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The “Italian reading of Gramsci” this chapter seeks to provincialize is deeply rooted in the political and intellectual history of the country after the Second World War. The reading of Gramsci was never a neutral scholarly exercise in Italy. His thought was always part of the stakes in the elaboration and discussion of the peculiar politics of the Communist Party. Gramsci was “appropriated” by the Party (particularly by its leadership gathered around its secretary Palmiro Togliatti) soon after the end of the war, and his reading (as well as the editorial work around his unpublished works) became a cornerstone in the building of an “imagined continuity” of the history and politics of the party since its foundation in 1921. For long time, dealing with Gramsci meant dealing with this political stake in Italy. And it should not be surprising that in the early 1960s, while Gramsci began to “travel” and to nurture creative and heterodox intellectual and political projects in different parts of the world, the break with Communist orthodoxy in Italy often expressed itself in the form of a break with Gramsci. Mario Tronti was actually referring to this point when he wrote in 1959 that the author of the *Prison Notebooks* had to be considered a “typically Italian thinker”; he was also setting the agenda for the years to come. This chapter aims at reconstructing (and deconstructing) the history of the “Italian reading of Gramsci” since the end of the Second World War (first section). The second section discusses the ways in which one of the most significant Marxist heresies in Italy often expressed itself in the form of a break with Gramsci. Mario Tronti was actually referring to this point when he wrote in 1959 that the author of the *Prison Notebooks* had to be considered a “typically Italian thinker”; he was also setting the agenda for the years to come. This chapter aims at reconstructing (and deconstructing) the history of the “Italian reading of Gramsci” since the end of the Second World War (first section). The second section discusses the ways in which one of the most significant Marxist heresies in Italy, “workerism,” dealt with this Gramsci reading tradition. The third section examines the ways in which, with the political defeat of the Italian Communist Party at the end of the 1970s and then its dissolution in 1991, when Gramsci “came back home” and a new season of Gramsci studies in Italy began. The discovery of the world relevance of his thought and the very relation of Gramsci to the Italian context began to be investigated in new ways. The fourth and last section discusses some of the issues at stake in recent developments of Italian Gramsci studies and outlines a research agenda for the near future.

In the Shadow of Togliatti

In March 1944, after eighteen years in exile, Togliatti came back to Italy and gave a boost to a new course in the history of the Italian Communist
Party (PCI), the so-called *svolta di Salerno*, “the turning point of Salerno.” The new strategy gave priority to the anti-fascist battle rather than to the proletarian revolution and delayed the solution of the institutional settlement of Italy, which meant the acceptance of the monarchy, at least temporarily. Moreover, Togliatti introduced two major novelties in the long term strategy of the Communist Party: he abandoned the Leninist model of a revolutionary cadre party for a modern mass party (the so-called *partito nuovo*, “new party”); the communists accepted the constitutional ground of democratic pluralism and parliamentary democracy, actively participating in drafting and approving the new constitution which came into force in 1948. This was a significant change compared to the cultural and political roots of communism in the 1920s, a change that reflected the political experience of Togliatti in the 1930s and 1940s. Togliatti’s conception of the “new party,” gained through his experiences in the popular fronts in the Spanish Civil War and through the analysis of fascism as a modern political mass phenomenon, also responded to the need to find an area of autonomy from the Soviet policy, despite a clear commitment to the Eastern bloc in terms of major international choices.

The emphasis on the national character of the Party (which changed its name from PCd’I, *Partito Comunista d’Italia*, “Communist Party of Italy,” to PCI, *Partito Comunista Italiano*, “Italian Communist Party”), and the “progressive democracy” as the pivot of the PCI strategy were far removed from the revolutionary internationalism of the early 1920s and paralleled the Stalinist doctrine of the national character of popular movements. These features constituted the peculiar history of Italian communism after the war. This new politics was accompanied by a vigorous cultural policy and by a historiography that relied on two defining elements: the history of the PCI was read, against any reasonable analysis, as a continuous development—without contradictions—since its founding in Livorno in 1921; the pillar that sustained this tradition was the figure of Antonio Gramsci. In the cultural policy promoted by Togliatti, Gramsci became the figure around which to build the history and tradition of the Italian Communist Party. This move proved to be particularly suitable in order to attract young antifascist intellectuals who had not yet joined the Communist Party. This operation—which did not hesitate to make use of omissions and outright falsification of Gramsci’s work—made Gramsci into a figure of the national culture that went beyond his militancy in the Party of which he had been leader and founder. The image of Gramsci in the works of Piero Gobetti and Guido Dorso, representatives of Italian radical-democratic liberalism, appreciated Gramsci despite different political affiliations, and even a famous sentence by Benedetto Croce, who wrote of Gramsci “as a man of thought he was one of ours,” helped to make of the work of Gramsci a national heritage and represented a crucial trait of union between national history and that of the Party (Croce 86).

The first Italian edition of *Lettere dal carcere* [Letters from Prison] published in 1947, which won a prestigious literary prize, already shows all
the characteristics of the editorial policy through which the Communist Party made Gramsci’s work known in the following years. These letters highlighted the human side of Gramsci and they assumed a paradigmatic meaning of the violence suffered by all those who had the courage to vigorously oppose the Fascist regime. Thus, the most private and personal work of Gramsci was the first to see the light after the war and become a monument to antifascism. These letters, which touched the whole country, were censored by the Party, for all references to the “heretics” of international communism in the 1920s, Bordiga, Trotsky, and even Rosa Luxemburg as well as the entire Left opposition within the PCd’I, were removed from them. In a book of 1951, coordinated by Togliatti, which sketched a history of the Italian Communist Party on the thirtieth anniversary of its birth, all the “dissidents,” both Right and Left, who punctuated the history of the Communist Party of Italy were concealed, removed, or attacked with violence, so that an enduring standard of the history of the Party, centered on the figures of Gramsci and Togliatti, was established. In the work plan prepared by Togliatti, the manipulative and propagandistic intent was clear. Togliatti wrote, among other things, “Make sure, of course, not to present objectively the infamous doctrines of Bordiga. Do that in a critical and destructive way” (qtd. in Liguori 271).

