

(Re)Reading the Notion of Ideology:

Luxemburg and Gramsci

Sevgi Doğan

Introduction

What was ideology for Rosa Luxemburg? Is her view different from that of Marx? These questions can also be asked about the Italian thinker Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937),¹ who suffered a similar fate and died at almost the same age as Luxemburg.² The former suffered from fascism while the latter lived on the eve of it. Gramsci was aware of Luxemburg's writings.³ In one of his pre-prison writings (June 1919), Gramsci mentions the assassinations of Karl Liebknecht (1871–1919) and Rosa Luxemburg and considers them as two *heroes* of revolu-

1 The Italian abbreviation of Gramsci's »Prison Notebooks (Quaderni del Carcere)«, if necessary, is used in the text with the reference to the paragraph number respectively as follows: Q, §. For the reference in Italian the following Italian edition is used: Valentino Gerratana (Ed.): Quaderni del Carcere, 3 vols., Torino 1977.

2 For a similar interpretation see, Tibor Szabó: Dittatura, Democrazia e Fattore Soggettivo nel Pensiero di Luxemburg, Gramsci e Lukács, in: *Il Politico* 3/1987, p. 486.

3 Gramsci reads some of her writings and mentions in his pre-prison and prison writings: for example, in one of his Notebooks, he mentions Luxemburg's Massenstreik, Partei und Gewerkschaften (1906) (»The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions«) regarding war of maneuver and war of position and syndicalism (in: Q7, § 10, vol. 2, pp. 858–859; Q7, § 16, p. 867).

tion.⁴ In another work (September 1920), he affirmed that they are greater than the greatest saints of Christ because their militant aim is concrete, humane and limited.⁵ According to him, by assassinating these two heroes of revolution, the German majority tried to assassinate the world revolution and thus they suffocated the only hope of salvation or emancipation that existed for the German people.⁶ Here, Gramsci analyzed the antagonism between states like the Russian Empire, the French Third Republic, the United Kingdom and Germany, which was no longer a military and imperialist order but the locale of class antagonism between capitalism and the German proletariat. At that point, Gramsci highlights that this antagonism could only be solved by the method and tactic of proletariat struggle and by the international proletariat's solidarity. According to him, the Spartacus League's members were aware of this phenomenon: *international revolution* or *internationalism*.⁷ In this period (August 1919), it seems that Gramsci also underlined the importance of internationalism, as Luxemburg did.⁸

In another pre-prison writing published in *Ordine Nuovo*, Gramsci refers to Luxemburg's thesis about the party and trade union, which was argued in »The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions«⁹ (1906); the thesis points out that political movements and unrest are the most energetic determinants of the solidarity of trade

4 Antonio Gramsci: Vita Politica Internazionale, in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, p. 101.

5 Antonio Gramsci: Il Partito Comunista, in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, p. 654.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid., p. 102.

8 Antonio Gramsci: Cronache Dell'»Ordine Nuovo« [XII] (August 1919), in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, p. 189.

9 Luxemburg's writing was translated in Italian in 1919. Rosa Luxemburg: *Lo Sciopero Generale – Il Partito e I Sindacati*, Milano 1919.

unions.¹⁰ For Gramsci, the concrete experience that one had witnessed in Fiat Centro and Brevetti Fiat confirmed this conviction.¹¹

These two revolutionary philosophers, in many respects, also bring similar approaches to concepts such as ideology, hegemony, culture, self-consciousness, party, intellectuals, and the relationship between praxis and theory. The present contribution, therefore, deals with the concept of ideology and its relation to the party, theory and praxis, and revolutionary actions in the thought of both Luxemburg and Gramsci. In doing so, it seeks to disclose the common aspects found both in Luxemburg's and in Gramsci's approaches to the concept of ideology and its role in revolutionary actions and struggles. Their views of the self-emancipation and self-consciousness and of the oppressed are compared with and connected to the thought of Marx in relation to the concept of ideology.

Luxemburg's »Stagnation and Progress of Marxism«¹² (1903) and Gramsci's »Prison Notebooks« (1929–1935), for example, give some evidence about the philosophical continuity between both regarding their views of culture, ideology and hegemony. Although Luxemburg does not elaborate these concepts as much as Gramsci, her writings on the *national question*, for instance, discuss the concepts of ideology and culture.

The present paper tries to answer the following questions: What is the role of ideology in Luxemburg's and Gramsci's philosophical

10 Antonio Gramsci: Verso Nuove Istituzioni. Postilla (August 1919), in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, p. 191.

11 Ibid.

12 Gramsci refers to Luxemburg's »Stagnation and Progress of Marxism« in different Prison Notebooks: Q3, § 31; Q4, § 46; Q7, § 43; QII, § 70. Gramsci read this article in a work of the collected writings of Marx edited by David Rjazanov in French: *Karl Marx homme, penseur et révolutionnaire*, Paris 1928. Probably Gramsci read also György Lukács's (1885–1971) article »The Marxism of Rosa Luxemburg« which was published in »Rassegna Comunista« in different periods in 1921.

and political thought? And how can their approaches be differentiated from that of Marx, if possible? For this purpose, the article concentrates on some of Gramsci's writings from the pre-prison period and from his »Prison Notebooks« (Quaderni del Carcere) and Luxemburg's »The National Question and Autonomy.«

Ideology: The Problem of the *True Picture*

Marx's problem with ideology is based on the mode and manner of introducing, submitting and fostering a *true picture* with true facts. One of the definitions of ideology refers to the systematic structure of thought or the structure of ideas and beliefs which does not represent reality as it is.¹³ Marx, in this respect, used the term, ideology, in the sense of an *unfair, sided or partial idea*.¹⁴ In other words, it is an illusion and creates mystifications. Ideology, in Marx's writings, means a totality of ideas. This complex totality of ideas and beliefs is the product of a social consciousness of an individual or a group of people who are members of a social group. The theory created by these ideas and beliefs presents the justification of an existing social situation. Moreover, ideology consists of »collective illusions, mystifications and false ideas« that are »learned« by people through tradition or education.¹⁵

Even though Marx had some systematic ideas about social reality, he did not see them as ideology. Marxists did not view Marxism as an ideology for quite a while. For Marx, his ideas were to be a means through which the world could be correctly perceived. Since ideology does not perceive the world in a correct way, Marx's claim »I am not Marxist«¹⁶ signifies that he did not consider Marxism or his idea

13 Şerif Mardin: *Ideoloji*, İstanbul 1997, p. 21.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 31.

