

555-40
A938
-8 FEB. 1968
Australian

Left

Review

I
1968

Wages — What Next?

Cartoonists of Australia

Profile — Bill Parkinson

Gramsci: The Man

February-March 1968

30C

AUSTRALIAN LEFT REVIEW is a marxist journal of information, analysis and discussion on economics, politics, trade unionism, history, philosophy, science and art, for the promotion of socialist ideas.

Published two monthly.

Single copies, 30c; Yearly subscription, \$1.75; Two years, \$3.25

EDITORIAL BOARD: Eric Aarons, Jim Baird, Leon Cantrell,
Richard Dixon, Theo Moody, Mavis Robertson.

BUSINESS MANAGER: 168 Day St., Sydney 2000. Phone: 26-2161

POSTAL ADDRESS: Box A247, Sydney South Post Office 2000.

REPRESENTATIVES: Mrs. B. Smith, 45 Devenish St., Victoria Park East, W.A. 6101; Mr. E. A. Bacon, 92 Edith St., Enoggera, Qld. 4051; Mr. B. Taft, 11 Rose Ave., Surrey Hills, Vic. 3127; Mr. F. Dean, 12 Station St., Wollongong, NSW 2500; Dr. G. Curthoys, 16 Rydal St., New Lambton, NSW 2305; Mr. P. Symon, 28 King St., Pennington, S.A. 5013.

Contents

February-March, 1968

COMMENT	1
WAGES — WHAT NEXT? Jack Hutson	9
DEVALUATION AND DOLLAR CURBS R. Dixon	16
DISCUSSION	22
TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION — A MYTH? Dave Morris	35
CARTOONISTS OF AUSTRALIA R. Smith	42
ANTONIO GRAMSCI: THE MAN Alastair Davidson	51
PROFILE — BILL PARKINSON Theo Moody	64
BOOKS	70

Alastair Davidson

ANTONIO GRAMSCI: THE MAN

A lecturer in politics at Monash University contributes the first of a series on the famous Italian marxist Antonio Gramsci. The concluding part of this article will be published in the next issue of ALR.

Later articles will consider Gramsci's understanding of Marxism and particularly his concept of hegemony, his views on the role of a socialist party in advanced capitalist countries and on the role of intellectuals and intellectual activity.

The author, who started work at sixteen, educated himself through matriculation and part of his degree while working at all sorts of manual and clerical jobs. He has travelled widely and speaks four languages. He spent a year and a half in Italy in 1956-57 and almost a year in 1962-63 learning the language and something of the Italian labor movement.

ANTONIO GRAMSCI'S work is already well-known in European countries, but has yet to be translated at length into English.¹ In Italy he is the rage, his *Quaderni del Carcere*,* in which most of his thought appears, selling 400,000 copies between 1948-57.² In France his work has been translated and widely read, especially in left wing circles. The present policy of the Italian Communist Party, which has such a distinctive stamp, is partly a result of that party's espousal of Gramscian marxism. In the French Communist Party, while his ideas have not acquired a hegemony, they are very influential.³ Dispute exists as to his real merit as a marxist theoretician but, I feel that he was underestimated by the writer who said "Gramsci is a marxist of the calibre of the early Kautsky, and compares favourably with Plekhanov and Rosa Luxemburg. He is a marxist in the great tradition of Marx himself, a thinker with an open mind, disciplined in the search for truth."⁴ The reader of these articles may judge for himself the merit of Gramsci, recognising that the articles may fail to do Gramsci justice. He could, if he wishes to inquire further, read the only three texts in English, which are, in order of merit, John Cammett's, *Antonio Gramsci and the Origins of Italian Communism*, Carl Marzani's,

* Prison Notebooks — Ed.

The Open Marxism of Antonio Gramsci, and Louis Mark's, The Modern Prince and other Writings.

