- as Chantal Mouffe and Anne Showstack Sassoon, who have navigated much of the Gramsci discussion for the British Left, would both see it -- is to bring the British discussion up to the level of the French and Italian.⁴² This is most avowedly the case in Gramsci and Marxist Theory, which presents some of the major contributions to a debate opened by the second Gramsci Conference at Cagliari in 1967, febrile in its political urgency, on the nature of Gramsci's political legacy, a kind of theoretical forecourt to the formal elaboration of a distinct Eurocommunist politics in 1975-6. Buci-Glucksmann's Gramsci and the State (published in the original French in 1975) should also be seen as part of this debate, as should Spriano's careful reconstruction of Gramsci's relations with the party after his imprisonment (originally published in 1977). Finally, Approaches to

Gramsci also contains a number of pertinent essays from ^(this) point of view, either as elements of contention (those by Giuseppe Vacca, Buci-Glucksmann, and Showstack Sassoon) or more detached commentaries (Eric Hobsbawm, Tom Nairn), while Showstack Sassoon's own book is conceived as a theoretical foundation for an equivalent left-Eurocommunist politics in Britain, whose interpretation of Gramsci's politics synthesizes the best insights from the continental debate. Allowing for a necessary partiality in the reading of Gramsci, these texts maintain an exceptionally high level of exegetical rigour and intellectual sophistication, which can rarely have been matched in the context of a party political discussion.

IV.

What can be said more specifically about the state of our current understanding? One's reactions to Gramsci's career may be organized in many different ways, but the following seem to me the features which are particularly worth remarking.

First, attention has shifted from the young to the older Gramsci. In a way this is obvious, given the centrality of the Prison Notebooks to his intellectual achievement (indeed, the absence outside the Notebooks of any sustained theoretical writing not directly harnessed to immediate political practice). But it is worth remembering that Gramsci first came to notice in English as the theorist and instigator of the Turin factory councils in 1919-20. This was true of some early fragments of translation before the major editions of the 1970s, of Cammett's pioneering book, of Martin Clark's dissertation, and of Gwyn Williams'

book and the accompanying translation of Spriano.⁴³ This was a period (late-1960s to early-1970s) when discussion of Gramsci was largely confined to a Marxist Left preoccupied with direct-democratic alternatives to parliamentary forms, and therefore more inclined to stress the revolutionary years 1917-21 than either the Second International or the Popular Front. The concern was explicitly polemical, namely to claim Gramsci for 'an anti-Stalinist libertarian camp' and to show that he belonged 'in the revolutionary tradition of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky and outside of the distortions which have so often posed as Marxism in the last fifty years'.⁴⁴ The current literature does not ignore the factory councils. But it addresses this early period either as a routine part of Gramsci's biography before the real 'meat' of the theoretical exposition (Adamson), or for the light it can shed on the larger problems of hegemony (Showstack Sassoon) or the state (Buci-Glucksmann) that are crystallized in the period of the Notebooks. There is nothing like the intensive dissection of the councils' experience in Gwyn Williams and Martin Clark, which together remain the best sources for this phase in Gramsci's career. In Salamini's book it disappears altogether.

The most integrated account is in Femia, who discusses the councils in the context of Gramsci's thinking about the party ('Architect of the new hegemony', pp. 139-51). But even Femia treats Gramsci's 'consiliar' doctrine as a 'digression', before returning to the dominant theme of the revolutionary party. Thus, though he polemicizes against 'the folly of treating his (Gramsci's) writings as a unified whole' (p. 139), Femia effectively does this himself by divesting the councils' experience of an independent significance, on the grounds that Gramsci subsequently

demoted them in his thinking.⁴⁵ But while Gramsci never revisited the idea of the councils in any detail (as such they are virtually unmentioned in the Notebooks), and while the foundation of the Communist Party and the victory of fascism involved a decisive break in Gramsci's career, the Ordine Nuovo period retained a none the less constitutive significance for certain of his mature themes, like the educative power of the factory in particular. For this reason Showstack Sassoon's decision to include two essays on the councils in her reader (by Franco De Felice on 'Revolution and Production', and Mario Telo on 'The Factory Councils') is all the more welcome. Here the key features of the factory councils are descriptively reaffirmed: their essential novelty in the context of the Second International; their affinities to the soviets in Russia and consequent intimations of 'dual power'; their subversion of undemocratic trade union bureaucracy (though not of legitimate trade union representation on the basis of the wage relation); their radical potential, as agencies of direct as opposed to representative or parliamentary democracy, as media of mobilization, and as instruments of working class self-education ('schools of propaganda', as Gramsci put it); and their fundamental political importance, as institutions which raised the workers to a sense of their full capacity to dominate production and thence society itself.

Historically speaking, it is valuable to be reminded of this given the relative indifference to Gramsci's early years now that the Prison Notebooks have come to dominate the stage. There were always definite weaknesses in the consiliar conception. Beyond a certain point there is an essential vagueness to Gramsci's statements in 1919-20 regarding the

exact relations between councils, trade unions and party, and while he took pains to affirm the legitimacy of all three in the overall repertoire of working class action, the nuance in his own position proved an insufficient defence against the tendential syndicalism of the Turin movement as a whole. Many militants (probably a majority) saw the councils increasingly as a revolutionary substitute for political action by a party, and this could easily degenerate into a localist, apolitical celebration of working class spontaneity.⁴⁶ Gramsci and his immediate collaborators were somewhat exceptional in holding the larger importance of state power firmly in view during the high tide of the Turin movement.

Moreover, this was compounded by other limitations. Given the factory as opposed to the territorial basis of the councils, it was unclear how far the education of the workers into self-management could also equip them to run society. This qualified their potential as organs of future state power, and as Mario Telo observes in the Showstack Sassoon collection, licensed 'a much reduced notion of the dictatorship of the proletariat stemming from a conception of revolution limited to the working class' (p. 204). The same 'productivism' tended to suppress the problem of class alliances (i.e. winning the democratic consent of non-proletarian strata to the revolution), and obscured the difficulties of articulating the councils with other kinds of popular activism (like agricultural unions and peasant land occupations) into a larger political movement that was genuinely national in scope (in both the social and territorial senses). Telo succinctly summarizes this weakness: 'exaltation of a working class productivism based in an

already existing industrial apparatus; separation of the working class from intermediate social strata; an accentuation of its distance from non-working class proletarian and semi-proletarian strata' (p. 205).

It was a serious deficit in Gramsci's thinking in the prison years that he never revisited these early problems. At different points in the anti-fascist struggle the council concept resurfaced as the distinctive working class contribution to the democratic anti-fascist front, capable of ushering in the socialist phase of the struggle and sustaining an appropriate level of radicalization.⁴⁷ But in general they became displaced in Gramsci's thinking during the 1920s by a Bolshevik conception of the revolutionary party. However, Gramsci's own later neglect is no reason to ignore the experience, whether for the intrinsic interest of the consiliar idea, its centrality to the revolutionary conjuncture of 1917-23 (in both Italy and Europe), or its constitutive importance for many of Gramsci's later preoccupations. This is partly because the buoyant, not to say utopian expectations of 1919-20 (optimism of the intellect?) cast the subsequent period into necessary relief. But the Turin years also retain a founding importance in Gramsci's career, not in the sense of some linear continuity which suppresses the elements of break and conjuncture in the following two decades, but as a moment of exceptional political and intellectual excitement, which convened an enduring configuration of problems in Gramsci's mind.

This was true above all of his thinking about education and culture. In this sense the conciliar experience already inscribed a powerful conception of the proletariat's hegemonic capability, though one whose

conditions of realization in society at large remained to be elaborated. Given the importance attributed to Ordine Nuovo by earlier work (especially by Davidson, Clark, Williams), it is strange -- though perhaps understandable in terms of how they construct their problematic around the 'privileged' texts of the Notebooks -- that the current works give it so little attention. As Davidson put it, Gramsci's 'experience with the factory councils taught him once and for all that the fundamental mode of creating class consciousness was through the practical activity of organizing the workers in a "conciliar activity", through which their possibilities would become "visible", and theory "realized"'.⁴⁸ Clark summarizes the period's longer significance very well: 'The idea that Fiat is the capitalist firm par excellence, the belief in the peculiar importance of the Turin working class (comparable in proletarian status to the miners in Britain), the leadership of intellectuals from the "Kingdom of Sardinia", above all the willingness to debate cultural and historical topics, the hostility to congealed orthodoxy and sectarianism -- all these features of the Italian Communist Party are characteristically Ordinovista'.⁴⁹

V.

The question of 'young' versus 'old' Gramsci also bears on the second theme I want to mention, namely the vexed question of Gramsci's relationship to Benedetto Croce. In his early formation it seems clear that Gramsci owed very little to the German orthodoxies of the Second International, specifically to the evolutionary determinism normally associated with Kautskyan Social Democracy, certainly in its codified and popularized versions.⁵⁰ He was far more drawn to the voluntarist and activist

mode of discourse strongly in the ascendant amongst radical intellectuals by the time he went up to Turin University in 1911. Amongst the specific influences on his early ideas the dominant Hegelianism of Croce's Neapolitan school seems to have been paramount, politically charged with a defiant Sard radicalism derived from Gaetano Salvemini's writings on the South. Fiori and Davidson explored this intellectual milieu in some detail, and Walter Adamson now provides an admirable summary of the prevailing climate of ideas during Gramsci's youth. He calls Gramsci a 'militant Crocean' -- 'one who drew on the new wave for its democratic temper, but who still located himself in the long, neo-Hegelian stream of Italian high culture'. He continues: 'This was possible largely because the left-right cleavage of prewar Italian political and intellectual life was very much overshadowed and even confused by other, more dominating cleavages between North and South, positivist and anti-positivist, Marxist and anti-positivist radical, and rationalist and irrationalist. On each of these divides, Gramsci stood on the same side as Croce' (p. 33). This puts it very well.

To this specifically Italian context should be added the influence of 'the romantic socialist but non-Marxist or at least nonorthodox sector of the French intelligentsia: Romain Rolland, Charles Peguy, Henri Barbusse, and Georges Sorel', whom Gramsci seems to have been reading in 1916-17. They gave him 'an intense preoccupation with the category of "will" and a moralism aimed at renewing the "consciousness" of the masses through education and culture' (p. 33f.). This makes sense of Gramsci's ambiguous interventionism in autumn 1914 (expressed in his article 'Active and Operative Neutrality', Oct. 31st 1914), and Adamson's treatment of these

points is succinct and convincing (e.g. in his gloss on Gramsci's second major article, 'Socialism and Culture', Jan. 29th 1916, pp. 31ff.). The high point of this 'Crocean' or even 'pre-Marxist' phase was represented in three acts: the famous article of Dec. 24th 1917, which greeted the victory of the Bolsheviki as a 'Revolution against "Capital"'; the abortive publication of La Citta Futura in February 1917 as the intended journal of the Socialist Youth Federation; and the founding of the Club di vita morale in December 1917 as an incubator of socialist consciousness amongst young workers.⁵¹

Of course, the Crocean origins of Gramsci's thought have never really been in dispute. The arguments arise over the nature of its lasting effects. Broadly speaking, there have been two extreme positions. One, for which Togliatti was the firm but sophisticated spokesman, was the official view of the PCI in its sterner pre-1956 moods. We may pass by the broader aspects of this view (e.g. the 'historicism' of the PCI's prevailing line in the 1950s), and for our current purposes stress the essential 'Leninism' of the interpretation. Gramsci is thought to have decisively repudiated the intellectual heritage of Italian idealism, so much so that the Prison Notebooks may be regarded as the 'anti-Croce' he always hoped to write. The key break was his recognition of the need for a Communist Party and for disciplined observance of the imperatives of the Third International. We may note in passing that this implies a qualified judgement (though not a dismissal) of the period of the councils in Gramsci's development.⁵² On the whole most subsequent Marxist commentary has accepted the premises of this interpretation, which establishes an abstract 'Leninism' as the external measure of Gramsci's maturity and consistency as a Marxist theor-

etician. Arguments can then proceed over the timing (whether the conciliar experience of 1919-20, the split with the PSI in 1920-1, or the fight with Amadeo Bordiga and the accompanying Bolshevization of the PCI in 1924-6 were the authentic 'Leninist' moments) and the completeness (Gramsci's 'historicism', his neglect of economics, his 'social democracy', or his 'Stalinism') of Gramsci's development into a genuine revolutionary Marxist.⁵³ Despite the opening of discussion in the PCI since the 1960s, in which the second Gramsci Conference was the key moment, this Leninist definition has remained largely intact. Gramsci's political theory has been systematically coopted (both crudely and with immense sophistication) into recent debates over the 'Italian road', to the point now of a decisive break with the Soviet model, but the revolutionary lifeline to the early Comintern years has not been snapped. In a similar vein, current discussions within the Eurocommunist perspective simply take Gramsci's materialism as understood and clearly see little value in discussing the question. Both Buci-Glucksmann and Showstack Sassoon give the question of Gramsci's possible 'Croceanism' short shrift.