The first publication of the Prison Notebooks, the thematic edition published between 1948 and 1951, falls within the framework described so far and its composition, which did not follow any philological criteria, responded to cultural policy pursued by the party. The identification of the Crocian tradition as the strong tradition of Italian intellectual history, which the Communist Party had to undermine, promoted the reading of Gramsci’s work on specific aspects, such as the interpretation of national history and the literary and artistic Italian tradition. This reading of Gramsci became mainstream in the postwar decades. It paradoxically led to the acceptance of the battlefield chosen by the opponent, that is, by the intellectuals inspired by Croce. Thus, texts crucial for understanding Italian society, which in the 1950s and 1960s experienced tumultuous processes of urbanization and industrialization, remained at the edge of the Gramscian reception. The notebook “Americanism and Fordism,” for example, which contained some of the sharpest pages written in prison by Gramsci, received marginal attention until the 1970s.

The thematic edition of the Notebooks was also intended to partially defuse the subversive potential of Gramscian thought in relation to the Soviet doctrine. Togliatti had immediately realized this question as he began to read the Notebooks, so much so that he wrote to Dimitrov in 1941:

Gramsci’s notebooks, which I have studied almost entirely, contain materials that can be used only after careful preparation. Without this treatment the material cannot be used and even some parts, if they were used in their current form, may not be useful to the party. For this I think it
is necessary that this material remain in our files to be developed here.  
(qtd. in Vacca, “Togliatti” 144–45)

The key elements of the partito nuovo of Togliatti, namely the acceptance of a pluralist democratic system and the mass party, can be hardly brought back to Gramsci’s thought or, at the very least, this requires a historicization of his work on those subjects which have undergone significant shifts in time. Gramsci had a Leninist view of the party and when he spoke of democracy he did not refer to parliamentary democracy. But this same relationship between Gramsci and Togliatti, presented as harmonious and inspired by a continuity of common purposes, actually knew moments of heavy contrast just in a fatal moment in the history of world communism. On October 14, 1926, Gramsci, on behalf of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Italy, intervened on the issue of the conflict between Stalin and Bukharin, on the one hand, and the unified opposition of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, on the other. Gramsci was on the side of the majority in the heart of the matter, however he expressed a clear criticism of the Stalinist method with a reminder of the need to maintain the party unity and enhance the legacy of Lenin, an issue he deemed critical for the advancement of the international communist movement:

> It seems to us that the violent passion of the Russian questions causes you to lose sight of the international aspects of the Russian questions themselves, causes you to forget that your duties as Russian militants can and must be fulfilled only within the context of the interests of the international proletariat. 

11 (qtd. in Daniele 408)

Togliatti was in Moscow and there he received the letter from Gramsci who asked him to forward it to the Bolshevik party. But Togliatti did not share the content of the letter; he personally spoke to some leaders of the Soviet Communist Party and of the Third International, and decided to hold the letter without making it public. He asked to review the whole matter at a meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, where Jules Humbert-Droz was sent as a delegate of the Third International. On October 18, Togliatti wrote to Gramsci informing him that he did not forward the letter because it was not appropriate in the phase of heavy confrontation within the Russian party and was not sufficiently clear in the approval of the line of the party majority (Stalin-Bukharin) and in the criticism toward the opposition. The answer of Gramsci, on October 26, was very hard. He wrote, among other things, “This mode of reasoning of yours has made a very distressing impression on me” (qtd. in Daniele 437). 

12 Gramsci complained of the superficiality of Togliatti’s analysis and considered the outcome of the conflict within the Bolshevik Party crucial for the fate of international communism. He claimed that the unity of the communists was of vital importance and
criticized the attitude of the majority, which seemed to want to crush the opposition. However, following the failed murder attempt of Mussolini on October 31, fascist violence broke out, leading to several arrests and forcing many leaders to go underground. Gramsci failed to reach that party meeting in Valpolicella (close to Genoa). There it was decided to accept Togliatti’s proposal to suspend the forwarding of Gramsci’s letter, with the only opposition coming from Vernagoni, who belonged to the left current of the party led by Bordiga. The evening of November 8, Gramsci was arrested. Gramsci and Togliatti would never meet again and their last direct correspondence is related to the clash of 1926. It is easy to understand that in order to build the legend of a Communist Party whose specificity rested on the solid intellectual and political association of Gramsci and Togliatti, the party leadership carefully refrained from publishing these letters until after the war. Thus, the last direct relationship between Gramsci and Togliatti was a tough battle on an issue of primary importance: the year after, with the expulsion of Trotsky and other opponents from the party, the historical importance of the conflict in 1926 would become very clear.

This clash between Gramsci and Togliatti has been written on extensively and has created some confusion. Some scholars see the episode as emblematic of the different characters and moral statures of Gramsci and Togliatti, the first sensitive to the unity of the movement and respectful of dissent, the second who cynically adapted to the new Stalinist course. This interpretation accords well with a hagiographic image of Gramsci built by the same Communist Party after the war through an instrumental use of witnesses who had known him in jail and who described him as a man of good character, well disposed toward “simple people,” and who never failed to have a good word for everybody.

What we want to reiterate here, however, is the political substance of their disagreement. Togliatti was in Moscow and certainly had a clearer perception of the conflict within the Bolshevik party. In short, he was aware that the clash had already concluded and had been won by the Stalinist majority so that the Italian party had no other option than to support—without any ifs, ands, or buts—the majority. Gramsci’s analysis, however, was more far-seeing because he understood that the laceration in the party was a consequence of bureaucratic and sectarian drifts that threatened the very credibility of international communism. From that conflict followed the national-bureaucratic drift of the Bolshevik party, the rupture in international communism and the institutionalization of violence in the management of the party that escalated in the 1930s. Thus, in the crucial moment that required an evaluation of this historic turning point, the positions of Gramsci and Togliatti were radically opposed. This was the real ground of the conflict, while the idea that Gramsci defended the opposition against Stalin is totally groundless. Gramsci shared the line of the majority; what separated him from Togliatti was the reading of the overall strategy of the international communist movement in the mid-1920s.
But all these files were revealed only between the 1960s and 1970s, so that the ideological construction of the continuous history of the party could establish itself in the postwar decades. Even the publication of Gramsci’s writings in *L’ordine nuovo* (Torino 1954), namely, the writings of Gramsci in the years of the councils movement in the “two red years,” the “Biennio Rosso” (1919–1920), did not open a critical debate on the reappraisal of his work. Only the young intellectuals of the journal, *Ragionamenti*, used Gramsci’s thoughts of 1919 and 1921 in order to criticize the pattern of the party promoted by Togliatti within a perspective of research on the institutions of workers’ power. In this perspective, the councils’ democracy was reappraised as a fundamental experience of management of the production process by the working class that would take it to direct the whole society, not through the instrument of the proletarian dictatorship, but by building its own hegemony. Togliatti himself was about to intervene in a speech in 1957, “Attualità del pensiero e dell’azione di Gramsci” [“The relevance of Gramsci’s thought and action today”] to prevent the recovery of Gramsci’s thought on worker councils casting a shadow on the clear continuity of the history of the Party. The events in Hungary in 1956 had shifted many intellectuals from the PCI to the PSI (Partito Socialista Italiano), the “Italian Socialist Party,” although they were positioned on the radical left within the party. The renovation of the political culture of the Italian Left was starting to rest on an original reinterpretation of Marx and on a fruitful confrontation with social sciences, particularly critical sociology that the PCI had openly opposed, preferring to concentrate on the cultural opposition to the liberal tradition of Benedetto Croce in terms that were completely outdated with respect to the recent transformations of Italian society. The interpretation suggested by Togliatti in 1957 was perhaps a little less schematic than the one advanced some years before, but he maintained the thesis of the continuity in the Party history, and saw in the failure of *L’Ordine Nuovo* the limits of a vanguard experience which did not have a political organization able to sustain it. The PCd’I founded in Livorno after the failure of *L’Ordine Nuovo* was an evolution of the council experience according to the Leninist doctrine.