15 Henri Chambre: *Soviet Ideology*, in: *Soviet Studies*, 3/1967, p. 315.

16 Engels reported the statement in his letter to Eduard Bernstein in 1882. Referring to the French thinkers claiming to be Marxists, Marx wrote: »Ce

about reality and the world as an ideology. In »German Ideology« (1846), Marx and Engels focused on the ideal and material form of the world and its reality. They, in this respect, especially criticized German idealism, which was not different from »the ideology of all the other nations.«¹⁷ This ideology views the world in relation to ideas and concepts »as determining principles.«¹⁸ Thus, they lack its materialistic aspect. In this regard, they believe that, in particular, German philosophy and in general »the whole ideology amounts either to a distorted conception of this history [of man] or to a complete abstraction from it.«¹⁹ Ideology, therefore, speculates only one side of this history. Its philosophers or theorists design a world on images, concepts, ideas, that is, on the products of ideas. This one-sidedness creates abstraction and a false consciousness. In the Preface to »A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy« (1859), Marx, in this regard, dealt with the problem of ideology first, especially in terms of consciousness,²⁰ and secondly in terms of history. History keeps dropping the ideas, concepts, and images back down to the earth. In contrast to the illusions and falsifications of ideology, Marx had a tendency to consider his works as theory or science that uncovers the misrepresentations or hidden world of ideology.²¹ Marx posed the problem of all

qu'il y a de certain c'est que moi, je ne suis pas Marxiste.« [If anything is certain, it is that I myself am not a Marxist]. Friedrich Engels: Engels to Bernstein, 2–3 November 1882, in Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels: Marx/Engels Collected Works (MECW): Marx-Engels: Letters: 1880–1883, Moscow 1992, vol. 46, p. 356.

- 17 Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels: *The German Ideology*, New York 1998, p. 30. Marx criticizes the followers of Hegel such as Strauss, the Bauers, Stirner, Feuerbach, etc.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 30.
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- 20 Karl Marx: *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Chicago 1904, pp. 9–15.
- 21 Douglas Kellner: *TV, Ideology and Emancipatory Popular Culture*, in: *Socialist Review* 45/1979, p. 14.

the ideologies in terms of their deprivation of dialectics, the dialectical relations between the material and ideal.

The false consciousness of the bourgeoisie, for Marx and Engels, is that »it is unable to perceive its true interests, but because it proclaims and believes that these partial and class interest have a universal and classless character.«²² In »German Ideology,« they write that »each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, that is, expressed in ideal form: it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones.«²³ For these revolutionary philosophers, each ruling class considers itself as being an ideal form of the common interest of all society. Ideology, for them, is »precisely the attempt to ›universalize‹ and give ›ideal‹ form to what are no more than limited, class-bound ideas and interests: it is in this sense that they use the word ›ideology‹ pejoratively, as meaning *a false representation of reality*.«²⁴ The problem, for Marx and Engels, is that these ideologies apply the ideas (mental productions) to certain fields such as politics, laws, morality, religion, economy, metaphysics, etc. without considering the materialistic and historical aspects of their reality.

Marx and Engels, in »German Ideology,« write that »the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i. e., the class, which is the ruling *material* force of society, is at the same time its ruling *intellectual* force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it.«²⁵

22 Ralph Miliband: *Marxism and Politics*, Oxford 1977, p. 32.

23 Marx/ Engels: *Ideology*, p. 68.

24 Miliband: *Marxism*, p. 32, my emphasis.

25 Marx/Engels: *Ideology*, p. 67.

Here, Marx and Engels refer to the structure of a ruling class that not only possesses material force but also intellectual force. The hegemony of the means of material production determines, therefore, the means of mental production. This relation of structure to superstructure is discussed in »A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.«

It is widely recognized that some currents within Marxism underwent some important changes from the beginning of the 1900s to the 1920s, especially before the rise of fascism. These changes at a theoretical level can be observed in Gramsci's and Luxemburg's extant and later theories and in their approaches to a Marxist understanding of class and structures. For quite a while, »Marxists« gave a negative connotation to the term »ideology.« However, in the 20th century, this view changed considerably. After Marx, Lenin, Gramsci and Lukàcs in particular used the term »ideology« in a positive and non-pejorative sense. For Lenin, as for Marx, ideology is also a class element and concept. However, in »What is to be done?« (1902), Lenin differentiated bourgeois ideology from the socialist²⁶ or revolutionary one, which is able to »struggle against all other ideologies.«²⁷ Therefore, ideology shifted from the idea of a false consciousness to the importance and role of socialist ideology. Lenin, in the same work, states that »without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.«²⁸ The socialist ideology is created not only by the socialist intelligentsia but by the workers themselves in the process of their movement. These workers, however, are those who are able to acquire and develop the knowledge of their age.²⁹ Gramsci, presumably, takes the positive side of the notion from Lenin. This will be discussed below, but it is worth briefly mentioning that Gramsci, in »Prison Notebooks«

26 Vladimir Lenin: *What is To Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, in: *Collected Works: May 1901 – February 1902*, Moscow 1961, vol. 5, p. 384.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 386.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 369.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 384.

(in Notebook 7, dated between 1930 and 1932, § 33), refers to Marx's theory and Marxism as *Weltanschauung*. Here, he refers to Lenin for the importance of the concept of hegemony.³⁰ While Lenin intended to place ideology – revolutionary ideology – into action or into revolutionary action, Gramsci, following Lenin, elaborated its role and function in his philosophy of praxis and his theory of the *historical bloc* (*blocco storico*).

Marx, Luxemburg and Gramsci analyzed the notion of ideology through the relationship between structure and superstructure and by means of the concept of civil society. These concepts are differentiated in their writings. Since Gramsci developed these concepts more than Luxemburg, an immediate difference can be observed between Gramsci's and Marx's views. Marx and Engels talked about the concept of civil society in »German Ideology«: »Civil society embraces the whole material intercourse of individuals within a definite stage of the development of the productive forces. It embraces the whole commercial and industrial life of a given stage, and insofar, transcends the State and the nation, though, on the other hand again, it must assert itself in its foreign relations as nationality, and inwardly must organise itself as State.«³¹ Civil society is the sphere of the economy. This economic sphere, therefore, determines the State. According to Marx, legal relations and political forms can be comprehended only through the material conditions of life that Hegel embraced within civil society. And »the anatomy of this civil society [...] has to be sought in political economy.«³² For Gramsci, however, civil society takes on another form and meaning. Civil society, for him, is an important sphere where ideology is (re)constructed along with hegemony. While Marx did not amply emphasize or deeply expound the development

30 Antonio Gramsci: Statement of the Problem, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York 1992, p. 381.

31 Marx/Engels: Ideology, p. 98.

32 Marx: A Contribution, p. 11.

and importance of superstructure in civil society, Gramsci tried to complete this deficiency with his theory of the historical bloc. However, it is worth mentioning that this does not mean that a dialectical relationship between structure and superstructure is absent in Marx's explanation. This dialectical relationship, in fact, refers to Gramsci's historical bloc. Consequently, ideology, in Luxemburg's and Gramsci's works, is related to the concepts and theories of intellectuals, culture, and hegemony.

The Notion of Ideology: Rosa Luxemburg

Since Luxemburg never explicitly talked about the notion of ideology, it might be more difficult to discuss the term immediately and directly. However, the following question can still be posed: What does ideology mean for Luxemburg's political and philosophical thought? Does she differentiate her conception from that of Marx? Needless to say, her conception of ideology is one of a Marxist and is based on *historical and scientific materialism*. Her ideology can be regarded as being *critical* and therefore can be labeled as *critical Marxism* along with that of Gramsci. The term »critical Marxism« refers to both *criticizing* and *advancing, deepening, and perfecting* Marx's own ideas. Her ideology is based on strengthening the masses by promoting their consciousness. Therefore, her conception can be characterized by the *ideology of consciousness*. Following Marx's understanding of ideology, according to Luxemburg, all ideologies »lack firm roots in the material interests of social classes.«³³ Since all ideologies are deprived of the material and historical understanding of societies, Luxemburg identifies all ideologies as illusionary, as Marx does.