The second extreme position was that of the Croceans themselves, encapsulated in Croce's own post-war assertion that the prison letters showed Gramsci to be 'one of us' -- i.e. 'a philosopher in the speculative, anti-positivist tradition, who recognized the value of idealist categories, displayed a lively appreciation of high culture, and took a broad view of historical development', as Femia puts it (p. 62). This achieved some slight currency in the 1950s, but only properly took root in 1963 with the publication of Giuseppe Tamburrano's Antonio Gramsci.

As Femia says: 'Gramsci's Croceanism, on this account, consists not in any fascination with abstract ideas or rarified philosophical questions, but in his emphasis on the subject rather than the object as the primary maker of social change, in his refusal to recognize the existence of any objectivity that cannot be overcome through conscious praxis. The materialist aspect of historical materialism virtually drops out. Gramsci emerges as a "realist" neo-Crocean, a Marxist working within a voluntarist, subjectivist, idealist framework, totally opposed to any form of economic determinism' (p. 65)⁵⁴. This anticipated Norberto Bobbio's more famous intervention at the Cagliari Conference four years later, when he claimed Gramsci as the 'theorist of the superstructure', who inverted the accepted relationship between superstructure and base and broke decisively with Marx's theoretical problematic ('Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society', in Mouffe, pp. 21-47). In one form or another the approach is shared by most of the non-Marxist commentators on Gramsci. H. Stuart Hughes (an especially simplistic version), George Lichtheim, Neil McInnes, James Joll, and Leszek Kolokowski all come to mind.⁵⁵ A particularly idiosyncratic rendering can be found in the writings of Piccone and the Telos group.⁵⁶

If Croce is to Gramsci as Hegel is to Marx, we should probably resign ourselves to a future of fruitful indeterminacy in the critical discussion of the relationship. No one has tried to argue that Gramsci's intellectual achievement hinged on an epistemological break, separating the mature problematic of the Notebooks from the youthful speculations in Turin, and such a notion would be singularly inappropriate for making sense of his career. It is surely Gramsci's consciousness of problems that makes him so attractive -- his awareness of difficulty and his willingness to argue his

way through unknown territory, pushing the enquiry beyond the frontiers of what passed for Marxist orthodoxy in the Marxist tradition, not just in the Second International, but in the Third, and for that matter in Marx himself. In this sense a kind of permanent dialogue with Croce was the motor for much of his innovation. Joseph Femia's discussion of this point ^{is} ~~is~~ first rate. As he says, 'Even the mature Gramsci employed the Crocean idiom, and this usage is emblematic of how the Neapolitan's ideas are woven into the Quaderni'. Several key themes ('the notion of ideological and spiritual rule through consent, the insistence on the relative autonomy of ideas, the hostility to philosophical materialism and so-called "economism"') were learned originally through a reading of Croce: 'Through his confrontation with Italy's leading Hegelian, Gramsci came to appreciate that every historical action presupposes a cultural framework, a complex organization of ends and means enclosed within a system of values. This insight, gained in his youth, always stood at the centre of his analysis, providing a foundation for his critique of mechanistic versions of Marxism' (p. 126).

None the less, despite this (and, e.g., the savagry of his attack on Bukharin) Gramsci stayed securely within Marx's materialist framework, proceeding from a definite notion of structure, as (in Togliatti's words) 'the location of practical productive activity, on which rises the whole of the social relations in which real men move and act'.⁵⁷ In his elaboration of this point ('The economic base sets, in a strict manner, the range of possible outcomes, but free political and ideological activity is ultimately decisive in determining which alternative prevails'; or 'In the last analysis, then, history works itself out through the discontents of men afflicted with

the contradictions that exist in the economic sphere. Any given hegemony must always be traced back to its material roots', pp. 121, 127), Femia comes close to the conception of structural determination derived from Althusser earlier in the 1970s, suggesting that Gramsci manages 'to steer a middle course between the Scylla of absurdity ("production determines everything") and the Charybdis of banality ("everything determines everything else")' (p. 121). His summary of Gramsci's final position can hardly be bettered: 'Gramsci was far from denying the classical Marxist primacy of being over thought; he only wished to say that subject and object existed in an interactive relationship, manifested in praxis. Man is at once cause and effect, author and consequence of certain definite conditions. Once objectified, however, these conditions -- especially their economic manifestation -- preclude the possibility of sovereign choice. Men make their own world and their own history, but not as they please. They are weighted down by their own past constructions, which are in turn conditioned by the primal forces of nature. It was Gramsci's hope to develop a concept of Marxism equi-distant from idealism and positivism. History is generated neither by the speculative unfolding of some transcendent "spirit" nor by the evolution of material forces' (p. 27).⁵⁸

Beyond a certain point, which was passed some time between the launching of Ordine Nuovo in May 1919 and the formation of the PCI in January 1921, Gramsci became more interested in Croceanism as a socio-cultural force than in Croce as an individual thinker. In this sense his thinking about hegemony owed more to an analysis of the Crocean presence in Italian society than to the intrinsic qualities of Croce's own ideas. For Gramsci, Croce occupied a strategic place in Italian culture, 'a kind of lay pope', whose influence

afforded a rare insight into the processes by which hegemony was secured.⁵⁹

In the celebrated essay on the Southern Question, written just before his arrest in 1926, Gramsci specified what he meant by this assessment: 'It is a remarkable fact that in the South, side by side with huge property, there have existed and continue to exist great accumulations of culture and intelligence in single individuals, or small groups of great intellectuals, while there does not exist any organization of middle culture. There exist in the South the Laterza publishing house, and the review La Critica. There exist academies and cultural bodies of the greatest erudition. But there do not exist small or medium reviews, nor publishing houses around which medium groupings of Southern intellectuals might form. The Southerners who have sought to leave the agrarian bloc and pose the Southern Question in a radical form have found hospitality in, and grouped themselves around, reviews printed outside the South. Indeed, one might say that all the cultural initiatives by medium intellectuals which have taken place in this century in Central and Northern Italy have been characterized by Southernism, because they have been influenced by Southern intellectuals'. Together with Giustino Fortunato Croce was one of 'the supreme political and intellectual rulers of all these initiatives', who ensured that 'the problems of the South would be posed in a way which did not go beyond certain limits; did not become revolutionary. Men of the highest culture and intelligence, who arose on the traditional terrain of the South but were linked to European and hence to world culture, they had all the necessary gifts to satisfy the intellectual needs of the most sincere representatives of the cultured youth in the South; to comfort their restless impulses to revolt against existing conditions; to steer them along a middle way of classical serenity in thought and action'.⁶⁰

In short, 'Benedetto Croce has fulfilled an extremely important "national" function. He has detached the radical intellectuals of the South from the peasant masses, forcing them to take part in national and European culture; and through this culture, he has secured their absorption by the national bourgeoisie and hence by the agrarian bloc'. Or, as Buci-Glucksmann puts it: 'In the absence of a great and politically united party of the bourgeoisie, Croce played the role of ideological federator, a cement between the various liberal groups. He offered them a common national and European vision of the world, a certain type of intellectual and moral leadership over society' (p. 393). It was this concentrated exercise of ideological creativity in the interests of a dominant social bloc and its political representation (what Buci-Glucksmann calls an 'apparatus of philosophical hegemony') that particularly fascinated Gramsci -- 'the access to and diligent use of scholarly journals and the scholarly press to saturate the intellectual life of Italy with a single point of view, a particular culture, in order to bring about what Croce liked to call the "cultural rebirth of Italy"'.⁶¹

Gramsci's essay on the Southern Question (which was appropriately included as a kind of preface to the original edition of selections from the Prison Notebooks in The Modern Prince) crystallized these thoughts about the social and political functions of intellectuals and convened most of Gramsci's developing theoretical preoccupations in a strongly articulated analysis. We may accept Buci-Glucksmann's arguments against regarding 1926 as an overly decisive break in Gramsci's career (e.g. between the political activist up to 1926, and the contemplative thinker after his arrest) and still regard the unfinished thoughts on the Southern Question as a significant point of departure.⁶² It assembled an agenda of questions, which (by the accident of

his arrest soon afterwards) Gramsci was able to pursue more extensively in the Prison Notebooks -- 'the role of the intellectuals, the historic bloc and the concept of hegemony, and the role of the proletariat and its political party' (as Showstack Sassoon summarizes them, p. 104). In other words, it brings us properly to the third major feature of the current books, namely what they have to say about Gramsci's concept of hegemony.

VI.

The concept of hegemony is the one most commonly associated with Gramsci's distinctive contribution to Marxist theory. Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that it was through this concept that most people over the last twenty years first encountered him. An enormous quantity of paper and ink have been expended in the specification and elaboration of what Gramsci meant by the term, and there is no space here to do the complexity of these discussions anything like justice.⁶³ In any case, my concern is less the clarification of Gramsci's concepts per se than the exploration of some current emphases in the literature about him. But for general orientation we can do far worse than quote Gwyn Williams' early definition (from 1960), which condensed the numerous Italian exegeses and Gramsci's own widely scattered statements on the subject (only a tiny fragment of which, of course, were then available in English), and which for many years (essentially until the translation of the Notebooks and the 'second phase' of the Gramsci reception in the mid-1970s) remained the main starting-point for English-language discussion. In this summary notation, 'hegemony' signifies 'an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations, informing with its spirit all taste, morality, customs, religious and polit-

ical principles, and all social relations, particularly in their intellectual and moral connotations'. Williams continues: 'An element of direction and control, not necessarily conscious, is implied'. And he added: 'This hegemony corresponds to a state power conceived in stock Marxist terms as the dictatorship of a class'.⁶⁴

In the Prison Notebooks it was the process of constructing hegemony, viewed through the lens of Italian history, that interested Gramsci more than anything else. How did such a single 'concept of reality' come to be dominant? How was its dominance constituted, organized, reproduced? Through what political modalities was the stability and moral cohesion of the social order guaranteed? How was popular consent, as opposed to pragmatic acceptance or enforced compliance, achieved? How might such broader 'national-popular' solidarities, which expressed the common sense of belonging of a society, which transcended the divisions of region, religion, sectionalism and even class, and which constrained the oppositional imagination of subordinate and exploited groups, be undermined? How might the working class in particular claim for itself an independent political effectivity, sufficiently resilient to withstand the enormous countervailing authority of the established order and sufficiently attractive to win the allegiance of the other popular classes? How, above all, might a credible counter-hegemonic potential against and within the existing society be organized?⁶⁵