During the 1970s, the analysis of Gramsci’s thought became more complex; contradictory aspects were highlighted as well as a shift in his orientation and his difficulties within the Party; the letters of 1926 were published in the Party press and the critical edition of the *Prison Notebooks* was eventually published by Valentino Gerratana in 1975. However, Gramsci, because of his reception in the 1950s and his strong historical identification with the Communist Party of Togliatti, was not an author of the new left, which developed new theoretical tools starting with a rereading of Marx. Some authors recovered Gramsci’s thought on worker councils, which could help to read the Italy of the 1960s and to mobilize and express the radical class conflicts that crossed it.
For this exclusion of Gramsci from the theoretical references of the new left the book by Alberto Asor Rosa, *Scrittori e popolo* [“Writers and the People”], was decisive. Asor Rosa, literary critic and member of the workerist left, blamed the cultural policy of the Italian Left in the postwar period, its provincial populism, and the petty bourgeois character of its culture that referred to a tradition created in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that had its pillars in Gioberti, De Sanctis, Croce and Gramsci. Much Italian literature of the twentieth century was consistent with this tradition, the principles of which had already been formulated in the Risorgimento, and went on unaffected through the Fascist period and was then re-launched by Neorealism and the PCI. The national and democratic strategy of Togliatti rested on that tradition and with the reception of the Zhdanovian Socialist Realism would have encouraged a moderate, passive, national and nostalgic portrait of the “poor people” who lived in the Italian province and had no class connotations. In this way, Togliatti developed a cultural policy consistent with the populist political mythology he had placed at the base of the Party’s strategy in the 1940s. Essential terms of this literary culture were its sentimental realism and the research on social subjects often detached from specific socio-historical contexts, who were peasants rather than blue collar workers and were generally located in the South, paradigmatic site of a populist rhetoric that in the 1950s was enriched by the works of Carlo Levi and Danilo Dolci. The insistence on the national character of this tradition meant distance, if not open hostility, to the great twentieth-century tradition of European literary research. Gramsci, according to Asor Rosa, was a crucial element of mediation between the moderate tradition of populism and the strategy of the Italian Communist Party. Thus Asor Rosa shared in Togliatti’s reading of Gramsci, although in order to reverse its sign. Asor Rosa, against the sentimental evocation of the people, argued for the political centrality of the working class and against the national and provincial neorealism for the avant-garde and its open European horizons. Asor Rosa took on theoretical innovation at the historical-literary level where workerism was introduced in the Italian political thought of the 1960s. In this sense it represented a major break and a radical critique of the strategy of the postwar Communist Party.

To reread them today, Asor Rosa’s pages on Gramsci appear to be ungenerous and substantially off-centered, but it is clear that Asor Rosa was not interested in a close analysis of Gramsci’s texts, but rather to draw criticism to a tradition that had been founded through Gramsci after the Second World War. Not by chance Asor Rosa spoke more of “Gramscianesimo” [Gramscianism] rather than of Gramsci. Asor Rosa was able to address a sharp critique to decades of cultural backwardness of the Communist Party with its distrust of the international avant-garde culture, ignorance of the social sciences, and the inability to grasp the contradictions of an advanced industrial society. For many young intellectuals this vehement complaint against the national populist culture was certainly perceived as the shedding
of an ideological cloak that compressed political energies rather than organize and mobilize them. However, this reading came to put a tombstone on any possible alternative use of Gramsci’s work.

There are many criticisms that can be made of Asor Rosa’s reading of Gramsci. Gramsci’s attention to the local and national level is constantly placed in an international and global dimension. This is the framework in which Gramsci’s thought makes sense, although he was nevertheless well aware of the importance of nation building as a constitutive element of social processes of modernity, such as wars and revolutions. The national dimension had to be carefully analyzed in order to avoid an abstract and schematic interpretation of social processes, and in this sense, Gramsci developed the research on nation and nationalism which had become crucial in the international Marxist debate at the beginning of the century. But there are at least three other aspects of Gramsci’s thought that Asor Rosa surprisingly failed to appreciate. First, Gramsci’s analysis of culture proved to be very keen, precisely in the direction which Asor Rosa hoped for, i.e., the battle against idealism and a materialistic view of cultural processes. Second, the analysis of the culture of the subaltern in the Prison Notebooks is far from any apologia; indeed, it denounced its more reactionary and regressive aspects, however imagining it as the only possible starting point for a political struggle that aimed at mobilizing subalterns who inevitably define themselves through the lens of the dominant culture. According to Gramsci, peasant and subaltern cultures do not in themselves automatically carry any antagonistic and progressive meaning, contrary to the opinion of some scholars of the “history from below,” which was so successful even in Italy in the 1960s and 1970s.

Finally, what is surprising is Asor Rosa’s separation of Gramsci as literary critic from Gramsci as political thinker, because the unification of these two figures prevents locking him into a national tradition that he confronts in order to overthrow its hegemony. Gramsci was the leader of an internationalist party that in the 1920s and 1930s was just coming to terms with the difficult terrain of articulating the local and national level with the international dimension in which to fight against global capitalism. This keen perception of the global dimension of capitalism was openly discussed in “Notebook 22,” “Americanismo e fordismo,” “Americanism and Fordism,” and the already mentioned conflict with Togliatti in 1926 bears tragic witness to the international dimension of Gramsci’s thought. In the famous letter of 1926, Gramsci was talking of the difficult relationship between local and international levels in the history of communism, and although he joined the majority’s argument against the unified opposition, his call for unity of the Leninists was not a simple tribute to orthodoxy but the prophetic intuition that a split of an international movement on a national conflict was a harbinger of doom for the history of international communism.