This article is about the man and the social context in which he expressed his ideas, as philosophy cannot be understood independent of the context in which it was evolved. Today, political philosophy taught in universities is dominated by the school which maintains the contrary and seeks for eternal values in political philosophy. Thus the ideas of John Locke are taught as relevant political ideas today without pointing out that they were written in a particular sort of society, that of the green England which existed at the end of the seventeenth century. More importantly, it is not considered relevant that Locke wrote his theory in response to certain political conditions and that his theory was inspired by a desire to justify a certain political system. In other words, the conditions *sine qua** Locke would not have written *what* he wrote, are dismissed as irrelevant. To study ideas in historical and social context is dismissed loftily as "political biography". There can be no doubt that the people who maintain that the social context is irrelevant are conservative apologists, no matter what reasons they give for their refusal to discuss ideas in historical context. To illustrate my point: at Monash university the views of Edmund Burke on the obligations of an elected representative are taught without emphasising that Burke's "speech to the electors of Bristol" was delivered in an oligarchic society where there was no thought of democracy existing in reality and that therefore what he said can have no relevance to a society in which liberal democratic government prevails, *as he was talking about a different problem*. Furthermore, to compound the misdeed—for the students swallow whole the notion that Burke is relevant today rather than merely belonging to the history of political theory—teachers do not teach the countervailing theory espoused and associated with socialists, above all, that the delegate has an exhaustive mandate and is not free to refer to his own conscience. Conscience is far too frequently interest writ large.

So Gramsci will be studied in historical context as the eternal verities which any man expresses can only be found by studying his thought in historical context and then deriving the verities. Those readers acquainted with Gramsci's thought will recognise that the ideological framework in which this essay is written is that of Gramscian marxism. For this I make no apologies. Indeed, I hope that the vulgar marxists will be suitably shocked to discover that there is no attempt to give explanations solely in terms of

* Without which — Ed.

economic determinism. Gramsci himself pointed out, with greater perception than any marxist philosopher since Marx, that:

We must fight theoretically as primitive infantilism the attempt to explain every fluctuation of politics and ideology as an immediate reflection of some change in the economic base of the structure. This nonsense is sometimes even presented as an axiom of historical materialism.

... The point is that any phase in the development of the economic base can be studied concretely only after its development has been finished.

We don't pay enough attention to the fact that many political actions are due to internal organisational necessities, the needs to maintain the coherence of a party, a group, a society. 5

Nor will there be any attempt to glorify the working class. Gramsci, while an intellectual, was innately egalitarian. He felt all men were thinking men, and all had their part to play. However, the object of the revolution was not to secure the triumph of popular values. Rather it was "to lift up the people" to the level of "higher" philosophy which would in the first instance be the preserve of intellectuals. The revolution was not to better the worker's lot, but in bettering him, to change him.⁶

That the ideas of a man are really only comprehensible and facts relevant in historical context is revealed in the amusing fact that Gramsci's paternal ancestors were Albanians who had come to Italy in 1821. This fact is not of relevance to Gramsci's political ideas, though it would be if he himself had come from Albania in, say, 1960. What is of relevance is the fact that he was born at Ales in Sardinia in 1891 to a father who was a mainlander and a member of the administration and to a mother who was a Sardinian of pure blood and more petty bourgeois/working class than his father. Being born in Sardinia meant that he was born to the problema del Mezzogiorno, or more precisely, to that of Italia isolana. The date of his birth meant that he was born when this problem was reaching its greatest height and when hopes of a better social life, which had prompted so many southern Italians to support Garibaldi, had died.

The problema del Mezzogiorno is the central problem of Italian history and has remained the central problem. It embodies a complex of social, political and economic inadequacies in Southern and Insular Italy.⁷ Considered in historical perspective, the problem was the result of the reactionary nature of the social, economic and political systems of the pre-unification Southern States and the mode by which Italian unification was achieved. While Sardinia was actually part of the political system of the Kingdom of Sardinia whose capital was Turin, it shared the general cultural characteristics of the South. Crucial to understanding the South of Italy, the Mezzogiorno, is an understanding of the miserable

poverty in which the bulk of the people lived when Italy was unified. A Neapolitan prince, Ferdinand II, once said that Africa began at Naples. It could more truly be said that it began at Rome, for the Papal States were more reactionary even than the Two Sicilies.⁸ The people lived in such poverty because of the extreme exploitation they suffered at the hands of their feudal landlords. Most were peasants, often having the status of feudal serfs. They worked the huge latifondi which were owned by absentee landlords and the Church, on a predial* labour system. Late in the 18th century the Neapolitans under Tanlogio, had attempted to introduce more modern methods of agricultural production, which sometimes preluded the coming of capitalism, but on the whole the agrarian system had not changed since the fall of the Roman Empire. What had changed was the productivity of the land. From Sicily and Apulia being the golden granaries described by the ancients, they had become barren, poverty-ridden, wastelands. This decline was due in great part to the inadequate methods of cultivation and the determination of the owners to screw the last drop of blood out of the peasants no matter what the long term losses.