It was to these questions that the remarkable achievement of the Notebooks was harnessed. Gramsci adumbrated the broad outlines of his project, which began as a 'study of the intellectuals' but which in practice (as Buci-Glucksmann persuasively argues) developed increasingly into a discourse on the state,

in a much quoted letter of September 1931: 'I greatly extend the notion of intellectuals beyond the current meaning of the word, which refers chiefly to great intellectuals. This study also leads me to certain determinations of the State. Usually this is understood as political society (i.e. the dictatorship of coercive apparatus to bring the mass of the people into conformity with the type of production and economy dominant at any given moment) and not as an equilibrium between political society and civil society (i.e. the hegemony of a social group over the entire national society exercised through the so-called private organizations such as the church, the trade unions, the schools, etc.). Civil society is precisely the special field of action of the intellectuals'.⁶⁶ Though he takes careful note of direct interventions to suppress opposition, to contain dissent, and to manipulate educational, religious and other ideological apparatuses for the production of popular compliance, therefore, Gramsci explicitly links hegemony with a domain of public life ('civil society') which is relatively independent of such controls, and hence makes its achievement a far more contingent process. To establish its supremacy a dominant class must not only impose its rule through the state, it must also demonstrate its claims to 'intellectual and moral leadership', and this requires a continuous labour of creative ideological activity. The capacity 'to articulate different visions of the world in such a way that their potential antagonism is neutralized', rather than simply suppressing those visions beneath 'a uniform conception of the world', is the essence of hegemony in Gramsci's sense.⁶⁷

The intricacies of Gramsci's meaning have been traversed many times. With the current literature we have probably now reached the limits of the exegetical mode. In their different ways Showstack Sassoon, Mouffe, Buci-

Glucksmann, Femia, Salamini, Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm, Stuart Hall, and Raymond Williams have all provided first-rate explications.⁶⁸ Amongst the books immediately under review, Femia probably provides the most rounded and satisfying account of 'hegemony's' theoretical content, Adamson the most perfunctory. Amongst the more closely 'textual' accounts, Showstack Sassoon's displays great synthetic lucidity, placing Gramsci's term securely in its larger conceptual field -- the idea of the state as 'hegemony fortified by coercion'; the notion of the 'historical bloc', the view of intellectuals as 'the organisers of hegemony', and the pervasive concern with 'the party'.⁶⁹ More specifically, Anderson and Buci-Glucksmann locate Gramsci's highly individual use of the term more precisely within the deeper ideological context of Russian social democracy (going back to Plekhanov) and in the contemporary usage of the Comintern.⁷⁰ Harold Entwistle explores its relationship to Gramsci's views on education, although his valuable account of Gramsci's rather 'conservative' pedagogy (stressing the need for 'precision, discipline, order, standards and "sobriety" in schooling', p. 107) is gratuitously hitched to an ultimately misplaced polemic against 'current neo-Marxist educational theory' otherwise known as the 'new sociology of education'.⁷¹ Finally, Ginsborg (in the Davis collection) and Adamson offer useful expositions of Gramsci's views on the Risorgimento (see pp. 45-61 and 184-96 of those works respectively).

As most authors point out, Gramsci's concept of hegemony is by no means a finished quantity or free of ambiguities. To take a major example, the Prison Notebooks are far more concerned with the mechanisms and modalities of hegemony under capitalism than with the problem of how a successful counter-hegemonic challenge might be mounted or the question of how working class

hegemony under socialism might be democratically guaranteed. As Bob Lumley says, 'the concept of hegemony in the Notebooks is used primarily to explain the ways in which the ruling bloc maintains its power'.⁷² Of course, Gramsci also had much to say about the 'Modern Prince' -- his conception of the new revolutionary party which was capable of organizing 'the national-popular collective will' into the potential for a new state and a 'new historical bloc bound together by a broadly extended hegemony', as Showstack Sassoon puts it (p. 153) -- and during the prison years (as Paolo Spriano shows) was understandably concerned with devising an anti-fascist strategy that might simultaneously introduce the transition to socialism.⁷³ These concerns were also linked to Gramsci's famous distinction between the 'war of movement' and the 'war of position', where the latter was meant to characterize the needs of the West European Left in the straightened circumstances of the later-1920s and 1930s. But specifying the practical implications of these ideas has been the task of Gramsci's subsequent commentators, of whom by far the most important has been the towering figure of his early Turin associate, long-time comrade and political legatee, Palmiro Togliatti. Similarly, on the evidence of the Notebooks Gramsci's thinking about the nature of revolutionary transitions remained fairly indeterminate once it came to the final moment of the seizure of power, a strategic question which the concept of the 'war of position' tended to mask. Here again, the task of clarification has been performed by the post-war commentators, principally those of a Eurocommunist persuasion, though as Poulantzas pointed out there was no explicit warranty in Gramsci ^{himself} for the idea that the state apparatus can be seized and transformed through a strategy of parliamentary and electoral politics.⁷⁴

But despite these ambiguities the resonance of Gramsci's concept for the

1960s was very great. For generations raised on the rigours of the Cold War, unimpressed with either the social democratic or orthodox Communist traditions, and bedazzled by the triumphs of consumer capitalism, a body of theory so strongly oriented towards the cultural aspects of domination was bound to seem attractive. On the one hand, the widespread belief that the Soviet and East European revolutions had left fundamental social inequalities intact found considerable support in Gramsci's stress on the need for cultural as well as political and economic transformation -- what Hobsbawm calls his distinction between 'how revolutionaries come to power' and 'how they come to be accepted, not only as the politically existing and irreplaceable rulers, but as guides and leaders' (Approaches to Gramsci, p. 30). On the other hand, the imagery of 'bourgeois hegemony' spoke eloquently to the emerging cultural critique of late capitalist society, with its stress on the incorporation of the working class, its absolute distinctions between revolution and reform, and arresting slogans of repressive tolerance. Gramsci's relevance to these concerns -- what Femia calls 'the process of internalization of bourgeois relations and the consequent diminution of revolutionary possibilities' (p. 35) -- is obvious, and it is easy to see how from a sixties' perspective he seemed all of a piece with the Frankfurt School and Lukacs. In this respect his importance has not only lasted but grown during the intervening years. As Femia says, 'Gramsci's most impressive contribution to Marxist analysis was to help shift its focus away from economics and natural science to the terrain of culture -- to philosophy and the intellectuals, to popular psychology, and to the manifold agencies of socialization' (p. 254).

But in making this point we should beware of mis-stating or exaggerating

the nature of Gramsci's recent influence. After all, an interest in the cultural mechanisms of bourgeois domination and the forms of working class subordination under capitalism (which began in the late-1950s/early-1960s with the new departures in British sociology, the political project of the early New Left Review, and the early achievements of current British social history) considerably predated the serious reception of Gramsci (which was not under way until the end of the 1960s). Perry Anderson may point proudly (and justly) to the role of New Left Review in 1964-5 in pioneering the exploration of Gramscian themes.⁷⁵ But these were only properly placed on the agenda, so to speak, by the political conjuncture which immediately followed, whose energizing effects were dramatized in the radical moment of 1968. Not the least of these effects radically reconstituted our understanding of the category of the political, culminating in a 'de-institutionalized understanding of politics, in which the possible sources of working class oppositional impulse are displaced from the recognized media of political parties and trade unions into a variety of non-institutional settings, embracing behaviour previously regarded as "non-political" -- e.g. crime, street violence, riots, industrial sabotage, mental illness, etc.'. ⁷⁶ Without simplifying too much, we might argue that this expanded but de-institutionalized notion of the political opened the way for a formally 'Gramscian' analysis and the more conscious appropriation of Gramscian concepts.

We might trace this trajectory in British left-intellectual practice in a number of places -- the annual conferences of the Labour History Society and the publications of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies would be two of the most obvious. The general field of North American and British social history, I would argue, reflects the process with particular clarity. There

was the familiar expansion of research and publication in the course of the 1960s. There was the remarkable explosion of the academic subject's formal boundaries in and around the experience of 1968, so that whole new areas of social life and social practice became opened up as legitimate areas of serious discussion (particularly affecting women, blacks, ethnic and social minorities, peasants, and a fortiore the working class). There were the few seminal influences who possessed some early familiarity with the ideas of Gramsci (above all Edward Thompson and Eugene Genovese).⁷⁷ There was the larger eclectic universe of theoretical influences (other 'Western' Marxists and the various tendencies of radical sociology) in which Gramsci then had his somewhat indistinct place. It was in this unruly intellectual environment that the serious utilization of Gramscian terminology, and eventually the confident deployment of his concepts, began. We might even say that it created the need for the latter, to order and rationalize the highly particularized findings on this or that individual aspect of popular culture and working class experience. Femia may say rightly that 'largely because of Gramsci, Marxist views of culture now understand symbolic or ideological representations of a given historical situation as an integral and defining part of the situation' (p. 254). But we should not ignore the impetus (partly linked to the Marxist engagement with Gramsci in the 1960s, ^{(but} partly independent) provided by key social historians, who pioneered the same type of insights in the course of their own research.⁷⁸

In concluding this discussion, three points are worth making. First, 'hegemony' should not be confused with 'ideology' or 'ideological domination' tout court in a perspective stressing the 'manipulations' or 'social control' deliberately exercised by a ruling class. As Raymond William says, in the

course of a brilliant exposition: hegemony comprises 'not only the conscious system of ideas and beliefs (i.e. 'ideology', GE), but the whole lived social process as practically organized by specific and dominant meanings and values'; or 'a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of the society to move, in most areas of their lives'. Hegemony should be seen 'as in effect a saturation of the whole process of living -- not only of political or economic activity, not only of manifest social activity, but of the whole substance of lived identities and relationships, to such a depth that the pressures and limits of what can ultimately be seen as a specific economic, political, and cultural system seem to most of us the pressures and limits of simple experience and common sense. Hegemony is then not only the articulate upper level of "ideology", nor are its forms of control only those ordinarily seen as "manipulation" or "indoctrination". It is the whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living: our senses and assignments of energy, or shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world'.⁷⁹ This sense of completeness and externally structured experience, of 'the wholeness of the process' by which a given social order acquires its legitimacy, is the most obvious feature of Gramsci's idea.⁸⁰ From the social historian's standpoint it allows one to seek evidence of hegemony in the most unlikely of places, from the nineteenth century attack on drink, popular festivals, cruel sports and customary ways of life, to the social relations of production and appropriation in the Newfoundland fisheries.⁸¹

Secondly, however, suggestions that Gramsci's is a 'totalitarian' concept, which were common in the older literature (e.g. H. Stuart Hughes), should be resisted. If we take the essential emphasis on consent (the idea

that dominant classes must demonstrate their claims to 'intellectual and moral leadership' in society at large as well as asserting their control over the state's coercive apparatus) and add it to the equally essential concept of structured class inequality (hegemonic processes operate through social relations of dominance and subordination), then we arrive easily at a third element of definition, that of uncertainty, impermanence, and contradiction. In other words, hegemony is also susceptible to change and negotiation. As I put it with Keith Nield on an earlier occasion, hegemony 'is not a fixed and immutable condition, more or less permanent until totally displaced by determined revolutionary action, but is an institutionally negotiable process in which the social and political forces of contest, breakdown and transformation are constantly in play'.⁸² In this sense hegemony is always in the process of construction. It is always open to modification, and under specific circumstances may be more radically transformed or even (though not very often) break down altogether. Thus civil society provides opportunities for contesting as well as securing the legitimacy of the system. More than anything else, then, hegemony has 'to be won, secured, constantly defended'. It involves 'a struggle to win over the dominated classes in which any "resolution" involves both limits (compromises) and systematic contradictions'.⁸³ It requires that the dominance of a social group be continually renegotiated in accordance with the fluctuating economic, cultural and political strengths of the subordinate classes.