At any rate, the text of Asor Rosa, despite the limited relevance of his critique of Gramsci, was central in the critique of the cultural tradition of the
PCI that had been based on a certain reception of Gramsci. In the 1960s, Italy became an advanced industrial society and the intellectual apparatus built by the Italian Communist Party after the war proved to be increasingly obsolete. The most innovative categories of social analysis and political intervention in social struggles were put forward from outside of the PCI and of its surrounding intellectual influence. From the intellectual and political environment of workerism came some of the most interesting hints toward a new political culture able to interpret the powerful social conflicts of those years.

“Our Near Past”: Marx v. Gramsci in the Experience of Workerism

Also known as “autonomist Marxism,” “workerism” was surely the most important and original theoretical and political development within Italian Marxism in the 1960s. It played a crucial role both in the interpretation of the powerful workers’ struggles that shook the country during that decade and in the formation of the revolutionary groups that shaped the “long” Italian 1968 movement—from 1968 to 1977. English-speaking readers may be familiar with what is today called “post-workerism,” associated with Antonio Negri whose theories have deeply influenced international debates on globalization and within cultural and postcolonial studies since the publication of *Empire*.

“Workerism” was, of course, not the only relevant development within Italian critical theory in the 1960s. As far as the legacy of Gramsci is concerned, it is worth mentioning the influence of the great anthropologist Ernesto De Martino, and the emergence of vast grassroots movements engaged in the south of the country in the project of developing what has been recently called an “ethnography of Italian subalterns.” Poor Southern peasants and rural day laborers were considered by these researchers and activists as the “internal others” par excellence, as the subjects who were to play a seminal role in the re-politicization of the “Southern Question” and in the renewal of the Gramscian project of an alliance between Northern industrial workers and Southern peasants. These experiences were often shaped by an original reading of Gramsci’s reflections on “subaltern groups” and “folklore” in the *Prison Notebooks* (especially “Notebook 25” and “27”). They nurtured a kind of underground Gramscian stream that in the following years deeply influenced the development of ethnology, anthropology and museography in Italy.

Nevertheless, the importance of “workerism” cannot be underestimated. In the 1960s the workerist intellectuals, researchers and militants seemed able to provide the most effective interpretations of what was called at the beginning of the decade “neo-capitalism,” the spectacular economic development as a result of “Fordist” mass industrialization that dramatically changed the
productive, social and cultural landscape of the country. In a book published in 1972, which remains the most important workerist statement on the issue, Luciano Ferrari Bravo and Alessandro Serafini noted that the very “Southern Question” changed its profile through the mass emigration toward the North and the contradictory take off of industrialization processes in several Southern areas between the end of the 1950s and the early 1960s. The reality of the Fordist factory was the research object and the political stake for the development of workerism in the 1960s. Such journals as Quaderni rossi and Classe operaia brought together intellectuals, researchers, militant workers and union organizers who, in the majority, had no previous political experience or came from the left of the Italian Socialist Party, such as the founder of Quaderni rossi, Raniero Panzieri, as well as Antonio Negri. The Roman group around Mario Tronti and the already mentioned Alberto Asor Rosa were an exception in this regard, since they were part of the University section of the Italian Communist Party. But in general the relation between “workerism” and the PCI was from the beginning very tense and conflict-ridden, and this is easy to understand since workerism as a whole developed a radical critique of the national hegemony project that had been elaborated by Togliatti in the previous years. It is nevertheless worth recalling that both Mario Tronti and Alberto Asor Rosa, as well as the younger student of Negri’s, Massimo Cacciari (who was to become a well-known philosopher and later, the mayor of Venice), decided to continue their political militancy in the Communist Party after 1968, further elaborating the legacy of workerism in peculiar ways that were quite influential for the cultural politics of the party in the 1970s and in the 1980s.

The birth of workerism in the early 1960s is a turning point not only for the political culture of the left and for the development of critical theory in Italy, it is also a crucial moment in order to understand the destiny of Gramsci in his home country in the following decades. For instance, if one looks at the history of the British New Left, at South America or India, it is easy to see that Gramsci’s thought provided crucial tools that helped to break with Marxist orthodoxy as represented by official Communist parties. This rupture must be recognized as the point of inception of some of the most important and creative developments of contemporary critical theory, in which the reference to Gramsci continues to be a defining theoretical element—from cultural to postcolonial and the Subaltern Studies project. In order to understand the different situation in Italy, one has to realize that the break with Marxist and communist orthodoxy was indeed a break with Gramsci, meaning a break with the image of Gramsci that took shape through the interpretation of his work within the Italian Communist Party in the 1940s and 1950s and that we have tried to reconstruct. And while for example, in Great Britain the basic critical move was to disentangle the element of “workers’ consciousness” from an “objectivist” reading of capitalist development, in Italy the workerist engagement with the reality of the Fordist factory immediately raised the problem of subjectivity.
Inhabited by what Tronti memorably termed the *rude razza pagana*, “the rough pagan race” (that is, the new “mass worker,” young, and mostly Southern migrant workers), the factory, as represented for instance by the huge FIAT plants in Turin, or by the emerging chemical industrial complex of Porto Marghera (Venice) was, in the eyes of the workerists, eventually opening up modernity in Italy. What Asor Rosa criticized, as we saw above, from the point of view of literature, the sentimental and nostalgic longing for the “people” of the province, became a kind of general cipher of an Italian provincialism that the struggles of the working class were getting rid of. The workerists were deeply convinced that Italy was becoming a very advanced revolutionary laboratory, and this meant that there was a need for a “philosophy”—or better for a “science”—capable of interpreting such advanced struggles. Needless to say, this could not be a “provincial” philosophy.

