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ANTONIO GRAMSCI ON IDEOLOGY

So far in our treatment of ideology we have been centering around its negative connotation only. Marx had been primarily concerned with ideology as false consciousness, and the intellectual endeavour of both Marx and Engels was to envisage concrete social conditions were it becomes possible for man to get rid of this age old malady of false consciousness: that which fills human imagination spurious phenomena by concealing the true nature of reality, which is contradiction.

In later Marx, we find the solution he gives. To eliminate ideology as false consciousness, Marx advocates practice. Thus all understandings points to one direction, revolutionary practice. It is here that two great revolutionaries and philosophers assume importance, and they are Mao-tse-tung and the thinker in question here Antonio Gramsci.

Marx himself suggests that revolutionary practice depends much on yet another type of
ideology, which may be called as scientific ideology or revolutionary ideology. It is at this point that ideology starts assuming its positive connotation, as operating in a constructive manner, to a definite constructive goal. When we read Neo-Marxists and their understanding of the concept of ideology, it is in this positive sense that they approach and treat the concept of ideology. However, for all practical purposes in our day to day world, ideology is used in the positive meaning only.

Hence it may be proper to point out that the concept of ideology had undergone a drastic change in the manner of an evolution, an intellectual evolution. To my mind this evolution of the concept of ideology is an integral part of the Marxist concept of historical necessity. Ideology could not have remained in its negative meaning only; it had to move forward in time and evolve itself. Or else it would have been a dead concept. However, I shall return to this point later in the ensuing chapter.

The road to Antonio Gramsci form Marx can not be taken as a straight one. From Marx, when we go to Gramsci, at least we have to go via another.
veteran dialectician, Vladimir Illivich Lenin. It, however does not mean that I am under estimating the importance of Plekhanov or Bukharin, on the other hand, I was attributing only relative importance for my purpose, which is precise. Thus an understanding of Gramsci calls for a brief explanation of Lenin, the first Communist, if I am permitted to call him so.

For both Lenin and Gramsci, history is very important. They understand history as a kind of evolution. It is an evolution of social formations; in the sense that one form of society gives rise to another, another and yet another. Such process is often called a historico-natural process, because it is only natural. For history to evolve; the evolution is spontaneous with the progress in time. This evolution may be called as an upward movement of history with the progression in time.

For Lenin, socialism is inevitable. Socialism is inevitable not due to any reason external to capitalism, on the other hand, socialism is inevitable by virtue of the very laws of capitalist development. In other words, the seeds of
destruction of capitalism is contained in capitalism itself.

In Marx we have seen that revolutionary practice as a remedy to ideology as concealing reality. Lenin also is found of speaking of practice. But though Lenin is found recognising the importance of practice, practice in Lenin stands qualified. Here practice is a conditioned practice, which is conditioned by or determined by economic structure. The economic structure of the society ultimately becomes condition to practice. Man's consciousness too is not different. Man opens his eyes, looks around himself, sees and learns about the world, and over and above, becomes aware of things in a definite, given, socio-economic conditions. These conditions vary in definite strata of society, that is, it differs from class to class. Class structure of a society is primarily due to economic structure. Therefore, we can say that practice and consciousness are instruments of what may be called as structural determinism. Thus one can see economic determinism at the root of all other things.

Here Lenin treats science as an exception. To Lenin, science is indetermined. He says that

--146--
socialism and class struggle are arising from different premises, neither of them deriving one from the other. Science is produced outside class struggle; Lenin sees science as the inevitable outcome of development of philosophy. It is the result of intellectual evolution of philosophical and economic theories. Thus science is not determined by anything else.

With the growth and development of science the role of consciousness in general also changes. By and by consciousness becomes no longer mere reflections of economic structure. Lenin says that the spontaneous consciousness of the working class reflects bourgeois ideology. Lenin says that the bourgeois ideology

"is older than the socialist ideology, so it is more developed, and possesses more means of dissemination". <1>

The presence of bourgeois ideology in the working class consciousness has also a logical character. It is logically necessary for the
bourgeois ideology to be present in the consciousness of the proletariat for all that bourgeois ideology is worth. This is precisely what makes it bourgeois ideology; otherwise it may be nothing.

Making a difference between base and superstructure, and finding the place of ideology in superstructure, it can be said that superstructure plays an important role in determining working class consciousness. True to its nature, bourgeois ideology mediates in the negative sense. It functions as concealing reality to working class and diverting the true nature of problems or contradictions into spurious directions. Bourgeois ideology stands in between proletarian consciousness and reality. On the other hand, science (Scientific ideology) mediates in a positive sense. It not only makes working class aware of reality, but also removes the hang over of ideology of the bourgeois. It is science that liberates the working class from their spontaneous consciousness.