This last point -- the dynamic, contradictory and negotiable aspects of hegemonic construction, which open the space for counter-hegemonic potentials -- is vitally important and enables us to resolve a strange misunderstanding in certain non-Marxist discussions of Gramsci (this is the third and last of

my concluding points). For example, we find R.J. Morris, in a long review of Robbie Gray's book on the labour aristocracy, asserting that the concept of hegemony 'implies the near impossibility of the working class or organized sections of that class being able to generate radical cultural and ideological ideas independent of the dominant ideology' without external assistance from professional intellectuals. In effect, Morris reassimilates Gramsci here to an orthodox or classical Marxist tradition on the role of the revolutionary party (left to themselves the workers will pursue only their immediate material interests; socialist ideas and a revolutionary consciousness can only be introduced from the outside), which is usually attributed to Lenin, but which was actually more widely diffused in the thought of Kautsky and the mainstream of the Second International. Morris also equates hegemony with ideological domination pure and simple, or the subordination of working class culture to the 'imposed values' of a dominant class. To the extent that Gray is able to overcome the limitations of this conceptual framework to explain 'the spontaneous generation of values and organization' within the working class itself (or in Gray's case the labour aristocracy), Morris argues, he must reach outside the Gramscian framework altogether to independent theories of 'cultural bargaining' between a subordinate class and the dominant culture developed within non-Marxist sociology. But once this theoretical borrowing takes place, Morris argues, the maintenance of a given social order (and hence the continued subordination of the working class, the containment of its aspirations within a reformist as opposed to a revolutionary framework of political demands) is seen to rest on a continuous process of renegotiation, and the concept of hegemony consequently loses much of its 'totalitarian force'.⁸⁴

This is extraordinary. A Gramscian analysis (Robbie Gray's) is taxed

with the very inadequacy -- an over-totalized conception of the power of the dominant ideology in society, and an idea of working class subordination which is made to justify the intervention of a vanguard party -- which Gramsci's ideas have actually been used to overcome. The suggestion that the idea of hegemony does not already provide for a vital element of 'negotiation' and may even be radically opposed to it is very strange, and such a misunderstanding will be harder to repeat now that the exhaustive exegeses referred to in this essay are available.⁸⁵ Now, it is certainly true that Robbie Gray also uses the kind of political sociology that Morris approvingly cites, notably the work of Parkin. But this is cognate to the Gramscian derivation of his argument, as opposed to supplemental or contradictory. This only goes to show how easily the potential value of Gramsci's concept may be misconstrued without a necessary familiarity with both the texts of the Notebooks themselves and the larger Marxist discussions that have recently come to surround them. 'Hegemony' must not be equated with straightforward ideological domination in Morris's 'totalitarian' sense, as Mouffe, Showstack Sassoon, Femia, and most other direct commentators go to great lengths to point out. In general this is a salutary reminder of just how superficial a formal acquaintance with a Gramscian vocabulary can actually be.

VII.

Where does this leave us? Many aspects of Gramsci's importance have not been dealt with in the above observations. But it would be impossible to deal with them in an essay of this kind without slipping into the most descriptive and routinized of surveys. Each of Gramsci's key terms (state/civil society, organic/traditional intellectuals, war of position/war of manoeuvre, coll-

ective will, historic bloc, corporatism, subalternity, passive revolution, and so on) deserves a commentary every bit as full as my preceding treatment of hegemony, and the latter itself suffers from being separated from this larger array of concepts. Entire dimensions of Gramsci's thought have been barely mentioned in this review -- his reflections of 'Americanism' and 'Fordism', for example, or his thoughts on popular culture, folklore and language.³⁶ Gramsci's place in current Marxist debates about the state, or about the nature of ideology, both deserve detailed exploration. Some of Gramsci's weaknesses (like his very schematic discussion of 'caesarism' or 'bonapartism') or blind spots (his relative neglect of sex-gender questions) deserve to be explored. His notes of Italian history might have been evaluated in the light of recent historiography. But rather than trying to 'cover' all of these topics, I will use what is left of this essay to identify very briefly some fruitful areas for future research -- to assemble an agenda, so to speak, for the next stage of the reception.

(a) First, it has become an urgent priority to 'historicize' or contextualize Gramsci's development. In part this means returning to the more biographical emphases of an earlier phase in the reception. The books by Cammett, Fiori, Davidson, Williams, and Clark all opted for an essentially narrative presentation. Since then, as Tom Nairn observes in a characteristically brilliant and dissentient essay in Approaches to Gramsci, the discussion has grown far less 'historical' in the conventional sense, treating Gramsci's career mainly for 'what can be distilled out of it as abstract political theory or revolutionary strategy' for the present (p. 178). Without regressing from the new theoretical sophistication (that would be terrible), this might now be reapplied to Gramsci's own biography. There are really two needs here.

One is for a better grasp of the 'national-particular' or 'Italianate' element in Gramsci's thought, which was dominated (Nairn argues) by the failure to constitute a unified Italian state and national political culture between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. In this view, Gramsci was formed from 'the clash between Sardinia and Piedmont, between the most unredeemed, alien South and the feral new capitalism of the North' (Nairn, p. 178), between the embittering childhood experiences of popular prejudice and the exhilarating Turin experience of popular vitality, between the exultation of revolutionary success and the slough of revolutionary defeat. He was the authentic philosopher of these specifically Italian contradictions, which 'constituted the very intellectual personality, the innermost drama of the founding father of the new revolutionary movement'. Gramsci's key ideas 'were valiant efforts to wrestle Italian dilemmas into some kind of theoretical sense' (Nairn, p. 175). This stress on Italy's 'historical pathology' is very much to be welcomed.³⁷

The second need is for a fuller understanding of the 1920s. The early years up to 1917 are now adequately covered (especially by Fiori, Davidson, and Adamson), as are those of the factory councils up to 1920 (Cammett, Davidson again, Williams, and Clark). Likewise, Spriano's meticulous chronicle provides as good a clarification of Gramsci's relations with the Communist Party in the 1930s as we are likely to get. It is for the period between the PCd'I's foundation in January 1921 and Gramsci's arrest in 1926 that the gap exists. Amongst the more biographical works only Davidson's goes into appropriate detail, and his account of inner-party alignments is frequently garbled and hard to follow.³⁸ Similarly, Buci-Glucksmann has lots to say about the Marxist debates of the 1920s (e.g. concerning Gramsci and Bukharin, pp. 199-290), but in a heavily theoreticist vein which bears indistinctly on the

detailed events in the Comintern. The real need is for monographs on the split with the PSI, the sociology of the infant Communist Party's regional and industrial base, Gramsci's relationship with Bordiga after 1921 (where Gwyn Williams stops), and the PCd'I's role in the Comintern, comparable in quality and depth to Martin Clark's study of the factory councils (or failing that a translation of Spriano's multi-volume official history of the PCI).⁸⁴ Such studies would have to be informed by a detailed knowledge of the international dimension, particularly as this was articulated through the Comintern, about which we still remain extraordinarily ignorant.⁹⁰

(b) Moving from the Italian dimension to the European, we also need a comparative history of the council movement and the associated neo-syndicalist manifestations during the revolutionary conjuncture of 1917-23. There is now a large monographic literature on this phenomenon in German and Italian, but a far spottier one in English. Not only would this broaden the discussion of Gramsci's Turin period and help ground the 'political' reading of the latter (i.e. the 'anti-Stalinist' affirmation of direct-democratic alternatives to Bolshevism) in a clearer grasp of its varying social reality and political limitations. It would also bring the history of the Communist Parties in the 1920s more clearly into focus. Arguably, the real significance of the councils was not their ability to offer a viable revolutionary alternative, but the kind of Communist Party their failure would eventually create. Like the Paris Commune the councils provided a vital glimpse of how a socialist society might be organized. But in other ways the most striking thing about the turbulent years of 1919-21 was the fragmentation of the 'revolutionary movement' into violently adventurist localist tendencies, which were sometimes consciously 'syndicalist', but were more often motivated by blanket antipathies to remote

and ineffectual party machines. The problem of the left was how to unify this militancy for political ends and -- after the defeats of 1920-1 -- how to organize the frustrated revolutionary expectations for a period of more prosaic defensive struggle. This was essentially the 'problematic' of Bolshevization (which as a process predated the slogans of the Fifth Comintern Congress in 1924) and it was at the centre of Gramsci's and most other leading Communists' preoccupations in the little-studied period between 1923 and 1928. In other words, the complement to a social history of the council movement would be an intensive investigation of the United Front.⁹¹

(c) The most obvious area for future work is the nature of the Gramscian legacy in the PCI. Until recently this was the subject of prejudice (usually aimed at Togliatti) and not much research. But fortunately, the interest in Eurocommunism has produced a steady flow of English publication on the PCI, and a much better-informed appraisal of Gramsci's influence is becoming possible.⁹² Discussion might take three directions in particular. One might be the diffusion of Gramsci's ideas in Italian culture, amongst the intelligentsia and the PCI's own mass support, focusing on 'Gramscianism' as a socio-cultural force (much as Gramsci focused on 'Croceanism'). This could lead naturally to analysis of the PCI's remarkable influence in Italian intellectual life, which sets it apart from most other West European Communist Parties.⁹³ Secondly, we need to know more about the years of Resistance and reconstruction in the mid-1940s, when the PCI properly emerged as a mass party, when the foundations of the post-war course were laid, and when the Party's democratic (or 'national-popular') credentials were first established.⁹⁴ Thirdly, Togliatti's role needs to be urgently delineated. As the most impressive politician produced by the international Communist movement between the 'left turn' of 1928 and the great

watershed of the mid-1960s (at least in Europe) -- 'the last great figure of the Third International', as Hobsbawm rightly calls him -- it is extraordinary that the English language has still produced virtually nothing approaching a biography.⁹⁵

(d) No less interesting than Gramsci's impact today is the question of Croce's influence in the first three decades of the century. Gramsci's observations on the character of 'Croceanism' as a dominant intellectual trend and larger cultural phenomenon linked to the rather fragile structures of political cohesion in Giolittian Italy (Buci-Glucksmann's 'apparatus of philosophical hegemony') are among the most fruitful of his specifically Italian reflections. As H. Stuart Hughes remarked, 'Not since Goethe had any single individual dominated so completely the culture of a major European country', while for Gramsci (as Edmund Jacobitti aptly puts it) 'Croceanism was the Hegelianism of the twentieth century'.⁹⁶ Indeed, as suggested above, Croce's influence (both through his own positive ideas of moral and intellectual reform, and through Gramsci's evaluation of their social influence) may be credited with a crucial stimulus on Gramsci's thinking about hegemony. Consequently, it is no surprise to find one of Gramsci's recent commentators turning to the study of Croce's thought.⁹⁷ At any rate, testing the accuracy of Gramsci's claims regarding Croceanism through some carefully focused historical sociology of knowledge would be an excellent project to pursue. This would also be a way of concretizing his arguments about intellectuals.