From this point of view, in order to understand the relation of the workerists with Gramsci it is particularly important to read an essay published in 1959 by Mario Tronti, “Tra materialismo dialettico e filosofia della prassi. Gramsci e Labriola” [“Between dialectical materialism and philosophy of praxis. Gramsci and Labriola”]. The importance of Gramsci is recognized from the first lines by Tronti, who states that “the whole cultural world of his age is interpreted and “translated in his thought.” But this is precisely the key to an interpretation of Gramsci that aims at locating his work within a history and a cultural constellation that are “immediately behind us” and that build our “near past” (in Caracciolo and Scalia 141). Even more relevant for our present discussion is Tronti’s argument that Gramsci “is a typically, I would even say fundamentally Italian thinker,” and that it would be a mistake to give him “a European range” (“Tra materialismo dialettico e filosofia della prassi” 156). Revisiting through Gramsci the history of the debates on Marx and Marxism in Italy since the late 1890s, Tronti argues that Gramsci himself remained caught within an interpretation of Marx shaped by idealism and historicism—that means by the philosophical interpretations provided by Giovanni Gentile and Benedetto Croce (“Tra materialismo dialettico e filosofia della prassi” 156–61).

One could say that the basic aim of Tronti and of most workerist theorists in the following decade was to disentangle Marx from idealism and historicism, and this meant to also disentangle him from Gramsci. *Back to Marx* became the slogan of workerism, which led to a tight engagement first of all with *Capital*, volume 1 (especially with the chapters on “The Working Day” and on “Machinery and Large-Scale Industry”25), and soon afterwards with the *Grundrisse*. And while Gramsci was a point of entry to understand the past, Marx was to be read *in the present*: he must be confronted “not with *his* age, but with ours. *Capital* has to be evaluated on the basis of contemporary capitalism” (Tronti, *Operai e capitale* 31). In 1966, Mario Tronti summed up the results of his engagement with Marx, publishing *Operai e capitale*, a book that was to become famous for the thesis of the priority of workers’ struggles with respect to capitalist development.27
At the same time, one has to keep in mind that the criticism of idealism and historicism opened up the possibility of a direct engagement with sociology, and especially labor and industrial sociology, that were in a way banned in the 1950s (of course with some relevant exceptions) with a reference to the authority of Gramsci and Croce, both from Marxist and from “liberal” culture. Some of the most important Italian labor and industrial sociologists of the following decades—from Aris Accornero to Giovanni Mottura—had their training in such journals as Quaderni rossi and Classe operaia. These journals started to produce an accurate cartography of workers’ conditions and struggles under the conditions of neo-capitalism, stressing the importance of seemingly “un-political” workers’ behaviors such as absenteeism and small (even individual) gestures of sabotage, and initiated “militant investigations” (or “co-researches”) in many factories, directly involving workers in the production of knowledge on their living and work conditions and experimenting with the transformation of this knowledge into a condition for struggle.28

“Militant investigation” and “co-research” became the tools through which the cartography of workers’ conditions and struggles turned into a cartography of subjectivity (we could even say, with contemporary terms, of the production of subjectivity). As we were anticipating previously, Italian workerists did not use the concept of “class consciousness” in their researches and in their political theory. It is easy to see that this happened because of the “idealist” imprinting of the very concept of consciousness. Instead of an emphasis on class consciousness, the way out of any possible kind of “objectivism” was sought, on the one hand, through the already mentioned thesis of the priority of workers’ struggles with respect to capitalist development, and, on the other hand, through the forging of the category of class composition and through a focus on the tension between its “technical” and its “political” dimensions. The concept of “technical class composition” was worked out as a kind of reverse side of what Marx had termed the “organic composition of capital,” and was meant to grasp from the workers’ point of view the structure of the capitalist organization of labor. To this, the concept of a “political class composition” was added in order to take the subjective behaviors, the needs, and the traditions of struggle into account when defining class.

The subjective figure of the “mass worker” (operaio massa) corresponding to neo-capitalism was interpreted as the partial subject that carried the whole weight of mass production and that had the potential to blow up the discipline and order of the “factory-society” with its correlate ideologies of social integration and welfare. It is precisely the emphasis on the partiality of this subject that leads Tronti to produce a radical rupture with the ideology and the project of the Communist party, which through a specific and, as we saw, very selective interpretation of Gramsci, did not center upon the working class but rather upon the “people”: “when the working class politically refuses to become people,” writes Tronti in 1963, “this does not mean that the straight way toward socialist revolution is being closed: the opposite
is true, it is rather the opening up of that way” (*Operai e capitale* 79). Tronti’s criticism applies not only to the concept of the people, but also to the concept of “general will” and to the political language of universalism in general, deconstructing the whole strategy of “progressive democracy” envisioned by Palmiro Togliatti. The name of Gramsci was so deeply associated with this strategy that he was not even mentioned in *Operai e capitale*. And while the concept of culture was playing a crucial role in the UK, for example, in an attempt to innovate the working class’s history and politics that shared at least some concerns with Italian workerism, Tronti was in a hurry to get rid of it as a legacy of the “near past” to which he relegated Gramsci. The very concept of culture, he wrote in 1965,

> does not mean anything more, or it takes up a totally alien meaning for the working class as a partial subject. Culture in fact, like the concept of Right, of which Marx speaks, is always bourgeois. In other words, it is always a relation between intellectuals and society, between intellectuals and the people, between intellectuals and class; in this way it is always a mediation of conflicts and their resolution in something else. If culture is the reconstruction of the totality of man, the search for his humanity in the world, a vocation to keep united that which is divided—then it is something which is by nature reactionary and should be treated as such. (*Operai e capitale* 245)

“Culture” appeared to Tronti closely associated with the concept of the “people,” which he was criticizing as the cornerstone of what appeared to him as a populist strategy of the Communist party. More precisely it was considered by him as the crystallization of a specific hegemonic constellation that the Communist Party was indeed contributing to enforce and reproduce (both through its “intellectuals” and through its action in “society”), while the insurgence of the working class as a *partial* subject was radically challenging it. This is perhaps the point in which the development of workerism was furthest away from the Communist Party reading of Gramsci in the 1960s.