33 Rosa Luxemburg: Up-And-Coming Men in Russia [Die kommenden Männer in Russland] (1905), in: Peter Hudis/Axel Fair-Schulz/William A. Pelz (Eds.): Complete Works of Rosa Luxemburg, London 2018, vol. 3, p. 169.

Luxemburg's notion of ideology is not different from Marx's critique of *bourgeois ideology*. In this respect, she attacks the ideological elements of counterrevolution and states that »the national state, national unity and independence were the ideological shield under which the capitalist nations of central Europe constituted themselves in the past century.«³⁴ For Luxemburg, a »national program could play a historical role only so long as it represented the ideological expression of a growing bourgeoisie.«³⁵ She regards the concept of nation as an ideological *mask* that covers imperialistic desires.³⁶ While the concept of nation, for Luxemburg, is preserved, its function and its real content are perverted into its opposite and it is used as an ideological element by imperialists and the bourgeoisie. All these ideological measures are set in order to send the masses to war for imperialist aims. Luxemburg, here, sees ideology as a bourgeois apparatus, as Marx and Engels explain in »German Ideology.«

Luxemburg, in »The National Question« (1909), touches upon the right of nations to self-determination by referring to the concept of nation as »one of those categories of bourgeois ideology which Marxist theory submitted to a radical re-vision, showing how that misty veil, like the concept of the ›freedom of citizens‹, ›equality before the law‹, etc., conceals in every case a definite historical content.«³⁷ She views the concept of ideology as a false consciousness in the sense of producing an illusion and hiding the truth. She marks it as a »misty veil,« which might correspond to Marx's statement of false conscious-

34 Luxemburg: The Junius Pamphlet (1915), in: Peter Hudis/Kevin B. Anderson (Eds.): The Rosa Luxemburg Reader (RLR), New York 2004, p. 326. Luxemburg, in the pamphlet, criticizes the decision of SPD for its affirmation and participation of the First World War.

35 Ibid., p. 327.

36 Ibid., p. 327.

37 Rosa Luxemburg: The Right of Nations to Self-Determination, in: The National Question, Rosa Luxemburg Archive, 16.5.2020. Online: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1909/national-question/choi.htm>.

ness. Being worried about the future of the Russian Revolution and uncovering the concept of nation as bourgeois ideology, Luxemburg believes that it might endanger the development of revolution as long as the independence of the nations might create a separation among the proletariat in Russia. Moreover, the nations, with the independence and freedom that they gained, might not care enough about or pay attention to revolution anymore. This is the result of the bourgeois notion of nation or a »nationalistic phraseology«³⁸ of the Bolsheviks. In »The Russian Revolution« (1918),³⁹ she indicates the ideology which asserts an idea against the revolutionary movement and strengthens the position of the bourgeoisie but weakens that of the proletariat.⁴⁰ The ideology of the right of nations to self-determination formulated by the Bolsheviks, in other words, strengthens the position of the bourgeoisie.

Criticizing the bourgeois woman for not having a »real interest in political rights because she does not exercise any economic function in society, because she enjoys the finished products of class domination,«⁴¹ in »The Proletarian Women« (1914), Luxemburg asserts that »the call for women's equality, when it does well up among bourgeois women, is the pure ideology of a few feeble groups without material roots, a phantom of the antagonism between man and woman, a quirk.«⁴² She describes the same Marxist understanding of bourgeois ideology about the woman question as one-sided, partial, abstract and with a lack of »material roots.«

38 Rosa Luxemburg: Russian Revolution (1918), in: Peter Hudis/Kevin B. Anderson (Eds.): *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader*, New York 2004, p. 297.

39 She wrote it in prison when she was arrested because of her opposition to the First World War, but after being released, she did not finish it and it was therefore never published during her lifetime.

40 Luxemburg: Russian Revolution, p. 297.

41 Rosa Luxemburg: Proletarian Women (1914), in: Peter Hudis/Kevin B. Anderson (Eds.): *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader*, New York 2004, p. 243.

42 Ibid.

Luxemburg's view of ideology can be evaluated in terms of her approach to culture and intellectuals. Discussing the development of the capitalist economy, she does not limit herself to the material and economic development of such elements of capitalist society as exchange, communication, or relationships of production. Indeed, she also touches on the cultural and intellectual development of the capitalist economy. Luxemburg, in this respect, details the ideological development of that sort of society. The dominant class creates its hegemony not only through material production but also through the spiritual or cultural one.

Luxemburg speaks of the *social classes* that play the biggest role in society in carrying out the intellectual, spiritual and political development. She addresses the petty bourgeoisie as follows:

»Above all, what is entirely lacking in Russia are the social classes that played the biggest role, in fact the leading role, in all previous modern revolutions because economically and politically they formed an intermediate layer between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and served as a revolutionary link connecting both of them, thus determining the radical and democratic character of the bourgeois class struggle, through which the proletariat was won over to serve as a fighting force [*Heerbann*] for the bourgeoisie, and thus provided the necessary material mechanism for those previous revolutions. We are referring to the petty bourgeoisie. This was undoubtedly the living cement that held together the most varied social strata in the European revolutions, functioning to *create and propagate the necessary fiction of a united folk (the people) in the class struggles* whose historical content actually boiled down to movements favoring the bourgeoisie. The same petty bourgeoisie was also *the political, spiritual, and intellectual educator of the proletariat*, and it was precisely in that February Revolution [of 1848] in which the Parisian proletariat for the first time entered into the revolutionary process with class consciousness, making a conscious distinction between itself and the bourgeoisie – it was in that February

Revolution that the influence of the petty bourgeoisie became most strongly evident.«⁴³

This passage is remarkably important for the fact that it demonstrates a similarity between Luxemburg and Gramsci regarding the role and function of intellectuals and therefore the notion of ideology. The intellectuals described as petty bourgeoisie not only have a leading role and are not only political, spiritual, and intellectual educators of the proletariat, but they are also producers and creators of political, spiritual, and intellectual ideology, as Gramsci affirms in the »Prison Notebooks.«⁴⁴ Luxemburg construes the petty bourgeoisie as »the living cement« that acts to »create and propagate the necessary fiction of a united folk (›the people‹) in the class struggles.« Regarding this role of the petty bourgeoisie in modern Europe, she maintains that in Russia there is a similar »widespread social stratum,« that is, *intelligentsia*. She adds that »it is this stratum that has devoted itself for the past many years to the political education of the working people.«⁴⁵ But according to Luxemburg, this intelligentsia is not »the ideological representative of definite classes, that is, of the liberal bourgeoisie and the

43 Luxemburg: Revolution in Russia (January 22, 1905), in: Peter Hudis/Axel Fair-Schulz/William A. Pelz (Eds.): Complete Works of Rosa Luxemburg, London 2018, vol. 3, p. 54, my emphasis.

44 Gramsci attacks Croce's position and points out that philosophy and ideology in Croce become identical. Philosophy, in this regard, is not more than »a practical instrument for organization and action«. Gramsci refers to the organization of a party. As an intellectual, Benedetto Croce puts his philosophy as ideology at the ruling class' disposal. In the same passage mentioned here Gramsci, in this respect, criticizes also the ideologue of fascism, the Italian philosopher, Giovanni Gentile for whom force and consent are the same and for whom there is no difference between hegemony and dictatorship. Antonio Gramsci: Historical Belles-Lettres, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York 1992, pp. 270–271.