Meanwhile, despite the periodic scourge of cholera and typhus, which swept through the sea-ports of the South, (including those of Sardinia), despite the malaria, the infant mortality rate, the low life-expectancy and the famines, the population had grown. In the 19th century there was no longer sufficient land to go around and huge numbers of peasants either worked as day labourers for somebody else, or starved on their too-small holdings, half of whose produce often had to go to the absentee landlord anyway.

Hundreds of years of such conditions had resulted in the emergence of certain cultural patterns among the people of the South and the islands. First of all the individual's object was to have his immediate family survive. Morality, social conscience, class unity, political affiliations was subordinate to this. As one despairing politician from the North said "Politically, the Southerner is absent".⁹ This is still true to some extent today.¹⁰ Their dreadful poverty often led them to become brigands as this was more lucrative than agriculture. Before unity brigandage was so prevalent in the South and in Sardinia that it was in many cases licensed (for a fee). The South and the islands had well developed criminal sub-cultures, represented by the Camorra and Mafia. Brigandage is still rife in Sardinia, so much so that guests from the sumptuous Costa Smeralda resort are warned not to leave the "pale of settlement." It has been pointed out in many places,

* Of peasants, attached to the land — Ed.

notably in the Massari report, which the new kingdom of Italy released soon after it came to power, that brigandage was often a primitive form of social protest.¹¹ This should not hide the reality that these brigands often preyed on the peasants who looked up to them as "mafiosi" (arrogant, i.e. not resigned to their lot).

In such a society nobody trusted anybody else, and except for these criminal associations, there were no unifying institutions. There were no political parties among the peasants. Even the church was not to be trusted. They lived atomised existences in family units, starving, and living in such spiritual and moral degradation outside the family unit, that they were compared unfavourably with "bedouins and africans," groups regarded with particular disapprobation by the Italian educated.¹²

Of course, not all Southerners or islanders lived thus. Apart from the nobility who lived in capital cities while their middle men exploited the peasants, there was another social category to be perceived, the governmental bureaucracy. Until unification, this had been Southern in composition and was characterised by being more corrupt and venal than the middlemen on the latifondi themselves. This bureaucracy already bore the characteristics of the Italian bureaucracy today. It was over-large, filled with placemen, lacking in technicians, corrupt, inefficient and more parasitic than serving a social function. It usually voted with the powers that be, but to pinch a metaphor, politically it was present and on sale to the highest bidder.

When unification came, it came as a result of the extension of Piedmontese hegemony over the rest of Italy. The puritanical, bourgeois, industrial and industrious Piedmontese were horrified by the conditions and qualities of the South. Fortunato also suggests that they were surprised. Coming in with the fervour of the moral do-gooders, they resolved to clean it up, (provided, of course, that this did not clash with their interests). They conducted a long war of a guerilla nature against the banditti before being defeated late in the century and coming to terms with the system. There is even a reputable theory held that the Southerners have converted the Northerners to their morality through a gradual permeation of the administration and government of Italy. The Piedmontese also immediately removed most of the Southern bureaucracy extending their personal and their administrative system to the South. This did not last long as the parasitic bureaucracy of the South soon ingratiated itself with the new masters and was back in command, ready to do its duty as petty tyrants, as much as it had ever done. Now however, there was a leavening of Piedmontese and Northerners in the South.

The Southern peasant was disillusioned by the new regime, from which he had hoped for an improvement in his lot, something he conceived in terms of more land. The object of the Northerners soon emerged as the exploitation of the South for the benefit of the North. If the Southerners' lot did not get worse after 1861, it certainly did not improve.¹³ After unification, peasant risings were so frequent that a characteristic method of Northern government of the South was martial law. One of the greatest of these risings was that of the Sicilian fasci in the year Gramsci was born and while the Italian Socialist Party was being formed. It marked the height of Southern disillusion with the situation brought about by Northern exploitation.

Much of the southern peasants' resentment was owed to the terrible tyranny of the administration. Salvemini wrote:

When the corruption of ruling classes of a country has reached the point of bestiality in which the Southern bourgeoisie has sunk, a crisis sooner or later becomes inevitable: the lower classes shake off the cruel yoke which oppresses them, sack and commit crimes, obliging the ruling class to renovate itself.¹⁴

Indeed, some of the Southern intellectuals became alienated in 1861-1900 and through them anarchist doctrine was introduced to the South of Italy. The majority in Gramsci's childhood still belonged to the corrupt.