(e) Though much quoted, Gramsci's famous distinction between East and West ('In Russia the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous; in the West there was a proper relation between State and civil society;

and when the State trembled a sturdy structure of civil society was at once revealed')⁹⁸ has had little discernible effect on studies of the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union. So far it has been taken almost exclusively as a cue for work on the West.⁹⁹ Moreover, the typical 'Gramscian' postulate of contemporary Left politics -- that the peculiar conditions of the West (stable capitalism/liberal democratic state/advanced civil society) have created 'the need for a comprehensive, systematic, long-range political strategy, based on a rigorous study of all superstructural phenomena', as Femia (p. 254) puts it -- also has an unfortunate side, namely the implication that questions of democracy and 'pluralism' have been inappropriate for the more 'backward' conditions of the 'East'. The potential for a certain kind of realist apologetics (Stalinism was determined by Russian backwardness, authoritarian bureaucratic regimes by the backwardness of East European political cultures) should be obvious here. In addition, the same syndrome easily perpetuates the West European Left's traditional twentieth century indifference to questions of democracy in the East and confirms its inexcusable ignorance of Eastern Europe's rich democratic socialist traditions. But, as recent events in Poland should remind us, the East affords a rich field for the exploration of Gramscian concepts, and not just as a negative counter-example to the West.¹⁰⁰

This clearly does not exhaust the range of questions which future research might pursue, and it would be easy to go on adding to the list, from the extremely abstract (e.g. the exact relationship between 'war of position' and 'war of manoeuvre' in Gramsci's strategic conception of the transition to socialism) to the very concrete (e.g. his attitude towards the idea of popular front). Abstracting from my own discussion, the general priority is to put Gramsci's concepts more concretely to work. The familiar exercise in exegesis, in either

book or essay form, to define what Gramsci really meant by his various concepts or to establish his specific contribution to political theory, will be harder and harder to defend after the current outpouring of literature. On the other hand, the opposite danger, that of reducing Gramsci too radically to the specifically Italian parameters of his thought, is equally to be avoided. Mairn, for one, comes perilously close to this, so that Gramsci the general theorist (of revolution in the West, or of Eurocommunism) threatens to disappear altogether, save as a role model of intelligent 'national-particular' analysis.¹⁰¹ If anything has emerged from the intensive discussions of the last decade and a half, surely, it is that Gramsci's own complexities should not be reduced. Both Gramscis -- the philosopher of specifically Italian contradictions and the architect of Marxist political theory, who precisely abstracted his distinctive general concepts from an incisive scrutiny of the Italian past and present -- are important. For entirely good reasons, as political theorists, philosophers, cultural theorists and historians discovered the enormous potential of Gramsci's ideas, the last few years have placed the accent on commentary, on clarifying Gramsci's formal meanings, and on exploring their extraordinarily fruitful indeterminacy. But it is no surprise that the most suggestive questions arising have increasingly concerned the intellectual, national-cultural, social and political contexts in which Gramsci wrote and which subsequently lent weight to his ideas. The philosophers have had their say. The historians should now take the stage.

NOTES

1. No sooner had this manuscript been completed than Roger Simon's Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983), was announced. So far as I am aware there are no other major additions to the literature, but by the time this essay is published I may be proved wrong. *Joseph Fernia's valuable review article, 'Gramsci's Patrimony', in British Journal of Political Science, 13 (1983), 327-64, appeared after this essay was written.*
2. The political assimilation of Gramsci seems to have reached a temporary terminus in Britain, while in the USA it still continues. See Paul Costello, 'Antonio Gramsci and the Recasting of Marxist Strategy', in Theoretical Review, 31 (Jan. 1983), 1-20, which also appeared after the time of writing.
3. This essay originated as a review of the most recent books on Gramsci and grew to its present form with the encouragement and indulgence of the Editor and Review Editors of the European Studies Review, for which I am extremely grateful. My general understanding of Gramsci owes much to a continuing intellectual collaboration with Keith Nield, while the present text benefited from a careful reading by Ron Suny.
4. The first editions of Gramsci were published in 1957: the well-known selection by Louis Marks, The Modern Prince and Other Writings (London, 1957), and the less well-known edition by Carl Marzani, The Open Marxism of Antonio Gramsci (New York, 1957). Instrumental in bringing Gramsci to the attention of an English-speaking audience were: Gwyn A. Williams' seminal article, 'The Concept of "Egemonia" in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes in Interpretation', in Journal of the History of Ideas, 21 (Oct.-Dec. 1960), 586-99; and John Cammett, Antonio Gramsci

and the Origins of Italian Communism (Stanford, 1967). Also important were Eugene Genovese's review of Cammett, 'On Antonio Gramsci', in Studies on the Left, 7 (1967), 83-107; and Alistair Davidson's early biographical presentation, Antonio Gramsci: The Man, His Ideas (Sydney, 1968). The New Reasoner published a selection of Gramsci's letters (9, 1959, 141-8, and 10, 1959, 122-7), and New Left Review published a fragment on education ('In Search of the Educational Principle', introduced by Quintin Hoare, 32, July-Aug. 1965, 53-62), and nine articles from L'Ordine Nuovo ('Soviets in Italy', introduced by Perry Anderson, 51, Sept.-Oct. 1968, 28-58). There are two annotated bibliographies on Gramsci in English: Phil Cozens, Twenty Years of Antonio Gramsci (London, 1977), and Harvey J. Kaye, 'Antonio Gramsci: An Annotated Bibliography of Studies in English', in Politics & Society, 10 (1981), 335-53. In the wider history of ideas Gramsci was all but ignored, a factor presumably of the Cold War and its legacy. One partial exception was H. Stuart Hughes, Consciousness and Society (New York, 1958), 96-104, but in retrospect his comments seems extraordinarily innocent of the subtleties and complexities that have subsequently brought Gramsci into vogue. Even George Lichtheim's comments in Marxism: An Historical and Critical Study (London, 1961), 368-70, were disfigured by the facile assimilation of Gramsci's thinking to the concept of totalitarianism. But in the long run Lichtheim was too good a historian to allow Gramsci's distinctive importance to pass: see his more nuanced remarks in Europe in the Twentieth Century (London, 1974), 257, 265ff. See also Neil McInnes, 'Antonio Gramsci', in Survey, 53 (Oct. 1964), 3-15.

5. The excitement of discovering the continental Marxist traditions for my

- generation in the late-1960s cannot be overstated, and this was a process which recognized few of the distinctions which became so important during the next decade (e.g. between Hegelian and non-Hegelian Marxism). This can be seen not only in the publishing and translation programmes of New Left Review and New Left Books from the 1960s, but also in the lists of other Left publishing houses (like Merlin or Pluto). For a useful but excessively harsh discussion of this process, see Donald Sassoon, 'The Silences of New Left Review', in Politics & Power: Three (London, 1981), 219-54; and for Perry Anderson's defence of the Review's record, Arguments Within English Marxism (London, 1980), 131-56.
6. Guiseppe Fiori, Antonio Gramsci. Life of a Revolutionary (London, 1970); A. Pozzolini, Antonio Gramsci (London, 1970); 'Gramsci's Letters from Prison', transl. by Hamish Henderson, in New Edinburgh Review, 2 vols (1974), 3-47, 1-44; Lynne Lawner, ed., Letters from Prison (New York, 1975); Victor Kiernan, 'Gramsci and Marxism', in Socialist Register 1972 (London, 1972), 1-33. Particular mention should be made of Quintin Hoare's excellent introduction to the Notebooks: Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, ed. and transl. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London, 1971), xvii-xcvi (henceforth SPN).
7. Dick Howard and Karl E. Klare, eds, The Unknown Dimension. European Marxism since Lenin (New York, 1972). The essay on Gramsci, 'Antonio Gramsci: The Subjective Revolution', 147-68, was by Romano Giachetti.
8. John Harrington, 'Theory and Practice in Gramsci's Marxism', in Socialist Register 1968 (London, 1968), 145-76; Harold Wolpe, 'Some Problems Con-

cerning Revolutionary Consciousness', in Socialist Register 1970 (London, 1970), 251-80.

9. Perry Anderson, 'Origins of the Present Crisis', in New Left Review (NLR), 23 (Jan.-Feb. 1964), 26-53; Anderson, 'Components of the National Culture', NLR, 50 (July-Aug. 1968), 3-57; Anderson, 'Problems of Socialist Strategy', in Anderson and Robin Blackburn, eds., Towards Socialism (Ithaca, 1966), 221-90. Anderson's own contribution to the Gramsci reception appeared in 1976 as 'The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci', in NLR, 100 (Nov. 1976-Jan. 1977), 5-77. More recently Anderson has said of the NLR policy in the later-1960s that 'the decisive influence was Gramsci, whose concepts were deployed by the Review in its explorations of English history and politics a decade before they became a vogue elsewhere' (Arguments, 149f.). While true, this perhaps asserts too easy a continuity with the mid-60s essays, whose explicit 'Gramscianism' is far less developed by present standards. Several essays by Tom Hain belong with those of Anderson: 'The English Working Class', in NLR, 24 (Mar.-Apr. 1964), 43-57; 'The British Political Elite', in NLR, 23 (Jan.-Feb. 1964), 19-25; 'The Anatomy of the Labour Party', in NLR, 27 (Sept.-Oct. 1964), 38-65 and 28 (Nov.-Dec. 1964), 33-62. Finally, it is worth pointing out that both John Merrington and Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith have been members of the NLR Board since the mid-1960s.
10. Robert Q. Gray, The Labour Aristocracy in Victorian Edinburgh (Oxford, 1976); Gray, 'Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain', in Jon Bloomfield, ed., Class, Hegemony and Party (London, 1977), 73-93. See also Gray's essay on 'History', in Trevor Pateman, ed., Counter Course. A

Handbook for Course Criticism (Harmondsworth, 1972), 220-93.

11. Gramsci, Selections from Political Writings (1910-1920), ed. by Quintin Hoare (London, 1977); Gramsci, Selections from Political Writings (1921-1926), ed. by Hoare (London, 1978); Palmiro Togliatti, On Gramsci and Other Writings, ed. by Donald Sassoon (London, 1979). We should also mention the successive volumes of papers from the Communist University of London, which contain extensive discussions of Gramsci, as do the volumes produced by the CPGB's Sociology Group. For the former, see Bloomfield, ed., Class, Hegemony and Party; Sally Hibbin, ed., Politics, Ideology and the State (London, 1978); George Bridges and Rosalind Brunt, eds., Silver Linings. Some Strategies for the Eighties (London, 1981). For the latter, see Alan Hunt, ed., Class and Class Structure (London, 1977); Hunt, ed., Marxism and Democracy (London, 1980). Lawrence & Wishart is also the publisher of two of the books reviewed later in this essay: Paolo Spriano, Antonio Gramsci and the Party: The Prison Years (London, 1979); Christine Buci-Glucksmann, Gramsci and the State (London, 1980). A volume of selections from the Prison Notebooks on philosophy and culture has also been announced. Much of the individual credit for this ambitious programme belongs to Roger Simon.
12. As well as the CPGB (through Lawrence & Wishart, Marxism Today, the Communist University, and so on) and MLR, the following all made important contributions: the Socialist Register and Merlin Press; Pluto Press; the Institute of Workers Control and Spokesman Books; the New Edinburgh Review.