45 Luxemburg: Revolution in Russian (January 22, 1905), p. 54.

democratically minded petty bourgeoisie« as »previously was the case in Germany and France.«⁴⁶ This intelligentsia does not represent the ideological apparatus of the liberal bourgeoisie or a »vehicle of liberalism« but »of reactionary conservatism or, even worse, of a completely reactionary passivity.«⁴⁷ As can be seen in this passage, Luxemburg regards the intellectuals as the bearers of ideology and intermediators between two classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Luxemburg, in »The National Question,« describes »any ideology as only a superstructure of the material and class conditions of a given epoch.« But each ideology has its own logical development while having a relationship with the previous ideologies. Luxemburg admits that the ideological apparatus of bourgeois society is at the same time the means for the rise of the proletariat as a class to struggle for emancipation and thus for the abolition of bourgeois rule. This means that she recognizes the positive aspect of ideology that works for emancipation from the ruling class. The democratic institutions which serve the capitalist class and bourgeois parliamentarianism »are, at a certain level, an indispensable school of the proletariat's political and class maturity, a condition of organizing it into a Social Democratic party, of training it in open class struggle.«⁴⁸ Thereupon, she adds that the same can be applied to the sphere of intellectuals. Knowledge as ideology is the power of bourgeois society, but the proletariat can notice that knowledge can be power as ideology for them as well. This knowledge is seen as »a lever of class struggle« and as »the revolutionary consciousness of working masses.«

In »Stagnation and Progress of Marxism,« Luxemburg underlines the stagnation in Marxism because »the substance of that theory re-

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

48 Rosa Luxemburg: The National Question and Autonomy, in: Rosa Luxemburg Internet Archive, 16.5.2020 Online: www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1909/national-question/cho5.htm.

mains just where the two founders of scientific socialism left it.«⁴⁹ According to Luxemburg, it is necessary to improve Marxism, and one of the fields to be improved is Marx's materialist-dialectical conception of history because it remains »unelaborated and sketchy.«⁵⁰ Luxemburg believes that it is wrong to claim that there are no deficiencies in Marxism or that there are no gaps in Marxist theory. She tries to show the poverty of some Marxists who, for a long time, believed that the first volume of »Capital« had solved a fundamental economic problem but, in fact, without third and second volumes, Marx's theory of capitalism is incomplete. In this regard, it seems that Gramsci agrees with Luxemburg about the development of Marxism. In one of his notebooks (Q3, § 31), while discussing the development of Marxist theory, Gramsci refers to Luxemburg and writes that »One can say about the philosophy of Marxism what Luxemburg says about the economic theory:⁵¹ in the romantic period of struggle, of popular Sturm und Drang, all the interest is focused on the most immediate weapons or on problems of political tactics. But as soon as a new type of state comes into existence, it gives rise [concretely] to the problem of a new civilization and hence to the need to elaborate more general concepts, the most refined and decisive weapons.«⁵² Both Luxemburg and Gramsci underscore the use of Marx's theory as an essential mental weapon in the new cultural, political, economic and historical context. Both Luxemburg and Gramsci agree that in a new cultural, political and economic framework, it is necessary to create and elaborate the concepts and weapons of Marxist theory. In this regard, Gramsci addresses Antonio Labriola (1843–1904), who could put in circulation

49 Rosa Luxemburg: Stagnation and Progress of Marxism, in: Rosa Luxemburg Internet Archive, 16.5.2020. Online: www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1903/misc/stagnation.htm.

50 Ibid.

51 Gramsci refers to Luxemburg's »Stagnation and Progress of Marxism«.

52 Antonio Gramsci: Types of Periodicals, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, vol. 2, New York 1996, p. 31.

his approach to the philosophical problem as an original contribution to Marxism in terms of the Italian context.⁵³ However, Gramsci criticizes those who consider practices superior to theory and regard theory as a complement or an accessory of practice.⁵⁴ In »Stagnation,« Luxemburg affirms that »theory is an incomparable instrument of intellectual culture,«⁵⁵ which Gramsci would disagree with as long as he underlined the unity of theory and practice in terms of the philosophy of praxis.

Gramsci, in another Notebook (Q4, §46), again refers to Luxemburg's »Stagnation« and her emphasis on »the impossibility of dealing with certain questions of historical materialism insofar as they have not yet become actual for the course of history in general or for the history of a particular social group.«⁵⁶ Every era has its particularity, its currents and its conceptions of the world. The task of historical materialism is to deal with the problem of the particular historical period by creating its ideology through culture and philosophy as well as through struggle.

Luxemburg, in »Stagnation and Progress of Marxism,« talks about the function of bourgeois culture as ideology. She, therefore, writes that »in every class society, intellectual culture (science and art) is created by the ruling class; and the aim of this culture is in part to ensure the direct satisfaction of the needs of the social process, and in part to satisfy the mental needs of the members of the governing class.«⁵⁷ In the article, there are also some indications recalling the relationship between Gramsci's *trilogy*: hegemony, culture and ideology. As Gram-

53 Ibid.

54 Antonio Gramsci: Relation Between Science, Religion and Common Sense, in Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, New York 1992, p. 334.

55 Luxemburg: Stagnation and Progress of Marxism.

56 Antonio Gramsci: Philosophy – Politics – Economics, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, vol. 2, New York 1996, p. 197.

57 Luxemburg: Stagnation and Progress of Marxism.

sci says, the ruling classes create their own cultural means to sustain their hegemonies (Q29 § 3, 1935; Q6 § 10, 1930–1932). These hegemonic weapons are the intellectuals that Gramsci scrutinizes carefully in Notebook 4 (Q4 § 49, 1930–1932). Gramsci, here, writes that every class has their own intellectuals who keep their ideology going. In a letter to his sister-in-law Tatiana Schucht (1887–1943), written in 1931, he states that the main category of hegemony is the intellectual one.⁵⁸ While Luxemburg states that in class societies, the creator of art and science, i. e. of intellectual culture, is the dominant class, Gramsci makes similar statements when he refers to the creative class of Renaissance culture in the *Notebooks*.⁵⁹ The aim of this intellectual culture is to satisfy the social needs and to please the dominant aspect of the dominant class. It is in the service of the ruling classes.

It might not be surprising to find some similarities between Luxemburg's and Gramsci's thoughts on hegemony, ideology and culture. As understood from the »Notebooks« (Q16 § 9, 1933–1934), Gramsci read Luxemburg's »Stagnation and Progress of Marxism.«⁶⁰ Luxemburg, of course, does not clarify the concepts of ideology, culture, and intellectuals like Gramsci does. While the progressive classes are subjugated, they emerge with a new science and movements in the arts against the old corrupt culture, thereby trying to establish political sovereignty on intellectual dominance. This fact is similar to Gramsci's emphasis on the power of superstructure. In other words, as the field of activities, culture, including ideology, art, and science, determines the superstructure along with the political. Similar to Gramsci, Luxemburg, in »The National Question,« highlights the

58 Antonio Gramsci: Lettera a Tatiana Schucht (7.10.1931), in: Aldo Natoli/Chiara Daniele (Eds.): *Lettere: 1927–1935*, Torino 1997, p. 791.