Gramsci belonged to the class of dominating corrupt bourgeoisie. His father was born and bred in Gaeta, a classical southern town. He was, to judge from his disapproval of his son's socialist leanings, an establishment man.¹⁵ In 1897, he was sent to jail for five years for "administrative irregularity"¹⁶ (the nature of the irregularity is obscure, but Gramsci's mother was always worried that Gramsci had been sent to jail for doing something dishonorable, which suggests that his father may have been diddling the books or taking bribes). This left Antonio's seamstress mother to support seven children. They moved from his birthplace to the malaria ridden town of Ghilarza.

Gramsci's family's position as members of the bourgeoisie had never been very stable, his father was only a minor official. The loss of the father for five years precipitated the family into the dreadful existence of the petty bourgeoisie who have fallen into the proletariat. While they lived in miserable conditions, without lighting or running water, it is difficult to be sure whether this experience, between the age of six and eleven, turned Antonio Gramsci to revolutionary solutions, to socialism. Nowadays, it is believed that it is in situations like that which had overtaken Gramsci's family that the bourgeoisie will turn to revolution.

However, it must be remembered that children are usually shielded from the worst suffering. This appears to have happened with Gramsci, who continued at school throughout the period when his father was in prison. He, himself, suggests in his letters that his mother shouldered nearly all of the burden. Certainly, Gramsci was still fairly confident and showed little of the disorientation which might be expected of a child for whom the fall from grace had meaning. Probably he resented his father's failure.

Only when he was eleven was he precipitated into adult life, working long hours for little pay in his father's office. His father felt that despite his talent he could not be kept at school as the extra two pounds a day of bread was needed in the family. Gramsci resented this bitterly. His main reason for resentment was his deformity. At the age of four he had been dropped, badly injured, and was given up for dead. He had recovered with a permanently hunched back. He was always very reticent about this deformity, which left him permanently sickly and at no time did he demand pity. While the psychologists may fasten on this as an explanation of his later political leanings (another Rosa Luxemburg?), there is no evidence that it was anything more than one factor in his make up. Clearly, it made him unable to work as a labourer and his personal security depended on his maintaining his position in the intellectual bourgeoisie. His father's action in withdrawing him from school condemned him to the no-man's land where he would for ever be afraid of becoming a worker who could not work. He knew he could not survive long as a labourer.¹⁷

In the following two years while he was close to the working class, if not of it, he learnt with his own eyes about the terrible conditions of the *contadino** of Sardinia.¹⁸ Then at thirteen his mother and sisters sent him back to school with the extra savings that they had made. He attended first the *ginnasio* at Santa Lussurgiu and then in 1908-11 the *Liceo Giovanni Maria Dettori* at Cagliari, the Sardinian capital. Here he revealed a great ability at classics, where as a primary student his best marks had been in mathematics.

By 1910 his political opinions had started to form. He wrote an essay in that year, "Oppressed and Oppressors", in which he praised mankind's incessant struggle against oppressors and he read *Avanti*, the socialist newspaper, regularly.¹⁹ He was obviously becoming alienated from the section of society to which he belonged. Any explanation must take into account the fact that he starved himself to remain at school. However, he now knew personally of the

* Peasant — Ed.

suffering of the peasants of Sardinia and shared their resentments. Later he wrote of the "pains of Sardinia, the miseria of the Sardinian peasants and workers exploited by all the capitalisms: by the English one which exploits the mines, by the Piedmontese one which exploits the railways, by the Roman one which exploits the grazing land, by the Italian State which each year carries away millions and millions of taxes which are not returned in any form and which serve to lighten the tax burden of the mainland".²⁰ He may have had personal experience of the banditry which this poverty caused especially after the unification, and identified it later as a primitive form of social protest.²¹ He was strongly separatist in his sympathies, a feeling provoked widely among Sardinians by the exploitation by the North, Sardinia being the first of the Italian regions to form a separatist party.²² His hostility towards the rich and privileged and towards the Italian state administration and the mainland was still more the result of his personal experiences and knowledge of the problema del Mezzogiorno than reading of socialist texts.