**Back Home**

After the great rupture produced by the 1968 movement and by the dramatic workers’ struggles during the fall of 1969, Gramsci was of course circulating among the revolutionary groups of the Italian new left: the group of il Manifesto gathered around such important political and intellectual former leaders of the Communist Party as Rossana Rossanda, Luigi Pintor, and Valentino Parlato (they were expelled from the party after openly criticizing the USSR intervention in Czechoslovakia), and took Gramsci’s writings on the workers’ councils as an important point of reference in the development of its reading of the Italian situation in the early 1970s. Also to be mentioned here is the
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activity of the “Gruppo Gramsci” in Milan, in which important intellectuals and political cadres such as Romano Madera, Luisa Passerini, and Giovanni Arrighi were active. This experience—“a rarity in the extra-parliamentary left,” as Arrighi himself retrospectively recognized—was meant in Gramscian terms to forge “organic intellectuals of the working class in struggle,” whose function was to help the class to develop its own “autonomy” (61–94, 66f). Nevertheless, Gramsci did not play an important role in the debates of the “new left” in the 1970s, while he continued to be at the core of the intellectual discussion within the Communist party. Independently of an extraordinary production of specialized scholarly works of heterogeneous quality, at stake from a political point of view was a new reading of the concept of hegemony. This new reading stressed the “organicistic” elements of Gramsci’s thought, making him available for a legitimization of the new strategy of the so-called “historical compromise.” The “historical compromise” meant the alliance with the Christian Democratic Party in the perspective of a revival of the founding spirit of the Republic after 1945, which the general secretary of the party, Enrico Berlinguer, started to develop in the wake of his interpretation of the 1973 coup in Chile and of the ongoing radicalization of social struggles and movements in Italy. From this point of view, a lively discussion developed around the thesis presented by Norberto Bobbio, who emphasized the “super-structural” elements of Gramsci’s concept of civil society and made this concept itself an important political battlefield. Bobbio’s reading was rooted in the liberal reading of Gramsci that had its antecedents in Benedetto Croce and Piero Gobetti. But it resulted, on the one hand, in making Gramsci even more distant from the intellectual references of the diverse spectrum of the radical left, and, on the other, it attracted severe criticism from intellectuals tied to the Communist Party. One could even say that Bobbio’s insistence on the cultural fabric of civil society anticipated some terms of later Gramscian revivals.

After the electoral successes of the Communist Party in the mid-1970s, it entered a phase of decline and the strategy itself of the “historical compromise” was a failure in the turbulent years that closed one of the most important and conflict-ridden decades in the history of the Italian Republic. The 1980s were shaped by a confused search for new models and perspectives within the Communist Party. In this search, Gramsci was progressively marginalized from the intellectual debate, and one can say that the end of the Communist Party after 1989 also marked the vanishing of a “cultural industry” revolving around the name of Gramsci, an industry which flourished for four decades, monopolizing the interpretation of his thought, surely producing some important scholarly achievements but also radically limiting the potentiality and reducing the openness of his work.

At the same time, an awareness of the existence of a different debate on Gramsci beyond the borders of his native land started to spread in Italy. It was no coincidence that one of the first points of crystallization of a new
interest for Gramsci (one which was nevertheless bound to remain quite marginal in the Italian academic and intellectual life) was “Notebook 22,” “Americanism and Fordism.” Giorgio Baratta, who would emerge as a central figure in this new season of Italian Gramscian studies, organized a conference on Gramsci’s critique of Americanism in 1987. It was an important landmark in the process of “provincializing” the Italian discussion on Gramsci and recovering the global perspective inherent in his thought. “Notebook 22” presented moreover an analysis of the complex relations between “culture” and production that were emerging as crucial, precisely in the crisis of Fordism, as had already been stressed by the so-called French regulation school and would lie at the core of Stuart Hall’s controversial reading of the New Times inaugurated by Thatcherism in the UK. In the following years, Baratta, who was also the founder of the Italian section of the International Gramsci Society, contributed to the reception of the most stimulating readings of Gramsci developed especially in the Latin American experience (especially Carlos Nelson Coutinho) and within cultural and postcolonial studies (especially Edward Said and Stuart Hall). A conference organized in 2007 in Rome titled “Gramsci, Cultures and the World” was a kind of concluding step in this direction: after many travels around the world, Gramsci was coming back to Italy in a quite different shape than the one that had dominated the postwar era.

**Outlining a Research Agenda**

In the last decade, the Italian debate and scholarly research on Gramsci has been particularly intense, producing important philosophical and political general interpretations of his thought as well as bibliographical and even encyclopedic reference works. But independently of individual achievements, what characterizes the new season of Italian Gramsci studies that started in the 1990s is the recovery of the global dimension of Gramscian thought and concepts that, as we have seen, had been previously inscribed within a rather parochial intellectual and historical experience. In what follows we would like to outline a kind of research agenda, indicating some of the basic topics and insights that are already developed in the Italian discussion and could be even more elaborated in the near future.

As Edward Said, in particular, has emphasized, the importance of space in Gramsci’s thought (his “geographical materialism”) opens up the possibility of using his concepts in order to reconstruct the historical and contemporary dynamics of global capitalism in its multi-scalar hierarchies, relations, and conflicts. This seems to us one of the most promising research perspectives to be developed in the near future. The interpenetration and increasing overlap between the local, the national, and the global would have been a topic of great interest for Gramsci himself, who was particularly sensitive to the mobility and elusiveness of spatial coordinates. Writing to his brother Carlo...
on September 28, 1931, Gramsci commented on H. G. Wells’ *Short History of the World*,

It is interesting because it tends to break with the prevailing habit of thinking that history only existed in Europe, particularly in ancient times; Wells discusses the ancient history of China, India, and the medieval history of the Mongols with the same tone he adopts in speaking of European history. He shows that from a world standpoint Europe should not be regarded as anything more than a province that considers itself the depository of all world civilization. (Gramsci, *Letters from Prison*, ed. Rosengarten 2:80)

In this perspective, the nation itself becomes a specific historical actor, which played a fundamental role in European modernity, but not the exclusive semantic horizon within which Gramscian concepts are located. As Gramsci wrote on August 8, 1927 in a kind of postcolonial mood to his friend Berti commenting on Henri Massis’ *Défense de l’Occident*,

What makes me laugh is the fact that this eminent Massis, who is dreadfully afraid that Tagore’s and Gandhi’s Asiatic ideology might destroy French Catholic rationalism, does not realise that Paris has already become a semicolon of Senegalese intellectualism and that in France the number of half-breeds is increasing by leaps and bounds. One might, just for a laugh, maintain that, if Germany is the extreme outcrop of ideological Asianism, France is the beginning of darkest Africa and the jazz band is the first molecule of a new Euro-African civilization! (Gramsci, *Letters from Prison*, ed. Rosengarten 1:128)

Crucial from the point of view of the formulation of his “geographical materialism” has been, of course, Gramsci’s work on the Southern Question. We do think that rereading these writings is particularly telling not only for the topic discussed but also more generally in terms of method. We find here a topological model of analysis of the peculiarities of Italian capitalism, of the social forces that shape it, of the political alliances, and conflicts among these diverse social segments, but above all of the multifarious ways in which power relations between them are continuously arranged and rearranged, establishing mobile forms of cultural hegemony. It is in this framework that the figure of the “subaltern” becomes a subject of history, with a specific gaze on the cultural forms of expression that were particularly analyzed by Gramsci in “Notebook 25” and “Notebook 27,” where he speaks of “folklore” not as something “picturesque” but as a “conception of the world and of life of certain defined social strata (defined in time and in space)” (2311). Entering history, subalterns do not enter a kind of teleological process, and their “spontaneous philosophy,” as Gramsci also writes, is not necessarily
“progressive.” Nevertheless, it is the inescapable point of reference for political mobilization of subalterns themselves as well as for a materialist writing of history.