13. Gwyn A. Williams, Proletarian Order. Antonio Gramsci, Factory Councils and the Origins of Communism in Italy, 1911-1921 (London, 1975); Paolo Spriano, The Occupation of the Factories: Italy 1920, transl. and introduced by Gwyn A. Williams (London, 1975); Martin Clark, Antonio Gramsci and the Revolution that Failed (New Haven and London, 1977); Anderson, 'Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci'; Alistair Davidson, Antonio Gramsci: Towards an Intellectual Biography (London, 1977); James Joll, Gramsci (London, 1977). The same sort of quickening is apparent in the article literature, as a glance at Kaye's annotated bibliography (see note 4) will confirm. Some of the more important items included the following: Thomas R. Bates, 'Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony', in Journal of the History of Ideas, 36 (1975), 351-66 (abstracted from his 1972 PhD at the Univ. of Wisconsin); Joseph Femia, 'Hegemony and Consciousness in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci', in Political Studies, 23 (1975), 29-48; Stuart Hall, Bob Lumley and Gregor McLennan, 'Politics and Ideology: Gramsci', in Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 10. On Ideology (Birmingham, 1977), 45-76; Eric Hobsbawm, 'The Great Gramsci', in New York Review of Books, April 4 1974, 39-44; Hobsbawm, 'Gramsci and Political Theory', in Marxism Today, 31 (July 1977), 205-13; Jerome Karabel, 'Revolutionary Contradictions: Antonio Gramsci and the Problem of Intellectuals', in Politics & Society, 6 (1976), 123-72; Chantal Mouffe and Anne Showstack Sassoon, 'Gramsci in France and Italy: A Review of the Literature', in Economy and Society, 6 (1977), 31-68; Roger Simon, 'Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony', in Marxism Today, 21 (March 1977), 78-86.
14. This is Russell Jacoby's list in Dialectic of Defeat. Contours of Western Marxism (Cambridge, 1981).

15. Ibid., 62. Not surprisingly, Jacoby has difficulties with assimilating Bordiga, an unrepentant vanguardist, to this definition. The complexities in Gramsci's own position in this respect are dealt with by essentially omitting him from any extensive or direct discussion.
16. Anderson, Considerations on Western Marxism (London, 1976), 56.
17. Ibid., 77-80.
18. Paul Piccone, 'Gramsci's Hegelian Marxism', in Political Theory, 2 (1974), 38. Though it purports to be about Gramsci, this article is actually a rambling and superficial discussion of the post-1917 voluntarist reaction against the Second International. Piccone's other articles are no more illuminating: 'Gramsci's Marxism: Beyond Lenin and Togliatti', in Theory and Society, 3 (1976), 485-512; 'From Spaventa to Gramsci', in Telos, 31 (1977), 35-66. On another occasion Piccone produced the memorable description of Lenin's What is to be Done as 'that incredible piece of shit', which at least has the virtue of candour. See Stanley Aronowitz, Russell Jacoby, Paul Piccone and Trent Schroyer, 'Symposium on Class', in Telos, 28 (1976), 157.
19. Carl Boggs, Gramsci's Marxism (London, 1976). See also the Telos reader: Pedro Cavalcanti and Paul Piccone, eds., History, Philosophy and Culture in the Young Gramsci (St. Louis, 1975). Here the translations differ in interesting and symptomatic ways from those in the Hoare edition of Political Writings from the same period: essentially, few opportunities are missed to render Gramsci's writing in as 'Hegelian' a manner as possible, the more obscurely the better (or so it seems).

20. Raymond Williams, 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory', in MLR, 82 (Nov.-Dec. 1973), 1-16, originally given as a lecture in Montreal. By Marxism and Literature (Oxford, 1977), the Gramscian perspective has been systematically thought through.
21. See esp. Hall, Lumley and McLennan, 'Politics and Ideology: Gramsci', and the following collections of essays: Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., Resistance through Rituals (London, 1976); John Clarke, Chas Critcher, Richard Johnson, eds., Working Class Culture. Studies in History and Theory (London, 1979). See also Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, Brian Roberts, Policing the Crisis. Mugging, the State, and Law and Order (London, 1978), esp. 201ff., Bob Lumley, 'Gramsci's Writings on the State and Hegemony, 1916-35 -- A Critical Analysis', Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Stencilled Occasional Paper No. 51. The essays of Stuart Hall and Richard Johnson have been especially valuable in the clarification of Gramscian concepts. For representative examples: Richard Johnson, 'Histories of Culture/Theories of Ideology: Notes on an Impasse', in Michele Barrett, Philip Corrigan, Annette Kuhn, Janet Wolff, eds., Ideology and Cultural Production (London, 1979), 49-77; Stuart Hall, 'Popular-Democratic vs Authoritarian Populism: Two Ways of "Taking Democracy Seriously"', in Hunt, ed., Marxism and Democracy, 157-85; Hall, 'Notes on Deconstructing "the Popular"', in Raphael Samuel, ed., People's History and Socialist Theory (London, 1981), 227-40; Hall, 'The Battle for Socialist Ideas in the 1980s', in Socialist Register 1982 (London, 1982), 1-19.
22. See for instance the following representative and influential texts:

Douglas Holly, ed., Education or Domination? A Critical Look at Educational Problems Today (London, 1974); Nell Keddie, ed., Tinker, Tailor ... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation (Harmondsworth, 1973); Michael F.D. Young, ed., Knowledge and Control (London, 1971); Sam Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York, 1976); Michael F.D. Young and Geoff Whitty, eds., Society, State and Schooling (Ringmer, 1977). The absence of reference to Gramsci is particularly striking in the case of Harold Rosen's pamphlet Language and Class (London, 1972) (reprinted in Holly, ed., Education or Domination?, 58-67), which was emblematic for the libertarian educationalism of the mid-1970s in Britain. A transitional text, so to speak, is the Open University reader edited by Roger Dale, Geoff Esland and Madeleine MacDonald, Schooling and Capitalism (London, 1976), which contained an extract from the FM on 'The Intellectuals' (218-23) and Raymond Williams' 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory' (202-10). By 1980 it was virtually inconceivable that reference to Gramsci should not be centrally inscribed in such discussions. As well as Harold Entwistle, Antonio Gramsci. Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics (London, 1979), see Michael W. Apple, Ideology and Curriculum (London, 1979), and Madan Sarup, Education, State and Crisis. A Marxist Perspective (London, 1982).

23. For a sense of this transition (from a situation where Gramscian reference is formally absent to one in which it increasingly pervades discussion) compare the volume of papers from the 1977 Conference of the British Sociological Association with the one from the following year: Gary Littlejohn, Barry Smart, John Wakeford, Mira Yuval-Davis, eds., Power and the State (London, 1978); Barret et al., eds., Ideology and Cultural Production.

Compare also the discussions in the 'Cultural Perspectives' issue of Screen Education, 34 (Spring 1980), with those in Screen earlier in the 1970s. For some individuals in the forefront of the Althusser reception an explicit interest in Gramsci has yet to develop, however. This seems to be true of Gareth Stedman Jones, of Paul Hirst and Barry Hindess, and (by and large) of the circle around Economy and Society. For reasons of extra complexity (not for personal or political indifference) Marxist feminist writings are excepted from these observations.

24. Thompson first addressed Gramsci in his polemic with Perry Anderson and Tom Mairn in the mid-1960s -- see 'The Peculiarities of the English', in The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays (London, 1978), 72ff. -- but it is fair to say that his close familiarity with Gramsci's ideas really dates from a decade later. See the following works in particular: 'Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture', in Journal of Social History, 7 (1974), 382-405; Whigs and Hunters (Harmondsworth, 1975); 'Eighteenth Century Society: Class Struggle without Class?', in Social History, 3 (May 1978), 133-66.
25. Keith Field and John Seed, 'Waiting for Gramsci', in Social History, 6 (May 1981), 210. For a splendid example of how a Gramscian analysis might be better conducted, see Seed's own article, 'Unitarianism, Political Economy and the Antinomies of Liberal Culture in Manchester, 1830-50', in Social History, 7 (Jan. 1982), 1-25.
26. Gray, 'Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain'. See also Alastair Reid, 'Politics and Economics in the Formation of the British Working Class: A Response to H.F. Moorhouse', in Social History, 3 (Oct. 1978), 353-7.

27. Field and Seed, 'Waiting for Gramsci', 210; Geoff Eley and Keith Field, 'Why Does Social History Ignore Politics?', in Social History, 5 (May 1980), 252. As Stedman Jones observes, the term 'bourgeois hegemony' also carries an extra caché of moral disapproval (although at the same time he probably dismisses the broader potential of a Gramscian perspective too easily): Gareth Stedman Jones, 'Class Expression versus Social Control? A Critique of Recent Trends in the Social History of "Leisure"', in History Workshop Journal, 4 (1977), 168. For reified usages of the concept in some prominent recent works of American history: T. Jackson Lears, No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920 (New York, 1980); Ronald T. Takaki, Iron Cages: Race and Culture in Nineteenth Century America (New York, 1979).
28. Michael Mann, 'The Social Cohesion of Liberal Democracies', in American Sociological Review, 35 (1970), 423-39.
29. See for instance, Robert Q. Gray, 'The Labour Aristocracy in the Victorian Class Structure', in Frank Parkin, ed., The Social Analysis of Class Structure (London, 1974), 19-38.
30. Frank Parkin, Class, Inequality and Political Order (London, 1971), and Parkin, Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique (London, 1979).
31. Apart from works already cited, see the following: Parkin, 'System Contradiction and Political Transformation', in European Journal of Sociology, 13 (1972), ; Mann, Consciousness and Action among the Western Working Class (London, 1973); Steven Lukes, Power: A Radical View

- (London, 1974); Howard Newby, The Deferential Worker (Harmondsworth, 1977).
32. Only Lukes discusses Gramsci's ideas directly. The neglect is especially marked in Parkin, whose receptiveness to Gramsci has not increased between his first and second books. See also his contribution to André Liebich, ed., The Future of Socialism in Europe? (Montreal, 1979), 'Socialism, Equality and Liberty', 247-56, and his extremely intolerant and arrogant contributions to the discussion which followed, 281-96. Another comparison of conference papers from the British Sociological Association Conferences (this time from 1973 and 1975) will also be illuminating: Parkin, ed., Social Analysis of Class Structure, and Richard Scase, ed., Industrial Society: Class, Cleavage and Control (London, 1977). By the latter some cursory references to Gramsci are starting to appear, though not in Howard Newby's very interesting contribution on 'Paternalism and Capitalism', 59-73, where they might have been expected. Gramsci is also largely absent from the writings of Anthony Giddens. See in particular: Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis (London, 1979); A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism. Vol. 1 Power, Property and the State (London, 1981).
33. For Jessop's earlier work, see: Bob Jessop, Traditionalism, Conservatism and British Political Culture (London, 1974). He then moved through a series of highly stimulating essays to the publication of The Capitalist State (Oxford, 1982), which contains an excellent discussion of Gramsci, 142ff. See also the extremely interesting works of Abercrombie and Urry: Nicholas Abercrombie, Class, Structure and Knowledge (London, 1980), esp.

113-31; John Urry, The Anatomy of Capitalist Societies. The Economy, Civil Society and the State (London, 1981); Abercrombie, Stephen Hill, Bryan Turner, The Dominant Ideology Thesis (London, 1980).

34. These developments are conveniently summarized in Wolfgang Leonhard, Euro-communism. Challenge for East and West (New York, 1979), 127-66, 271-7.
35. Specific dating will obviously be arbitrary, and my choice of 1976 is based on a reading of the CPGB's journal Marxism Today and the proceedings of the annual Communist University of London.
36. See the volumes of essays listed in Note 11 above.
37. Some of these were directly on Gramsci and the PCI, some on the international Communist movement, and some on the specific features of the British situation: 'The Great Gramsci'; 'Gramsci and Political Theory'; 'Gramsci and Marxist Political Theory', in Anne Showstack Sassoon, ed., Approaches to Gramsci (London, 1982), 20-36; 'The Dark Years of Italian Communism', in Revolutionaries (New York, 1975), 31-42; The Italian Road to Socialism. An Interview by Eric Hobsbawm with Georgio Napolitano of the Italian Communist Party (London, 1977); 'Intellectuals and the Labour Movement', in Marxism Today, 23 (July 1979), 212-20; 'Forty Years of Popular Front Government', in Marxism Today, 20 (July 1976), 221-8; 'The Forward March of Labour Halted?' and associated materials, in Martin Jacques and Francis Mulhern, eds., The Forward March of Labour Halted? (London, 1981), 1-19, 64-71, 75-99, 167-82.