Before becoming a committed socialist of marxist opinion he left Sardinia to attend the University of Turin. He arrived there in 1911 and won a scholarship which barely kept body and soul together. He was placed fifth in the examination, an examination in which Palmiro Togliatti was placed second. Togliatti remembers a "young man, dark, little, apparently very poor too, whose body seemed suffering and whose eyes were large and shining."²³ They became close friends soon after, although Gramsci was enrolled in the faculties of philosophy and letters and Togliatti in law. Another close friend at this time was Angelo Tasca with whom Gramsci lodged in 1911. Gramsci embarked on an ambitious course of studies and at his first examinations did brilliantly receiving 30 in geography, 30 in glottology* and 27 in Greek and Latin grammar. It appears from his activities in 1911 and 1912, that he still wished to become a professor as he had in Sardinia. It is therefore arguable that he still wished to escape from his social origins as much as to change the system which caused the suffering they entailed. His unusual ability was evident from his publications on linguistics in learned journals and from the fact that one of his professors invited him to draw up the courses in that subject. However, at the examinations in the spring of 1914 he received much worse marks. This may be due to the conditions of starvation in which he lived, but it was also probably due to his increasing interest in socialism and the Socialist Party. The year after he discontinued his university course, although he still

* = Glossology, the definition and explanation of terms, or more broadly, linguistics — Ed.

seems until 1918 to have aspired to winning a degree in glottology. His friends and teachers felt that he could have had as many degrees as he liked, so remarkable were his talents.²⁴ Gramsci was to develop into a true intellectual filled with contempt for the narrowness of the academic.

Two main factors impelled him towards socialism. First there was the influence of some of his teachers and secondly, the influence of the Young Socialist Movement.

Turin university was an isolated outpost of liberalism in a conservative city, ruled by the huge car-manufacturing complexes. It was not dominated by marxist philosophers as Italian universities had been in the nineties, but many of the professors had been socialists in that period and retained their sympathies. The man who most influenced Gramsci was the professor of literature, Umberto Cosmo, who was a follower of Benedetto Croce. Later Gramsci wrote very harshly of Cosmo and then regretted it, acknowledging that he was greatly indebted to Cosmo and had been excessively harsh.²⁵ Gramsci's acquaintance with Cosmo extended beyond the lecture hall. Evidently Cosmo used to lend or give money to Gramsci and his circle when they were in excessively penurious circumstances.

From Cosmo, Gramsci got not only his Croceian philosophy but also, that rare quality in Italians, his puritanism and his cult of political honesty. His beliefs on the obligation of the North to the South also derive from this period.²⁶

Cosmo was also a follower of Gaetano Salvemini, himself an alienated Southerner, who at that time enjoyed the status of Grand-Old-Manship among Southern if not Northern socialists.²⁷ Salvemini's socialism was highly humanitarian and intellectual and had as much to do with the values of the Enlightenment as with the values of Marx. Gramsci was later to attack Salvemini too, but at the beginning of the war almost heroworshipped him.

Through common enthusiasm for Salvemini, Gramsci built up contacts with members of the Socialist Young Federation of Turin whom he met in various clubs and bars in the neighbourhood in which he lived. Since his arrival in Turin he had had contact with Socialists (e.g. Tasca, who was a founder of the SYF) but he began to draw closer to the youth movement in 1913. The Youth Movement, too, had started with positivist beliefs and was moving via reading of Prezzolini, and Salvemini's paper *Unità* towards a more militant socialism. It took some time for Gramsci to finally join the Socialist Party, something he did with Togliatti in 1914.²⁸

What really converted him to socialism, though as he himself admitted and as his actions during the war showed, it was a somewhat nebulous socialism, was his observation of the elections in Sardinia in 1913.²⁹ Tasca later wrote that Gramsci described to him in a long letter that he "was struck by the transformation produced in that area by the participation of the peasant masses in the elections, although they did not know how to and could not yet use their new weapon to their own advantage (per conto loro)". As the mode of his conversation suggests, he was still concerned with the way in which socialism could help the Southern peasant. In 1914 he played a leading part in the attempt to get Salvemini to run for the Turin seat which Salvemini turned down. This support for Salvemini's candidature indicates that Gramsci was still a humanitarian socialist. He had not yet clarified his ideas. Indeed, during the war he favoured interventionism, while the official policy of his party was not to support the war. This error of judgement damaged his reputation and his attitudes at this time were frequently used against him in his disputes with the socialists after the war. Furthermore, he showed some signs of admiration for Mussolini, who was the Socialist Party Secretary until early in the war. Mussolini also supported Italian participation in the war. One of the reasons for this support was Mussolini's militancy, something Mussolini reputedly derived from Sorel's theories.