In the field of tension between the two concepts of hegemony and subaltern, a whole series of problems, dynamics, and conflicts can be relocated and investigated anew: from the question of ideology to investigation of the social pressures that limit and shape individual behaviors (what Gramsci analyzes through such keywords as *conformismo*, “conformism,” and *uomo-massa*, “man-as-mass" (*Prison Notebooks* 3:164–66). The field of “culture,” sharply criticized and radically dismissed in the 1960s by Mario Tronti, presents itself now as a privileged field on which the crucial issue of the production of subjectivity under the conditions of contemporary capitalism can be critically analyzed. This critical analysis can find in Gramsci’s answer to the question “What is Man?” a surprisingly useful tool. It is worth rereading it after the whole discussion on the crisis of humanism and post-structuralist deconstruction of the subject: “[M]an must be conceived of as a historical complex made up of purely individual and subjective elements on the one hand, and on the other, of mass, objective or material elements, with which the individual has an active relationship” (*Quaderni* 1338).

Another topic worth developing is Gramsci’s thought and his reflection on language in general, and specifically on translation and translatability.40 “Notebook 29,” “Note sullo studio della grammatica” (“Notes on the study of grammar”), the last “Notebook,” demonstrates this reflection. The distinction formulated by Gramsci between “normative grammar,” on the one hand, and “spontaneous and immanent grammars,” on the other hand, seems to be particularly promising, especially if we connect it with the definition of “man” quoted previously. In a way, the “normative grammar” discussed by Gramsci seems to be one of those “mass and objective elements” that make up “man,” while “spontaneous and immanent grammars” (whose number is “incalculable and theoretically one can say that everybody has his or her grammar”) surely correspond to the “purely individual and subjective elements” (*Quaderni* 2343). More generally, Gramsci seems once more particularly sensitive here to the mobility of languages and to the reality of power relations that crisscross the processes of their formation and that shape their relations—in other words, he was sensitive to an issue that is widely recognized as crucial in our postcolonial world.

A very rich reflection on the issue of translation relates to this conception of language in the *Notebooks*. It is worth emphasizing that the very root of the problem for Gramsci is political, and he was already aware of that in the wake of the Russian revolution. One of the most intense paragraphs on the problem of translation in the *Notebooks* is introduced by a quote from Lenin, who said in 1921 that “we haven’t managed to translate our language,” meaning the revolutionary politics of the Bolsheviks themselves, “into the European languages” (*Quaderni* 1468). Starting from this very peculiar problem of “translation,”
Gramsci developed a multi-scalar theory of translation (linguistic, scientific, philosophical, popular, cultural, and so on) that although fragmentary, seems to be particularly topical. In a way, it allows to combine and articulate, as a kind of mobile and flexible platform, the interplay of the three previous points that we briefly discussed: Gramsci’s “geographical materialism,” his “topological” reflection on the cultural dynamics of hegemony, and his approach to the issue of subjectivation. It is working from within this mobile and flexible platform that we hope new Italian studies and scholars will be able to contribute in an innovative and creative way to the ongoing transnational and transcontinental conversation on Gramsci’s thought.

Notes

1. See Tronti, “Tra materialismo dialettico e filosofia della prassi,” 141–62. We discuss Tronti’s essay subsequently (second section).

2. The analysis of the fascist movement as a “regime reazionario di massa” (reactionary regime with mass support) was outlined by Togliatti in 1935 in a series of lectures held in Moscow, but published in Italy only in 1970. These lectures represented a very stimulating analysis of fascism and the awareness of the mass character of fascist organizations influenced Togliatti’s project of the “partito nuovo”; see Togliatti, Lezioni sul fascismo.

3. This book won the Premio Viareggio, a major Italian literary prize. In 1950 the Fondazione Istituto Gramsci was founded, whose aim was to promote research on Gramsci’s work and the communist movement. In the 1960s the Istituto Gramsci acquired the letters and the notebooks of Gramsci.

4. This censorship was denounced by the socialist historian Salvatore Sechi already in 1965; see Sechi, “Le ‘lettere dal carcere’ e la politica culturale del Pci” (1965), now in Movimento operario e storiografia marxista, Bari, De Donato, 1974. The fact that Gramsci’s reception after the war was based on a heavy manipulation and sometimes falsification of his writings is nowadays recognized by scholars with different orientations in the interpretation of Gramsci; see Vacca, “Togliatti editore delle Lettere e dei Quaderni del carcere,” in Vacca, Togliatti sconosciuto 123–69; Bermani 2007.

5. Palmiro Togliatti, Trenta anni di vita e lotte del Pci.

6. A substantial change in the historiography on the Italian Communist Party was introduced by the huge work of Paolo Spriano, whose first volume was published in 1967; see Spriano 1967–1975.

7. Amadeo Bordiga was the leading founder of the PCd’I in 1921, his left-wing positions within the communist movement had been attacked by Lenin already in 1920 in Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder. In the following years Bordiga maintained a critical position toward the development of the Bolshevik Party in Russia and its leading role in the Third International, and he was a prominent representative of the so-called left-wing communism so that he was marginalized both in the Italian and international communist movement. Bordiga was expelled by the Communist Party in 1930 and he never went back. After the second World War he founded his own small revolutionary party which did not have any significant role in Italian politics; on Bordiga see De Clementi.
8. The first edition of the *Prison Notebooks* was published by Einaudi (Torino) in six thematic volumes between 1948 and 1951, edited by Felice Platone under the supervision of Togliatti. The *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Hoare and Smith, which shaped the discussion of Gramsci’s work in the Anglophone world, was based on this edition.

9. Croce has been the most influential intellectual of Italian idealism in the twentieth century. His work constituted the basis of the education of the liberal ruling class in Italy. The Italian Communist Party aimed at refuting Croce, stressing the role of the “common people” in nation building and in the development of Italian modernity, but it shared with Croce a similar historicist-progressive vision of history.