28. If space permitted further demonstration of this point, it would proceed by reference to several key individuals -- Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall, Stuart Holland among them. Among the more important contributions to recent discussions of the Labour Party the following should be mentioned: essays by Barry Hindess and Paul Hirst in Politics & Power, 4 vols. (1980-1); Hobsbawm's 'Forward March of Labour Halted?', and subsequent debates in Marxism Today, MLR, and New Socialist (1978-82); Tony Benn, Parliament, People and Power. Agenda for a Free Society. Interviews with MLR (London, 1982); Raymond Williams, 'An Alternative Politics', in Socialist Register 1981 (London, 1981), 1-10; Hall, 'Battle for Socialist Ideas'; Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman Jones, 'The Labour Party and Social Democracy', in Samuel and Stedman Jones, eds., Culture, Ideology and Politics. Essays for Eric Hobsbawm (London, 1983), 320-9. See also Stuart Holland, 'The New Communist Economics', in Paolo Filo della Torre, Edward Mortimer, Jonathan Story, eds., Eurocommunism: Myth or Reality? (Harmondsworth, 1979), 209-45; Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques, eds., The Politics of Thatcherism (London, 1983). The feminist contribution to current discussions of Socialist strategy has been deliberately left out of these comments, not because it isn't important, but because its coordinates are very different and its origins independent. The theoretical trajectory of Marxist and Socialist feminists in the 1970s cannot be assimilated to the Gramscian logic here described, although there are definite points of congruence. See here Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal, Hilary Wainwright, Beyond the Fragments (London, 1979); Michele Barrett, Women's Oppression Today. Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis (London, 1980); Colin Mercer, 'Revolutions, Reforms or Reformulations? Marxist Discourse on Democracy', in Hunt, ed., Marxism and Democracy, 101-37. But for the persisting difficulties, see the adversary Women's and Men's Editorials in Politics

Power: Three (on 'Sexual Politics, Feminism and Socialism'), 1-19, and the associated polemic between Paul Hirst ('The Genesis of the Social') and Fran Bennett, Beatrix Campbell, Rosalind Coward ('Feminists -- The Degenerates of the Social?'), 67-95. See also the subsequent exchange between Mike Prior and Dan Smith, in Politics & Power: Four (London, 1982), 305-22. However, the acrimony of this particular falling-out should not be allowed to obscure the important convergence between strong tendencies within British feminism and 'anti-economistic Marxists'.

39. The full list is as follows: Anne Showstack Sassoon, Gramsci's Politics, London, Croom Helm, 1980, 261 pp., 12.95 hard covers, 5.95 paper covers; Chantal Mouffe, ed., Gramsci and Marxist Theory, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, 288 pp., 9.50 hard covers, 5.95 paper covers; Christine Buco-Clucksmann, Gramsci and the State, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1980, xiv + 470 pp., 14.00; John A. Davis, ed., Gramsci and Italy's Passive Revolution, London, Croom Helm, 1979, 278 pp., 12.50; Harold Entwistle, Antonio Gramsci. Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, viii + 207 pp., 7.95 hard covers, 3.95 paper covers; Paolo Spriano, Antonio Gramsci and the Party: The Prison Years, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1979, 192 pp., 2.95 paper covers; Walter L. Adamson, Hegemony and Revolution. Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory, Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1980, x + 304 pp., ; Joseph V. Femia, Gramsci's Political Thought. Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981, xiv + 303, 17.50; Leonardo Salamini, The Sociology of Political Praxis. An Introduction to Gramsci's Theory, London, 1981, x + 258 pp., \$27.50; Anne Showstack Sassoon, ed., Approaches to Gramsci, London, Writers and Readers, 1982, 254 pp., 3.95 paper covers.

40. Nield and Seed, 'Waiting for Gramsci', 225.
41. Ibid., 226.
42. See their joint article, 'Gramsci in France and Italy'.
43. On the other hand, this was not true of the reception's 'pre-history'. See here Williams, 'The Concept of "Egemonia"'.
44. Quoted from Andrew Sayers' Introduction to Pozzolini, Antonio Gramsci, xix. Inside Italy the same concern led during the 1970s to an ultra-left stress on the virtues of Bordiga over those of Gramsci, who was thereby consigned to the same anti-Stalinist demonology. None of this specifically Italian literature has found its way into English. There is some bibliographical reference in Jacoby, Dialectic of Defeat, 181 (note 9). Otherwise, see note 53 below.
45. It also makes his criticisms of Showstack Sassoon a little gratuitous. See Journal of Modern History, 54 (1982),
46. For the best discussion, see Clark, Antonio Gramsci and the Revolution that Failed, 46-73.
47. Ibid., 217ff. However, by the 1930s, as Spriano's book makes clear, Gramsci was far more preoccupied with the idea of a Constituent Assembly for the 'period of transition' after the fall of fascism. This would facilitate the broadest basis of democratic unity, destroy the material basis of fascism, and mobilize the workers and peasants for the next phase of the

- struggle. See Spriano, 65-78, 104f., 119f., 123ff.
48. Davidson, Antonio Gramsci, 155.
49. Clark, Antonio Gramsci and the Revolution that Failed, 218.
50. There is little in English on Italian socialism before 1914. The older works by W. Hilton Young, The Italian Left (London, 1949), and Richard Hostetter, The Italian Socialist Movement: Origins, 1860-1882 (Princeton, 1958), are still extremely useful. But see now Franco Andreucci, 'The Diffusion of Marxism in Italy during the Late Nineteenth Century', in Samuel and Stedman Jones, eds., Culture, Ideology and Politics, 214-27.
51. The best and most detailed discussion of this early period is in Davidson, Antonio Gramsci, 48-107. Femia (81-94) is also excellent.
52. For the Prison Notebooks as an 'anti-Croce', see Palmiro Togliatti, 'The Present Relevance of Gramsci's Theory and Practice', and for Togliatti's judgement on the councils, 'Leninism in the Theory and Practice of Gramsci', On Gramsci, 153, 173f. The first text dates from 1957, the second from 1958.
53. The main attacks on Gramsci from the Left came in the late-1960s/early-1970s, either from the ultra-left (tending to an idealized reading of the councils movement or a refurbished 'Bordighism'), or from the followers of Althusser. Christian Riechers, whose book was (calamitously) until recently the main introduction to Gramsci in German, is an extreme case of the first trend,

while Althusser's general sloppiness on the subject of Gramsci may explain the continuing indifference of some of his former disciples to Gramsci's ideas. See Christian Riechers, Antonio Gramsci: Marxism in Italien (Frankfurt, 1970), and 'Kommentar zu Bordigas Brief', in Claudio Pozzoli, ed., Jahrbuch Arbeiterbewegung, vol. 1: Über Karl Korsch (Frankfurt, 1973), 248-63. There are useful surveys of these debates in Salamini (13-21), and Femia (143f., 165-8, 198-200). See also: Williams, Proletarian Order, 302-6, 338-40; Williams, 'The Making and Unmaking of Antonio Gramsci', in New Edinburgh Review, 'Gramsci-III', (1974), 7-14; Davidson, 'The Varying Seasons of Gramscian Studies', in Political Studies, 20 (1972), 448-61; Franco Andreucci and Malcolm Sylvers, 'The Italian Communists Write their History', in Science and Society, XL (1976), 28-36.

54. Tamburrano was a Socialist Party activist, who precisely didn't question Gramsci's own Marxist activism. Here I am following Femia's excellent account (61-6).
55. Hughes, Consciousness and Society, 96-104; Lichtheim, Marxism, 368-70; McInnes, 'Antonio Gramsci'; Joll, Gramsci, 76-107; Leszek Kolokowski, Main Currents of Marxism, 3: The Breakdown (Oxford, 1981), 220-52. See also Robert Wohl, The Generation of 1914 (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 191-202.
56. See notes 18 and 19 above. See also Jacoby, Dialectic of Defeat, and Alvin Gouldner, The Two Marxisms (New York, 1980), whose scattered references to Gramsci are hard to take very seriously.
57. Togliatti, 'The Present Relevance of Gramsci's Theory and Practice', 152f.

58. Pemia's whole discussion in this long chapter ('Base and Superstructure: The Role of Consciousness', 61-129) is excellent and is the best part of the book. The closeness to certain formulations of Raymond Williams is also worth noting. See his 'Beyond Actually Existing Socialism', in Problems in Materialism and Culture (London, 1980), 255-7.
59. This progression, from Croce's direct inspirational influence to the sociology of his impact on Italian culture, provides a useful pointer to one of the directions which a 'Gramscian' approach to concrete historical analysis might take. In this sense it is no accident that at least one of the current Gramsciologists has moved on to a study of Croce. See Walter L. Adamson, 'Benedetto Croce and the Death of Ideology', in Journal of Modern History, 55 (1983), 208-36. See also the work of Edmund E. Jacobitti: 'Hegemony before Gramsci: The Case of Benedetto Croce', in Journal of Modern History, 52 (1980), 66-84; Revolutionary Humanism and Historicism in Modern Italy (New Haven and London, 1981).
60. Gramsci, Political Writings (1921-1926), 459f. (also for the following quote).
61. Jacobitti, 'Hegemony before Gramsci', 69.
62. Euci-Glucksmann argues that the concept of hegemony is present much earlier than 1926, but 'in a practical state', and on the whole her detailed analyses are persuasive. Showstack Sassoon follows broadly the same argument.
63. I find the following accounts to be the most useful: Gwyn Williams, 'The

Concept of "Egemonia"; Hall, Lumley, McLennan, 'Politics and Ideology'; Showstack Sassoon, 'Hegemony, War of Position and Political Intervention', in Showstack Sassoon, ed., Approaches to Gramsci, 94-115; Buci-Glucksmann, 'Hegemony and Consent', *ibid.*, 116-26; Chantal Mouffe, 'Hegemony and the Integral State in Gramsci: Towards a New Concept of Politics', in Bridges and Brunt, eds., Silver Linings, 167-87; Raymond Williams, Marxism and Literature, 108-14; Jessop, Capitalist State, 142-52; Urry, Anatomy of Capitalist Societies, 21-5 and in general.

64. Williams, 'Concept of "Egemonia"', 587.
65. The work which poses these questions best is probably Hall, Lumley, McLennan, 'Politics and Ideology'.
66. I have quoted this letter from Hobsbawm, 'Gramsci and Political Theory', 209, which differs from the translation in Lawner, ed., Letters from Prison, 204. On another occasion Gramsci referred to 'two major superstructural "levels"' ('civil society' and 'political society' or the 'State'), which correspond to the functions of 'hegemony' and 'direct domination' (SPN, 12). In fact, there has been much discussion of the ambiguities and contradictions in how exactly Gramsci deploys the distinction between state and civil society at different places in the Notebooks. The key texts in this respect are Buci-Glucksmann (19-195) and Anderson, 'Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci'. In the end Anderson probably makes too much out of Gramsci's inconsistencies, and I find Showstack Sassoon's resolution of this discussion (112f.) fairly persuasive.