59 Antonio Gramsci: *The State*, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York 1992, p. 264.

60 Antonio Gramsci: *The Philosophy of Praxis and Modern Culture*, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York 1992, p. 392.

development of intellectuals under the capitalist system, the intellectuals who render a service to educate the people in the interest of the dominant class. »Capitalist production requires not only specially trained production managers but universal, elementary, popular education, both to raise the general cultural level of the people which creates ever growing needs, and consequently demand for mass articles, and to develop a properly educated and intelligent worker capable of operating large-scale industry. Hence, bourgeois society everywhere, popular education and vocational training are indispensable. Consequently, we see public schools and numerous elementary, secondary, and college teachers, libraries, reading rooms, etc.«⁶¹

Luxemburg underlines that bourgeois society not only requires a certain production, exchange and communication for its existence and development but also reveals specific intellectual relations within the class contradictions.⁶² This cultural and intellectual development helps the dominant class to realize its *political hegemony*. The capitalist, being the dominant class, creates a new culture: »public education, development of science, the flowering of learning, journalism, a specifically geared art.«⁶³ The ruling class's intellectual and cultural development brings the appearance of bourgeois ideology. »In a word, the vulgar material process of capitalism creates a whole new ideological »superstructure« with an existence and development which are to some extent autonomous,« writes Luxemburg.⁶⁴ She, therefore, accentuates the importance of the proletariat's intellectual development. According to her, the conditions of class struggle are not only created and made possible »by modern political forms, democracy, parliamentarianism, but also open public life, with an open exchange of views and conflicting convictions, an intense intellectual life.«⁶⁵

61 Luxemburg: National Question and Autonomy.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid.

When Luxemburg writes that »revolutions are not ›made,«⁶⁶ she underscores the power of the masses who can introduce a serious change in society and who can transform it. She continues to mark that »great movements of the people are not produced according to technical recipes that repose in the pockets of the party leaders.«⁶⁷ The task and duty of the masses are to create a transformation. There is no ready recipe to direct the masses to rebel and to radically revolutionize the society, but »a number of economic, political and psychological factors« would decide »the success of the great popular movements.«⁶⁸ Luxemburg, as a great follower of Marx, demonstrates how she evaluates the popular movement in a scientific way.

Ideology, in short, for Luxemburg, is »the medium through which class struggle is conducted in theory,« as McCarney points out in »The Real World of Ideology« (1980).⁶⁹ The functions of ideas, beliefs, discourses and thoughts are important for the emergence of class consciousness. This account is a functionalist claim for which Gramsci criticizes Luxemburg along with other so-called Marxists.

Ideology: Gramsci

Unlike Marx, Gramsci, following Lenin, offers a different approach to the concept of ideology. As Giuseppe Cospito puts it, Gramsci does not place philosophy or idealism on its feet as Marx does but tries to transcend and overcome it.⁷⁰ Joseph V. Femia, in his book »Gramsci's Political Thought« (1981), provides a similar interpretation. Under the subheading, »Base and Superstructure: The Role of Consciousness,« he points out that Gramsci does not put speculative idealism on its

66 Luxemburg: Junius Pamphlet, p. 328.

67 Ibid.

68 Ibid.

69 Joe McCamey: *The Real World of Ideology*, Sussex 1980, p. 22.

70 Giuseppe Cospito: *Introduzione a Gramsci*, Genova 2015, p. 82.

feet as Marx does. Going further, he states that Gramsci has injected some Marxist elements in his theory.⁷¹ His interpretation seems exaggerated because asserting that Gramsci adds some Marxist elements to his doctrine means underestimating the place of Marx's philosophy in Gramsci's thought. Carlos Nelson Coutinho, a Brazilian Gramscian, affirms in »Lukács e Gramsci: un'analisi comparativa« (Lukács and Gramsci: A Comparative Analysis, 2012)⁷² that ideology for Gramsci, as for Lukács, is not only *false consciousness* but something that intervenes in the structure of social life and becomes almost a socio-ontological reality. Here, the interpretation of Coutinho is important for emphasizing the socio-ontological character of ideology. The latter, in this sense, is not estimated only as a tool, as can be found in Luxemburg. On the contrary, for Gramsci, ideology is a form of social existence, the social manifestation of being. Here, there appears to be a significant difference between Gramsci and Luxemburg.

In Gramsci's philosophy, there are different meanings of ideology. Here, two meanings might be mentioned: 1) ideology perceived as false consciousness, and 2) ideology as a vision or understanding of a world.⁷³ Gramsci refers to the second meaning of ideology more than to the first. It would be well worth mentioning Raymond Williams' three definitions of ideology, common in Marxist thought and close to Gramsci's view: 1) »a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular class or group«; 2) »a system of illusory beliefs – false ideas or false consciousness – which can be contrasted with true or scientific knowledge«; and 3) »the general process of the production of mean-

71 Joseph V. Femia: Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process, Oxford 1981, pp. 61–62.

72 Carlos Nelson Coutinho: Lukács e Gramsci: un'analisi comparativa, in *Critica marxista*, 1/2012, pp. 45–56.

73 Guido Liguori: Ideologia, in: Fabio Frosini/Guido Liguori (Eds.): *Le parole di Gramsci*, Roma 2010, p. 140.

ings and ideas.⁷⁴ The latter reminds us of *Weltanschauung*, the concept with which Gramsci describes Marxism.

Gramsci's philosophy has an ontological structure, just like Marx's. Therefore, it can be said that he does ontology. Gramsci does not ignore the Marxian elements or Marx's conceptions. He uses them for his socio-ontological analysis. This is not an ontology that can be found in the philosophies of Aristotle or Hegel, but a Marxian ontology that can be found in Marx's »Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.« Gramsci strikingly accentuates culture because he desires to understand the conditions in which the individuals try to exist, to prove their existences and to experience their own lives. Culture is an essential element for his ontology. Ideology, as an element of culture, is another critical element of existence. Moreover, it opens up a place for politics in this ontology.

Following Marx, Gramsci also views ideology as a superstructure element.⁷⁵ He refers to structure and superstructure in different parts of the »Prison Notebooks.« In Notebook 7, under the subheading »Struttura e superstruttura« [Structure and superstructure] (Q7 § 24, February 1931), Gramsci begins to describe how economy is the structure and ideology is the superstructure. Gramsci refuses any mechan-

74 Raymond Williams: *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford 1977, p. 55.

75 The article of Gianni Francioni, »L'estensione del concetto di ideologia in Gramsci e la genesi delle sue articolazioni«, clarifies the development of the category of ideology in »Notebooks« between 1929 and 1930. Francioni analyzes the category of ideology in relation to some fundamental concepts such as superstructure, philosophy, the conception of the world along with religion, common sense and folklore. He considers all these concepts as a member of a family of ideology in which he puts also hegemony, conformism, language, utopia, myth, etc. Gianni Francioni: *L'estensione del concetto di ideologia in Gramsci e la genesi delle sue articolazioni*, in: Francesca Antonini/Giuliano Guzzone (Eds.): *Materialismo Storico: L'estensione dell'ideologia folklore, religione, senso comune, buon senso, filosofi*, Vol. 5, Urbino 2018, pp. 130–149.