In explaining this vacillation, it must be remembered that Gramsci was born in Italy when the theories and groupings associated with fascism, socialism and idealism had not yet been separated. Croceian theory was, for example, both a source of idealism and marxism. Croce, himself, after a partial and disillusioning honeymoon with marxism of the sort taught in Italy in the 1890's turned temporarily to fascism, before turning away from it again. This was also the heyday of revolutionary syndicalism which dominated the socialist movement and which also provided some of the ideas behind fascism (though not in Gramsci's estimation).³⁰ The first and second decades of the twentieth century saw in Italy, as elsewhere, a widespread alienation among the young of Italy which provided a seed-bed for both socialism and the nationalist movements which started to grow after 1911. It was possible before 1914 for a socialist to find himself in very strange company. It would be a fascinating study tracing the reasons for the number of socialists who ended up in the fascist camp, after having been honest and ardent socialists in the war years. It is salutary for socialists to realise, that fascism is not the "tool of monopoly capitalism" alone, it is also a mentally disturbed working class movement, especially in its early stages.

During the war Gramsci was, however, reading widely and acquiring a deep and authoritative understanding of theories associated with the working class movement. Most influential at this time were the theories of marxism and their syndicalist variants.

At this time he was working as a journalist on the Turin socialist paper *Grido del Popolo* and for *Avanti*. His articles written under the heading *Sotto la Mole* enjoyed considerable popularity. He himself through his dedication and his learning was accepted more and more as a theoretician. He also began to immerse himself in working class activities and life, living with the working class and like them. This gave him an invaluable advantage over the other theoreticians of the socialist party, and there were many of them, because they had completely lost touch with the Italian masses. Gramsci therefore knew how the workers of Turin felt and experienced at first hand the rising radicalism of the war.

In Turin the workers had been becoming more and more militant as conditions for the working class grew worse and worse in 1915-17. This continued the tradition of militancy which had ruled in that city for some years before the war. Indeed, the Turin workers and Italian workers as a whole became so militant under the pressures of wartime rationing and fall in standards of living that there were several armed risings in Italy during or just before Italy entered the war. The Italian situation in 1917 can be paralleled quite fairly with that in Russia and it remained so for some three years after 1917.³¹ It is a matter of debate whether a revolutionary situation existed in Europe during and just after the war.³² However, it seems beyond doubt that a situation which could have led to revolution if correctly utilised was present in Italy. Gramsci, close to the workers, was conscious of this unease, something he considered could be felt.

He was, early in 1917, groping towards his own understanding of marxism. In *La Città Futura*,* a paper which was all his own work and which only appeared once, in February 1917, he wedded Croceian idealism with marxism. Interestingly there were already similarities with some of Lenin's thought, though Gramsci had read no Lenin. Most of these similarities fell under two heads. First the rejection of the evolutionary theories of marxism favoured by the mature working class parties of Germany and secondly the introduction of the notion of will in utilising revolutionary situations. Both Lenin's and Gramsci's theories were activist theories emphasizing the need for conscious activity before a revolution could be conducted. However, there were crucial differences of emphasis and content which make Gramsci's theory as a whole

* The City of the Future — Ed.

"qualitatively" different from that of Lenin. He argued that it was necessary to capture the masses' imagination for the revolution in the way that the revolutionaries (he meant intellectuals) had captured it before 1789, by establishing a mythical ideal state which all men could work for. (In the case of the French Revolution it had been the Rights of Man). Hence the first task was a struggle to secure the acceptance of an idea. Here his Croceian heritage looms large. Gramsci noted with some gratification that in Italy there was no ruling ideal state (there were borrowed and inappropriate models from overseas—note that the Statuto of 1848 was an unhappy attempt to wed Rousseau and British constitutional principles) and that therefore the ruling ideal did not have to be defeated before the new ideal *Città Futura* could be introduced. I note, in anticipation, that he revised his opinion on this somewhat later, but in the revolutionary situation of 1917 it did not appear that any notion of an ideal state had hegemony over the minds of Italians.