67. Ernesto Laclau, Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory (London, 1977), 161.
68. See the works listed in notes 63, 66, and 21 above.
69. As some reviewers have noted, Showstack Sassoon's synthetic lucidity is achieved partly at the cost of over-rationalizing many of Gramsci's ambiguities and of making the fragmentary and open-ended discussions of the Notebooks much tidier than they actually are. See Field and Seed, 'Waiting for Gramsci', 212. Field and Seed provide a much fuller assessment of the books by Showstack Sassoon, Mouffe and Buci-Glucksmann than I have attempted here, and as I largely agree with their judgements it seemed otiose to retrace the same ground again.
70. Until this basic work was done, the assumption was easily made that Gramsci invented the term hegemony in Marxist discourse, whereas in fact it had long been in technical use. See Buci-Glucksmann, 174-95, and Anderson, 'Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci', 15-18.
71. Entwistle points to certain interesting correspondences between (a) Gramsci's stress on discipline, structure and basics and the current concerns of conservative educationalists as contained in the Black Papers, and (b) the libertarian emphases of progressive educationalists in the 1970s (e.g. on the social construction of knowledge, 'learning by doing', and so on) and the subjective idealism of Giovanni Gentile, Mussolini's first Minister of Public Instruction in the 1920s. But this polemic is never systematically unfolded, and the essential unfairness of the anti-libertarian taunt threatens to undermine the value of Entwistle's own positive exposition. Ultimately, he

- confuses the conjunctural specificity of Gramsci's immediate observations on education with the larger arguments about knowledge, language, culture, and ideology that his thoughts as whole can help sustain. Field and Seed are again very good on this point. See 'Waiting for Gramsci', 221-3.
72. Lunley, 'Gramsci's Writings on the State and Hegemony', 27.
73. There has been much political controversy over Gramsci's attitudes towards official Communist policy in both the 'ultra-left' phase after 1928 and the new period of the Popular Front introduced in 1934-5. Spriano's book was written in large part to resolve these speculations.
74. This point is made by Mark E. Mann, 'Antonio Gramsci and Modern Marxism', in Studies in Comparative Communism, XIII (1980), 264. The Poulantzas reference comes from an interview conducted by Henri Weber, 'The State and the Transition to Socialism', in Socialist Review, VIII (1978), 17.
75. 'Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci', 6f.: '.... MLR was the first socialist journal in Britain -- possibly the first anywhere outside Italy -- to make deliberate and systematic use of Gramsci's theoretical canon to analyze its own national society, and to debate a political strategy capable of transforming it'.
76. Eley and Field, 'Why Does Social History Ignore Politics?', 267.
77. For Thompson, see note 24 above. Apart from his review of Cammett, Genovese's Roll, Jordan, Roll (New York, 1972) was enormously influential in making

known a Gramscian perspective.

78. The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies has produced a number of publications exploring these processes in post-war British Marxist historiography, in which Richard Johnson and Bill Schwarz have been particularly influential. See Clarke, Critcher, Johnson, eds., Working Class Culture, and more recently Richard Johnson, Gregor McLennan, Bill Schwarz, David Sutton, eds., Making Histories. Studies in History-Writing and Politics (London, 1982).
79. Williams, Marxism and Literature, 109f. See also Johnson, 'Histories of Culture/Theories of Ideology', 73, where he distinguishes between 'common sense' ('the lived culture of a particular class or social group'), 'philosophy' (or 'ideology'), and 'hegemony' ('the state of play, as it were, between the whole complex of "educative" institutions and ideologies on the one hand, and lived culture on the other').
80. Williams, Marxism and Literature, 108.
81. See the magnificent article by Gerald M. Sider, 'The Ties that Bind: Culture and Agriculture, Property and Propriety in the Newfoundland Village Fishery', in Social History, 5 (Jan. 1980), 1-39, which with Seed's article referred to in note 25 above is one of the very best applications of Gramsci's concepts in a concrete historical field.
82. Eley and Field, 'Why Does Social History Ignore Politics?', 269. This essay contains much that we would now say differently (or not say at all), but this particular formulation seems worth defending.

83. Hall, Lumley, McLennan, 'Politics and Ideology', 68.
84. R.J. Morris, 'Bargaining with Hegemony', in Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, 35 (Autumn 1977), 59-63. See also Morris's pamphlet, Class and Class Consciousness in the Industrial Revolution 1780-1850 (London, 1979), 58-61, where the discussion of Gramsci is similarly misconceived.
85. But see Peter Burke, 'From Pioneers to Settlers: Recent Studies of the History of Popular Culture. A Review Article', in Comparative Studies in Society and History, 25 (1983), 186f., where an approach to the study of popular/high culture 'based on "negotiation"' is directly opposed to 'a model of cultural interaction centred on "hegemony"'.
86. For the former, see Michael Burawoy, Manufacturing Consent. Changes in the Labour Process under Monopoly Capitalism (Chicago, 1979); for the latter Alberto Maria Cirese, 'Gramsci's Observations on Folklore', in Showstack Sassoon, ed., Approaches to Gramsci, 212-47. See also Tim Patterson, 'Notes on the Historical Application of Marxist Cultural Theory', in Science and Society, 39 (1975), 257-91.
87. However, Hain also goes too far. Quite apart from the faintly disreputable side swipes against 'those plagued with cosmopolitan delusions' (178), his definition of Gramsci's central concern is unnecessarily exclusive. E.g. 'The problematic conditioning all Gramsci's themes and researches was essentially one of Italian catastrophe; not Stalinism, workers' control, the nature of the Party, Leninism's Seventh Seal or the other preoccupations of

the Euro-communists' (170). This really won't do. It converts Gramsci's national and regional origins from a point of departure to a historicist prison.

88. Davidson, Antonio Gramsci, 158-231, and The Theory and Practice of Italian Communism, Vol. I (London, 1982), 102-22. This criticism should not detract from the overall merits of Davidson's new volume, which is now the best thing we have on the PCI before the Resistance.
89. See Paolo Spriano, Storia del Partito comunista italiano, 5 vols. (Turin, 1967-75), universally admired in the quality of scholarship, and as such quite unusual amongst Communist Party histories, official or otherwise.
90. Aside from the copious memoirist literature, the best introduction to the history of the Comintern in the 1920s is through the relevant parts of Carr and Gruber's two volumes, followed by Claudin's more discursive treatment. Borkenau's pre-war volume also retains its value. See E.H. Carr, A History of Soviet Russia, 10 vols. (London, 1950-78); Helmut Gruber, ed., International Communism in the Era of Lenin (New York, 1967), and Gruber, ed., Soviet Russia Masters the Comintern (New York, 1974); Fernando Claudin, The Communist Movement. From Comintern to Cominform (New York, 1975); Franz Borkenau, World Communism (New York, 1939).
91. For stimulating introductions to the comparative analysis of the period 1917-23, see James E. Cronin and Carmen Sirianni, eds., Work, Community, and Power. The Experience of Labour in Europe and America, 1900-1925 (Philadelphia, 1983), and Carmen Sirianni, Workers Control and Socialist

Democracy. The Soviet Experience (London, 1982), 307-56. For the period of United Front the best starting point is the works listed in the preceding note.

92. The literature on Eurocommunism has become simply enormous. The best introduction is through the following volumes: Peter Lange and Maurizio Vannicelli, eds., The Communist Parties of Italy, France and Spain. Postwar Change and Continuity. A Casebook (London, 1981); Leonhard, Eurocommunism; Carl Boggs and David Plotke, eds., The Politics of Eurocommunism (Boston, 1980); David Childs, ed., The Changing Face of Western Communism (London, 1980); Keith Middlemas, Power and the Party. Changing Faces of Communism in Western Europe (London, 1980); George Schwab, ed., Eurocommunism. The Ideological and Political-Theoretical Foundations (Westport, Conn., 1981); Richard In Search of Eurocommunism (London, 1981). For a typically succinct statement of key issues, see Perry Anderson, 'The Strategic Option: Some Questions', in Liebich, ed., Future of Socialism in Europe?, 21-9. For literature specifically on the PCI, the most useful are the following: Giuseppe Vacca, 'The "Eurocommunist" Perspective: The Contribution of the Italian Communist Party', in Kindersley, ed., In Search of Eurocommunism, 105-46; Hobsbawm and Napolitano, The Italian Road to Socialism; Maria Antonietta Macciocchi, Letters from inside the Italian Communist Party to Louis Althusser (London, 1973), esp. 114-39; Harald Hamrin, Between Bolshevism and Revisionism. The Italian Communist Party, 1944-47 (Stockholm, 1975); Donald Sassoon, The Strategy of the Italian Communist Party. From the Resistance to the Historic Compromise (London, 1981); Donald Blackmer, Unity in Diversity. Italian Communism and the Communist World (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); Blackmer and Sidney Tarrow, eds., Communism in Italy and France (Princeton,

1975); Grant Amyot, The Italian Communist Party. The Crisis of the Popular Front Strategy (London, 1981); Simon Serfaty and Lawrence Gray, eds., The Italian Communist Party Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (Westport, Conn., 1980). The best single monograph is that by Amyot, whereas the collection edited by Serfaty and Gray contains an excellent bibliographical essay.

93. None of the works listed above contains a satisfactory treatment of this theme.
94. Here see Hamrin's excellent study, Between Bolshevism and Revisionism, and Macciocchi's eloquent and suggestive discussion, Letters from inside the Italian Communist Party, 114-39.
95. Hobsbawm, 'Forward', in Sassoon, Strategy of the Italian Communist Party, ix. Together with his Introduction to Togliatti, On Gramsci, 7-20, Sassoon's monograph is the closest we have to an English language biography. Lawrence Gray, 'From Gramsci to Togliatti: The Partito Nuovo and the Mass Basis of Italian Communism', in Serfaty and Gray, eds., Italian Communist Party, 21-35, is also a good brief introduction.
96. Hughes, Consciousness and Society, 201; Jacobitti, 'Hegemony before Gramsci', 69.
97. Adamson, 'Benedetto Croce and the Death of Ideology'. Unfortunately the comments on Gramsci (234f.) fall considerably below the level of the analysis in Adamson's book.

98. Gramsci, SPN, 238.
99. However, see the preliminary sketches in two articles by Ken Spours: 'Marxist Theory and the Soviet Superstructure', in Socialist Europe, 1 (1976), 15-17, and 'Crisis in Soviet Ideology', in Socialist Europe, 4 (1977), 13-18.
100. I am grateful to my colleague Roman Szporluk for making me more aware of this point. In this respect it is not without interest that a two-volume edition of Gramsci was published in Poland in 1961 as part of an ambitious multi-volume 'Library of Socialist Thought'. As projected this consisted partly of Saint-Simonists (Saint-Amand Bazard, Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin, Dom Deschamps) and other early Socialist pioneers (Joseph Dietzgen), some leading figures of the Second International (Antonio Labriola, Paul Lafargue, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg), and pioneers of Polish Marxism (Stanislaw Krusinski, Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz, and a volume on the first generation of Polish Marxists between 1878 and 1886). Aside from Anatoli Lunacharsky, Gramsci is notable in this list for being a figure primarily of the 1920s and the years of the Comintern. I have not been able to trace the further history of this publishing project, but an analysis of its conception and impact would make an interesting contribution to the history of Polish Marxism between 1956 and 1968. See Antonio Gramsci, Pisma wybrane, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1961). I am grateful to Roman Szporluk for bringing this to my attention.
101. Of course, for all his criticisms of Eurocommunist efforts to appropriate Gramsci for their own contemporary purposes, Nairn's Gramsci is just as

partially and instrumentally defined, in his case by the commitment to a left Scottish nationalism. For the extremely interesting self-presentation of the latter, see the various issues of the Bulletin of Scottish Politics, from Autumn 1980, espec. Nairn's own article, 'Internationalism: A Critique', in I, 1 (Autumn 1980), 101-25.