10. In the 1970s, just in the phase of Fordism’s crisis, some scholars began to pay more attention to “Notebook 22,” on “Americanism and Fordism”; see the special edition of the Notebook edited by F. De Felice in 1978. Some papers presented at the Gramsci conference of 1977 have a focus on “americanism e fordismo,” in particular Bodei, Battini, Salvadori, Paggi, F. de Felice; see Ferri 1977. Within the workerist debate, Sergio Bologna recovered Gramsci’s thought. In the following years, interest grew in “Notebook 22,” and the analysis of it signaled the engagement with Gramsci of Giorgio Baratta, one of the most distinguished scholars of the Gramsci renaissance of the last twenty years. See Baratta and Catone (eds.), *Modern Times*. A brilliant reading of the influence of “Notebook 22” in postwar Italian debates on the left, “through and beyond workerism,” has been recently provided by Boni 79–88.

11. “[C]i pare che la passione violenta delle quistioni russe vi faccia perdere di vista gli aspetti internazionali delle quistioni russe stesse, vi faccia dimenticare che i vostri doveri di militanti russi possono e debbono essere adempiuti solo nel quadro degli interessi del proletariato internazionale,” Gramsci, letter of October 14. The correspondence of 1926 is now entirely published in Chiara Daniele (ed.), *Gramsci a Roma, Togliatti a Mosca. Il carteggio del 1926*. In an essay within this book, Vacca reads these letters within the internal debate of the Italian Communist Party in those years, focusing on the conflicts between the political strategies of Gramsci and Togliatti. The text of the first letter had been already published by Tasca in 1938; the answer of Togliatti was published in *Rinascita* in 1964; the above objection of Gramsci was published only in 1970. It was certainly not by chance that Togliatti published a part of the correspondence just three months before his death at a moment in which, faced with the conflict between the Soviet Union and China, he was outlining a critical perspective on the history of international communism.

12. An English translation of this letter can be found in [http://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/1926/10/letter-togliatti.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/1926/10/letter-togliatti.htm).

13. Gramsci was stopped in Milan and sent back to Rome by the police. What occurred in those days has been clarified by a letter of Tatiana Schucht discovered only in 2008 and published in *L’Unità* on November 7, 2008.

14. Emblematic of this hagiography is the first biography of Gramsci, by Lucio Lombardo Radice and Giuseppe Carbone, *Vita di Antonio Gramsci* (1952). This book contributed to consolidating the historiographical tradition discussed above, i.e. a direct line which linked Ordine Nuovo, PCd’I (Partito Comunista d’Italia), and the “partito nuovo” (the “new party”) bound by the relationship
between Gramsci and Togliatti. This orthodox tradition eliminated every other voice which had contributed to the history of the Italian communist movement, labeling them as sectarians and heretics.

15. *Ragionamenti* was an innovative journal animated by young intellectuals closest to the socialist party and was financed by Gian Giacomo Feltrinelli; see Columbi 31–56.

16. This rereading of Gramsci’s thought in the early 1920s was encouraged also by Antonio Giolitti in the VIII congress (1956) of the PCI, which was the last before his exit from the party. See Giolitti 1957.


18. An exception was represented by scholars who considered Gramsci a man betrayed by the party, according to an interpretation that was already claimed by the Italian Trotskyists (see Corvisieri 1969).

19. Meaningful is an essay written just on the eve of the 1968 events; see Merli 1967.


23. For a good introduction in English, see Wright. In Italian see Asor Rosa, 1649ff; Trotta and Milana, *L’operaismo degli anni Sessanta. Da “Quaderni rossi” a “classe operaia.”*


26. See for instance Marx, *Scritti* and above all the first translation (by Renato Solmi) of the so-called “Fragment on the machines” from the *Grundrisse* in *Quaderni rossi*, 4 (1964), 289–300. The first Italian edition of the *Grundrisse* was also translated and edited by a workerist intellectual, Enzo Grillo; cf. Marx, *Lineamenti fondamentali della critica dell’economia politica*. See also Negri, *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*.

27. On the continuing importance of Tronti’s “Copernican revolution,” see Hardt and Negri, *Commonwealth* 290–95.

28. See for instance the work of the “inventor” of the methodology of “militant investigation” or “co-research,” Alquati.

29. One could recall here the recent interpretation of Togliatti’s “new party” in terms of populism provided by Laclau, *On Populist Reason*. Needless to say, while Laclau uses the concept of populism in positive terms, Tronti was radically criticizing the centrality of the “people” (and not of the working class) in the political strategy and discourse of the Communist party in the 1950s and 1960s.

30. Arrighi also mentions in this important interview that in the postscript to the second edition of *The Geometry of Imperialism* (1983) he argued “that the Gramscian concept of hegemony could be more useful than imperialism in analyzing contemporary dynamics of the inter-state system” (70); his experience in the
“Gruppo Gramsci” was thus an important step in the formulation of a theory of the world system of historical capitalism that has played a crucial role in the international debate of the last two decades.

31. For one of the most important works on Gramsci in these years, see Paggi.

32. Bobbio's pamphlet developed the text of a paper presented by him in 1967 at a conference for the thirtieth anniversary of Gramsci's death.

33. An important event in this regard was the conference organized by the “Fondazione Istituto Gramsci” in 1989 in Formia: see the proceedings, Righi (ed), Gramsci nel mondo. See also Santucci.

34. Baratta and Catone (eds.), Tempi moderni.

35. See for instance Aglietta, and Hall and Jacques.


37. See the proceedings in Schirru (ed.), Gramsci, le culture, il mondo. A collection of landmark essays in cultural studies on Gramsci has been edited by Vacca, Capuzzo, and Schirru, Studi gramsciani nel mondo: gli studi culturali.

38. See for instance Burgio, Gramsci storico. Una lettura dei Quaderni del carcere; Frosini, Da Gramsci a Marx. Ideologia, verità, politica; Liguori, Sentieri gramsciani; and Guido Liguori and Pasquale Voza (eds.), Dizionario gramsciano.

39. Particularly important in this regard is the work done in Naples by Lidia Curti and Iain Chambers: see for instance Chambers (ed), Esercizi di potere. Gramsci, Said e il postcoloniale.

40. There is of course a wide literature especially on the issue of translation and translatability in Gramsci's thought. Particularly important in the Italian debate has been the work on Gramsci and language by Lo Piparo, Lingua, intellettuali, egemonia. See also his recent essay, “Gramsci and Wittgenstein. An Intriguing Connection,” in Capone (ed.), Perspectives on Language Use and Pragmatic: A Volume in Memory of Sorin Stati.