ical relationship between structure and superstructure.⁷⁶ For him, the material forces in the historical bloc are content and the form is ideology (Q7 § 21). This distinction between form and content becomes »just heuristic because material forces would be historically inconceivable without form and ideologies would be individual fantasies without material forces.«⁷⁷

According to Gramsci, ideology, not directly but indirectly and implicitly, is found in art, law, and economic activity. In other words, in the expression of all individual and collective life, ideology demonstrates itself. For him, ideology is the domain of the struggle of Marxism and Leninism.⁷⁸ Gramsci recalls that in Italy (other than Antonio Labriola), Marxism is studied by bourgeois intellectuals rather than by revolutionaries. They do this both to misrepresent Marxism and to use it for bourgeois politics.⁷⁹ They, in a few words, do so in order to spread their ideology and to defame the opposing one. Unlike Marx, Gramsci sets forth that a party must focus on the field of ideology and systematize its activities in the ideological sphere.⁸⁰

Gramsci, in his writings, seeks to reveal the nature and role of ideology along with politics in the process of history. Before everything else, he denies »the traditional mechanistic interpretation of cause and effect in the relation between structure and superstructure.«⁸¹ The noble cause of his theory is to comprehend and to reflect upon the culture in which the working class was defeated and fascism came to power. The culture as a superstructure is a determining and crucial

76 Giuseppe Cospito: *The Rhythm of Thought in Gramsci: A Diachronic Interpretation of Prison Notebooks*, Leiden 2016, p. 23.

77 Antonio Gramsci: *Validity of Ideologies*, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): *Prison Notebooks*, Vol. 3, New York 2007, p. 172.

78 Antonio Gramsci: *L'Ordine nuovo* (May 1925), in: Eugenio Garin: *Intelletuali del XX secolo*, Roma 1987, p. 322–323.

79 *Ibid.*, p. 323.

80 Szabó: *Dittatura*, p. 497.

81 Joseph A. Woolcock: *Politics, Ideology and Hegemony in Gramsci's Theory*, in: *Social and Economic Studies* 3/1985, vol. 14, pp. 200–201.

element for the comprehension of ideology, which is settled in civil society. Gramsci's conception of civil society is different from that of Marx. He writes as follows:

»[...] what we can do for the moment, is to fix two major superstructural »levels«, the one that can be called »civil society«, that is, the ensemble of organisms commonly called »private«, and that of »political society« or the State. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of »hegemony« which the dominant group exercises throughout society, and on the other hand to that of »direct domination« or command exercised through the State and »juridical« government.«⁸²

According to Gramsci, the distinction between civil society and political society is methodical but not organic. He condemns the idea that economic activity belongs to civil society and that political society does not have to intervene in its regulation. But for him, in the concrete historical life, political society and civil society are the same (Q4, § 38).

Civil society, in Gramsci's philosophy, includes both structure and superstructure. For both Marx and Gramsci, civil society is the theatrical scene of history. Gramsci places the hegemonic relations in civil society, in which one can find the bourgeois hegemony. It might be said that Gramsci's theory is based on the theory or concept of hegemony. This theory includes many elements such as classes, ideology, the theory of intellectuals, and the theory of culture/new culture. Ideology is the crucial element to understand the theory of hegemony. Moreover, ideology is fundamental to construct an intellectual and moral structure of the hegemony of the working class. »For the Italian Marxist theorist, Antonio Gramsci, the ruling intellectual and cultural forces of the era constitute a form of hegemony, or domina-

82 Antonio Gramsci: *The Intellectuals*, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York 1992, pp. 3–23.

tion by ideas and cultural forms which induce consent to the rule of the leading groups in a society.«⁸³ Culture as an element of ideology paves the way to the hegemony of classes. Gramsci, in this regard, describes ideology as follows: »[...] material forces are the content and ideologies the form, though the distinction between the form and the content has purely ›didactic‹ value, since the material forces would be inconceivable historically without form, and ideologies would be individual fancies without the material forces.«⁸⁴ According to Gramsci, the meaning of ideology has changed throughout history. In the »Prison Notebooks,« Gramsci writes that »›Ideology‹ was an aspect of ›sensationalism‹, i. e. eighteenth-century French materialism.«⁸⁵ It was the science of ideas and, as a scientific method, the analysis was applied and therefore it means an *analysis of ideas* and *investigation of the origin of ideas*. Unlike Marx, Gramsci characterizes ideology as science, the science of ideas. He affirms that the concept of ideology has changed from the meaning of *science of ideas* to a *specific system of ideas*⁸⁶ that needs to be examined historically.⁸⁷ Ideology, for him, must be analyzed historically based on the philosophy of praxis.⁸⁸

In order to establish his theory of the historical bloc, Gramsci needed to discover the real relation of superstructure to structure, of form to content. Gramsci, therefore, attempted to uncover the following misunderstanding of ideology: »1. ideology is identified as distinct from the structure, and it is asserted that it is not ideology that

83 Meenakshi Gigi Durham/Douglas M. Kellner (Eds.): *Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks*, Oxford 2012, p. 3.

84 Antonio Gramsci: *The Concept of ›Ideology‹*, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, New York 1992, pp. 375–377. This passage is from the Prison Notebook 4 (Q4), § 35. See also: Antonio Gramsci: *Ideologies*, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): *Prison Notebooks*, Vol. 3, New York 2007, pp. 170–171

85 Gramsci: ›Ideology‹, p. 375.

86 *Ibid.*, pp. 375–376.

87 *Ibid.*, p. 376

88 *Ibid.*

changes the structures but vice versa; 2. it is asserted that a given political solution is ›ideological‹ – i. e. that it is not sufficient to change the structure, although it thinks that it can do so; it is asserted that it is useless, stupid, etc.; 3. one then passes to the assertion that every ideology is ›pure‹ appearance, useless, stupid, etc.« (Q7 § 19).⁸⁹

Engels, in a letter written to Franz Mehring on July 14, 1893, describes the misconception of ideology as follows: »Ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, indeed, but with a false consciousness. The real motives impelling him remain unknown to him, otherwise it would not be an ideological process at all.«⁹⁰ In the continuation of his letter, he states that ideologues are wrong about them (Marx and Engels) because, in reality, they both do not think that the different ideological areas involved in history have an independent historical development. Hence, they accept that these various ideological areas have a significant impact on history. Dialectic does not deny mutual influence. However, their thoughts are based on the »undialectical conception of cause and effect as rigidly opposite poles,«⁹¹ so they are mistaken. According to Engels, the reason for their misconception is that they »deliberately forget that once an historic element has been brought into the world by other elements, ultimately by economic facts, it also reacts in its turn and may react on its environment and even on its own causes.«⁹² The multi-faceted effect of the events and phenomena, or the mutual effect, therefore, is forgotten. Gramsci evaluates this letter of Engels in his »Notebooks.« According to Guido Liguori, Engels' ideas produce a positive perception of ideology as an effective engine by Gramsci.⁹³

89 Ibid.

90 Friedrich Engels: Engels to Franz Mehring, 14.7.1893, in: Marx Engels Internet Archive, 16.5.2020. Online: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1893/letters/93_07_14.htm.