To destroy or retard the development of the line of thought somewhat vaguely sketched in the *Città Futura* came the news of the Russian revolutions. They had an enormous impact in Italy as they did elsewhere. In the Italian working class, Gramsci not excepted, Leninist theory was widely adopted as a sort of infallible guide on how to make a revolution. The result was the development in Gramsci's thought in 1919-1920 of theories which almost contradict those which he developed in *La Città Futura* and which later formed the core of Gramscian thought which is valuable today. It is in this period that Gramsci was in the Leninist tradition. Even so, in his writings of this period can still be detected a wedding of ideas he had developed before Lenin became his mentor. Later this lack of purity was condemned by the Comintern as erring towards syndicalism.

1 J. Harvey, "Antonio Gramsci", *Marxism Today*, April 1967, pp.114-120 states that an English translation of Gramsci is being prepared. The three books on Gramsci at present in English are John Cammett, *Antonio Gramsci and the Origins of Italian Communism*, (Stanford, 1967); Carl Marzani, *The Open Marxism of Antonio Gramsci*, (Cameron, 1957); L. Marks ed., *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*, (International Pub., 1959).

2 J. Cammett, op.cit., p.190.

3 See for example the Gramscian ideas in *Cahiers du Communisme* June 1963, p.74 but note that the French leaders are quite hostile.

4 Carl Marzani, op.cit., p.5.

5 *Ibid.*, pp.43-44; A. Gramsci, *Ordine Nuovo* 1919-1920 (Einaudi Turin, 1955), p.234. "Communism is integral humanism".

6 Marzani, op.cit., pp.25-31.

7 N. Valeri, *La Lotta Politica in Italia dal Unite al 1925* (Le Monnier 1962), p.19ff.

8 *Ibid.*, p.52, citing B. Croce, *Storia del Regno di Napoli*, (Bari, 1925).

9 F. Nitti, *Nord e Sud, Prime Linee di una inchiesta sulla repartizione Territoriale delle entrate e delle spese*, (Turin, 1900). Introduction.

10 See E. Banfield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, (Free Press, 1958) for a brilliant contemporary survey which confirms the attitudes expressed by Nitti, Spaventa and other nineteenth century observers.

11 E. Hobsbawm, "Primitive Rebels" (Manchester, 1957) for a good example of this thesis. It must be considered next to accounts of terrorism against the peasantry such as those given by D. Dolci, *Waste*, (London, 1963).

12 N. Valeri, op.cit., p.63.

13 N. Valeri, op.cit., p.19-58.

14 G. Salvemini, *Problemi educativi a speciali dell'Italia di Oggi*, (Florence, 1922), p.29.

15 Cammett, op.cit., p.10.

16 A. Gramsci, *Lettere dal Carcere*, (Einaudi, Turin, 1965), p.696.

17 J. Harvey, op.cit., p.114, "Many nights I cried secretly because my whole body was in pain" [as a result of carrying heavy loads]

18 *Lettere dal Carcere*, p.674.

19 He is reputed to have read it from the age of fourteen years.

20 *Ordine Nuovo*, p.323.

21 *Ibid.*, p.86; See *Lettere etc.* p.161 for an account of being fired upon "Certamente era una comitiva di buontemponi che voleva divertirsi a spaventarci" writes Gramsci and it was not "una storia di briganti," but he could not have been sure.

22 See N. Valeri, op.cit., p.60.

23 See Togliatti, *Antonio Gramsci*, (Rome, 1944).

24 J. Cammett, op.cit., p.17.

25 *Lettere dal Carcere*, p.412, 466.

26 *Ordine Nuovo*, pp.362-365.

27 Among Salvemini's writings on the Southern peasantry see *Problemi educativi e sociali dell'Italia di Oggi*.

28 A. Tasca, "I Primi Dieci anni del Partito Comunista Italiano." *Il Mondo*, 18 August 1953.

29 *Ibid.*

30 A. Gramsci, *Passato e Presente*, pp.186-7.

31 See J. Cammett, op.cit., pp.23-31, 47-58 for Turin. I have argued that the formation of the PCI can only be understood in these terms. A. B. Davidson, "The Russian Revolution and the Formation of the Italian Communist Party," *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, X. No. 5, 1964.

32 For an argument against the proposition see B. Lazitch, *Lenine et la Troisième Internationale* (Paris, 1951).