91 Ibid.

92 Ibid.

93 Liguori: *Ideologia*, p. 134.

When one looks at the terms used by Engels, the expression »having any effect on history«⁹⁴ gives to Gramsci the idea that ideology does affect the motor power influencing history. Thereafter, Gramsci starts to have a positive perception of ideology.⁹⁵

Gramsci, in his pre-prison essay »Astrattismo e intransigenza,« written in 1918, criticizes Marx for making fun of ideologies. He, in these early writings, states that Marx himself was an ideologue as well as a real political and revolutionary man.⁹⁶ In his *Notebooks*, Gramsci's approach to ideology and his critique of Marxism become much clearer. For Gramsci, Marxism is a moment in modern culture (un momento della cultura moderno). He writes that one of the greatest weaknesses of immanentist philosophies in general consists precisely in not having been able to create an ideological unity between the low (vulgar/base) and the high (top), between the »simple« (*semplici*) and the intellectuals (QII, § 12).

94 Engels to Mehring.

95 Fabio Frosini believes that Gramsci in »Notebooks« seeks to succeed in two tasks: on the one than, he deals with redeeming Marx from the crocean influence, on the other hand he wants to positively develop a theory of ideology without reducing it only into a mere falsity. Fabio Frosini: *Ideologie, superstrutture, linguaggi nei Quaderni del carcere di Antonio Gramsci*, in: Francesca Antonini/Giuliano Guzzone (Eds.): *Materialismo Storico: L'estensione dell'ideologia folklore, religione, senso comune, buon senso, filosofi*, Vol. 5, Urbino 2018, p. 51.

96 Antonio Gramsci: *Astrattismo e intransigenza* (May 1918), in: Sergio Caviglioglio (Ed.): *Il nostro Marx: 1918–1919*, Torino 1984, p. 17. Gramsci, in this article, writes that: »Marx laughs at ideologies, but he is an ideologue as a current politician, as a revolutionary. The truth is that ideologies are laughable when they are pure chatter, when they are aimed at creating confusions, deluding and enslaving potentially antagonistic social energies, to an end that is foreign to these energies. [...] But as a revolutionary, that is, a current man of action, he cannot disregard ideologies and practical schemes, which are potential historical entities, in formation.«

The following quotation is worth repeating at length here because Gramsci explicitly distinguishes himself from Marx regarding the notion of ideology:

»The source of Croce's theory on ideologies – recently repeated in his review of Malagodi's booklet in *La Critica* – is obviously Marxist: ideologies are practical constructs, they are instruments of political leadership. Croce's theory, however, reproduces only one part, the critical-destructive part, of Marxist theory. *For Marx, ›ideologies‹ are anything but appearances and illusions: they are an objective and operative reality; they just are not the mainspring of history, that's all. It is not ideologies that create social reality but social reality, in its productive structure, that creates ideologies. How could Marx have thought that superstructures are appearance and illusion? Even his theories are a superstructure. Marx explicitly states that humans become conscious of their tasks on the ideological terrain of the superstructures, which is hardly a minor affirmation of ›reality‹, and the aim of his theory is also, precisely, to make a specific social group ›become conscious‹ of its own tasks, its own power, its own coming-into-being. But he destroys the ›ideologies‹ of the hostile social groups; those ›ideologies‹ are in fact practical instruments of political domination over the rest of society, and Marx shows how they are meaningless because they are in contradiction with actual reality. Intellectually, Croce is in a bad position.»⁹⁷*

It seems that the difference between Marx and Gramsci regarding our argument, i.e. the concept of ideology, is that Gramsci in the »Notebooks« designs and establishes ideology as a conception of the world (for Marx, it is bourgeois ideology) and as a place of the constitution of collective subjectivity, actually, for all fundamental classes. Ideology has a constitutive role not only in the revolutionary struggle

97 Antonio Gramsci: Croce and Marx, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): *Prison Notebooks*, vol. 2, New York 1996, p. 157, my emphasis.

but also for the ruling class in the struggle from liberal-democratic to authoritarian-conservative.

The ideological tools in a constitutive manner can be comprehended through an analysis of some current political regimes and their policies which, in general, aim to maintain the traditional view of society, which is conservative. It is especially schools and the media, in this respect, that take this in charge. These institutions remind the citizens of their ancestry, how they can remain faithful to their ancestry, and how they can resemble them instead of developing the mentality of citizenship.⁹⁸ In this way, they constitute their hegemony in an ideological sphere. The school is the main institution that the traditionalist is quite aware of.

Conclusion

For Gramsci, Marxism has nourished and determined some currents, but this situation is unfortunately overlooked, especially by the »official« representatives of Marxism (Q4 § 3).⁹⁹ According to him, Marxism includes a dual composition. On the one hand, certain elements of Marxism are directly and indirectly absorbed by some idealist currents, such as Croce, Sorel, Bergson and pragmatists (Q4 § 3).¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, the »official« Marxists are engaged in finding a philosophy that would include Marxism, and they find it either in the idealistic currents of Kantianism, as Max Adler did, or in the modern derivative of vulgar materialist philosophy (Q4 § 3).¹⁰¹ Referring to

98 Ali Mezghani: *Tamamlanmamış Devlet: Arap Ülkelerinde Hukuk Sorunu*, İstanbul 2015, p. 153.

99 Antonio Gramsci: *Two Aspects of Marxism*, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): *Prison Notebooks*, vol. 2, New York 1996, p. 140.

100 Ibid.

101 Ibid., p. 140–141.

Labriola at this point, he insists that his Marxism is an independent and original philosophy and that it is separated from the two.

Gramsci states that a party should focus on the field of ideology and make its activities systematic in the ideological sphere. In this area of ideology, it must be a militant task to raise awareness of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. In contrast to Marx, he does not view ideology only as false consciousness. Luxemburg, on the other hand, considers ideology as false consciousness but, as seen in some of her writings, she seems closer to Gramsci than to Marx regarding the concept of ideology when her understanding of ideology is evaluated in terms of her theory of consciousness and her conception of intellectuals: the relationship between the intellectuals and the masses. However, it is worth mentioning that even if Marx and Engels regard (bourgeois) ideology as false consciousness and consider it as »a system of beliefs founded on a class position,«¹⁰² this does not mean that they deny one of Williams' classifications of ideologies mentioned above: »the general process of the production of meanings and ideas.« The contributions of Marxists such as Luxemburg, Gramsci, and Lenin can be seen as a kind of development of Marx's own ideas and those of Marxism or an application of them in specific and different historical and national contexts. This continuity with Marx's ideas emerges by a harsh critique, a scientific interpretation and a contradiction or conflict with Marxist elements. To conclude, one can respect Lenin's differentiation between socialist ideology as scientific and bourgeois ideology as one-sided and partial. The post-Marxist changes radically begin with Luxemburg and Marx but with a departure from classical Marxist understanding. The change and transformation from the classical Marxist tradition resulting in this *critical Marxism* at the end of the 19th century relied on a body of theory and praxis in relation to ideology.

102 Kai Nielsen: The Concept of Ideology: Some Marxist and Non-Marxist Conceptualizations, in: *Rethinking Marxism* 4/1989, vol. 2, p. 148.

Works Cited

- Chambre, Henri: Soviet Ideology, in: *Soviet Studies*, 3/1967, pp. 314–327.
- Cospito, Giuseppe: *Introduzione a Gramsci*, Genova 2015.
- Cospito, Giuseppe: *The Rhythm of Thought in Gramsci: A Diachronic Interpretation of Prison Notebooks*, Leiden 2016.
- Coutinho, Carlos Nelson: Lukács e Gramsci: un'analisi comparativa, in *Critica marxista*, 1/2012, pp.45–56.
- Durham, Meenakshi Gigi/Douglas M. Kellner (Eds.): *Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks*, Oxford 2012.
- Engels, Friedrich: Engels to Bernstein, 2–3 November 1882, in *Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels: Marx/Engels Collected Works (MECW): Marx-Engels: Letters: 1880–1883*, Moscow 1992, Vol. 46, pp. 353–358.
- Engels, Friedrich: Engels to Franz Mehring, 14.7.1893, in: *Marx Engels Internet Archive*, 16.5.2020: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1893/letters/93_07_14.htm.
- Femia, Joseph V.: *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process*, Oxford 1981.
- Francioni, Gianni: L'estensione del concetto di ideologia in Gramsci e la genesi delle sue articolazioni, in: *Francesca Antonini/Giuliano Guzzone (Eds.): Materialismo Storico: L'estensione dell'ideologia folclore, religione, senso comune, buon senso, filosofi*, Vol. 5, Urbino 2018, pp. 130–149.
- Frosini, Fabio: Ideologie, superstrutture, linguaggi nei Quaderni del carcere di Antonio Gramsci, in: *Francesca Antonini/Giuliano Guzzone (Eds.): Materialismo Storico: L'estensione dell'ideologia folclore, religione, senso comune, buon senso, filosofi*, Vol. 5, Urbino 2018, pp. 150–187.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Valentino Gerratana (Ed.): *Quaderni del Carcere*, Vols. 1–2–3, Torino 1977.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Lettera a Tatiana Schucht (7.10.1931), in: *Aldo Natoli/Chiara Daniele (Eds.): Lettere: 1927–1935*, Torino 1997.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Statement of the Problem, in: *Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York 1992, p. 381–382.

- Gramsci, Antonio: The Intellectuals, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York 1992, pp. 3–24.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Historical Belles-Lettres, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York 1992, pp. 270–272.
- Gramsci, Antonio: The State, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York 1992, pp. 257–264.
- Gramsci, Antonio: The Philosophy of Praxis and Modern Culture, in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York 1992, pp. 388–399.
- Gramsci, Antonio: The Concept of 'Ideology', in: Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, New York 1992, pp. 375–377.
- Antonio Gramsci: Relation between science, religion and common sense, in Quintin Hoare/Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (Eds.): Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, New York 1992, p. 326–343.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Croce and Marx, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, Vol. 2, New York 1996, pp. 156–158.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Types of Periodicals, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, Vol. 2, New York 1996, pp. 30–31.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Two Aspects of Marxism, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, Vol. 2, New York 1996, pp. 140–144.
- Antonio Gramsci: Philosophy – Politics – Economics, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, Vol. 2, New York 1996, pp. 196–197.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Validity of Ideologies, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, Vol. 3, New York 2007, pp. 171–172.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Ideologies, in: Joseph A. Buttigieg (Ed.): Prison Notebooks, Vol. 3, New York 2007, pp. 170–171.
- Gramsci, Antonio: L'Ordine nuovo (May 1925), in: Eugenio Garin: Intellettuali del XX secolo, Roma 1987.
- Gramsci, Antonio: Astrattismo e intransigenza (May 1918), in: Sergio Caprioglio (Ed.): Il nostro Marx: 1918–1919, Torino 1984, pp. 15–19.

- Gramsci, Antonio: *Vita Politica Internazionale*, in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, pp. 101–102.
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Cronache Dell'»Ordine Nuovo«* [XII], in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, pp. 189–190.
- Gramsci, Antonio: *Verso Nuove Istituzioni. Postilla (August 1919)*, in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, p. 191.
- Antonio Gramsci: *Il Partito Comunista (September 1920)*, in: Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci (Eds.): *L'Ordine Nuovo 1919–1920*, Torino 1987, pp. 654–661.
- Kellner, Douglas: *TV, Ideology and Emancipatory Popular Culture*, in: *Socialist Review* 45/1979, pp. 15–53.
- Lenin, Vladimir: *What is To Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, in: *Collected Works: May 1901 – February 1902*, Moscow 1961, Vol. 5, pp. 347–521.
- Liguori, Guido: *Ideologia*, in: Fabio Frosini/Guido Liguori (Eds.): *Le parole di Gramsci*, Roma 2010, pp. 131–150.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *Up-And-Coming Men in Russia [Die kommenden Männer in Russland] (1905)*, in: Peter Hudis/Axel Fair-Schulz/William A. Pelz (Eds.): *Complete Works of Rosa Luxemburg*, London 2018, Vol. 3, pp. 167–172.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *The Junius Pamphlet (1915)*, in: Peter Hudis/Kevin B. Anderson (Eds.): *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader (RLR)*, New York 2004 pp. 312–342.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *The Russian Revolution (1918)*, in: Peter Hudis/Kevin B. Anderson (Eds.): *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader*, New York 2004, pp. 281–312.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *Proletarian Women (1914)*, in: Peter Hudis/Kevin B. Anderson (Eds.): *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader*, New York 2004, pp. 243–248.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *Revolution in Russia (January 22, 1905)*, in: Peter Hudis/Axel Fair-Schulz/William A. Pelz (Eds.): *Complete Works of Rosa Luxemburg*, London 2018, Vol. 3, pp. 51–59.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *Lo Sciopero Generale – Il Partito e I Sindacati*, Milano 1919.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, in: *The National Question*, Rosa Luxemburg Archive, 16.5.2020. Online: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1909/national-question/choi.htm>.

- Luxemburg, Rosa: *The National Question and Autonomy*, in: Rosa Luxemburg Internet Archive, 16.5.2020. Online: www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1909/national-question/cho5.htm.
- Luxemburg, Rosa: *Stagnation and Progress of Marxism*, in: Rosa Luxemburg Internet Archive, 16.5.2020. Online: www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1903/misc/stagnation.htm.
- Mardin, Şerif: *İdeoloji*, İstanbul 1997.
- Marx, Karl /Friedrich Engels: *The German Ideology*, New York 1998.
- Marx, Karl: *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Chicago 1904.
- McCamey, Joe: *The Real World of Ideology*, Sussex 1980.
- Mezghani, Ali: *Tamamlanmamış Devlet: Arap Ülkelerinde Hukuk Sorunu*, İstanbul 2015.
- Miliband, Ralph: *Marxism and Politics*, Oxford 1977.
- Nielsen, Kai: *The Concept of Ideology: Some Marxist and Non-Marxist Conceptualizations*, in: *Rethinking Marxism* 4/1989, vol. 2, pp. 146–173.
- Rjazanov, David: *Karl Marx homme, penseur et révolutionnaire*, Paris 1928.
- Szabó, Tibor: *Dittatura, Democrazia e Fattore Soggettivo nel Pensiero di Luxemburg, Gramsci e Lukács*, in: *Il Politico* 3/1987, pp. 485–503.
- Williams, Raymond: *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford 1977.
- Woolcock, Joseph A.: *Politics, Ideology and Hegemony in Gramsci's Theory*, in: *Social and Economic Studies* 3/1985, vol. 14, pp. 199–210.