We have seen earlier that science doesn't arise in connection with class struggle, nor its
objective is class practice. It may be so with relations of production. Yet we see the role of science, strangely enough, appearing as determining revolutionary practice. As a result, practice continues to be determination of some external elements. This is very clear in two of Lenin's works. In the book "WHAT THE FRIENDS OF PEOPLE ARE" we see practice as the instrument of economic necessity. In his later work What is to be Done? practice appears as the instrument of consciousness, whether it appears as bourgeois ideology, or it appears as science.

We can see that Engels is treating the concept of ideology in the polarity of base and superstructure. But though Engels is treating the concept of ideology within the polarity of base and superstructure, this particular treatment of Engels does not innovate the basic negative meaning which he and Marx gave to the concept of ideology in the "German Ideology". Though ideology appears as a reflection of economic relations in consciousness, Engels spontaneously asserts that this relation appears inverted. To quote Engels:
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"this inversion, which, so long as it remains unrecognized, forms what we call 'ideological outlook', influences in its turn the economic basis.......". (2)

However, this treatment of Engels was definitely a step towards progress in the evolution of the concept of ideology. The way preference was given to the concept of ideology was moving closer to a tradition which was soon to stop treating ideology with its inverted character. This happens due to the fact that the relationship between base and superstructure refers not just to distorted forms of consciousness; but, to all forms of consciousness. All products of thoughts, valid or invalid are determined by the base. In the superstructure, there were proletarian ideology, as there were bourgeois ideology; no matter which one was more prominent or popular; because, prominence or popularity can only be for some limited time if it is contrary to historical forces.

Lenin synthesises this double movement at the level of superstructure. He started using the concept of ideology with innovation, ideology as
a set of cognitions and theories which expressing the class interest. In his work, "What is to be done?", one can find the abundant usage of "socialist ideology" as against "bourgeois ideology".

As a result ideology came to represent class interests. Ideology representing class interest could be called as class ideologies. Now the very nature of class ideology is that they should not have any inherent characteristic which makes it a necessary inversion, particularly so in case of working class. How can a working class ideology, which represents the interest of the proletariats have an inherent character which necessarily makes it an inversion, which produces an inverted consciousness, of an inverted world? It will be logically inconsistent.

With this particular expression of ideology, by now ideology equipped new meaning. Now the concept of ideology can be seen as encompassing both meaning: it encompasses distorted consciousness as well as true forms of consciousness. As a result of this, by itself,
ideology does not have any negative meaning now. The question of falsity of bourgeois ideology is not due to anything intrinsic in the concept of ideology. On the contrary, its falsity is due to the bourgeois origin of the concept of ideology.

Here, Lenin makes two important contributions. On the first place, he expresses a particular development which over-stresses the polarity of base and superstructure. Secondly, he also makes an implicit expression of a political practice which goes to give credibility to the theory–practice polarity. Later the question of theory and practice drew much attention from Gramsci.

It is at this point that Antonio Gramsci gets attracted to the concept of ideology, and he takes up the analysis of the concept of ideology for this precise purpose, despite Gramsci’s opposition to the positivist interpretations of Marx and his concept of ideology. Gramsci finds that ideology as a superstructure is compatible with ideology as a class ideology. When ideology makes a transition from ideology to class ideology, ideology was
undergoing drastic evolutionary change; a kind of reconstruction in its meaning and connotation. Due to the move from ideology to class ideology, it looses its original negative meaning which Marx and Engels gave in German Ideology, and acquires a new meaning which is positive; in the sense that ideology stands to make working class conscious of contradictions instead of concealing it as it was done earlier.

For Marx, as we have seen that ideology stands for concealing contradiction in the interest of bourgeois. But, one may ask the question; as to what makes an ideology valid or invalid? Could it be said that a mere class origin can be treated as the criterion of evaluating ideology?

It seems different to me. What might make an ideology valid or invalid is not due to its origin in such and such class, but the fact that to which class interest a particular ideology stands for and functions. It is the class interest an ideology represents and the class in whose interest it functions (naturally, there cannot be any contradiction in this case) makes it valid or not. For example, an ideology may have its origin
in bourgeois class, but it may truly represent proletarian class interest and may stand for the working class. To this extent, it would be ridiculous to call that ideology as not valid simply due to the fact that it originated in the bourgeois class. So it is not a mere class origin which makes an ideology valid or not valid.

Mao and Gramsci are particularly significant in the context of developing societies. They have laid much premium on the ideological superstructure, and both Mao and Gramsci argued that a strategy of revolution should begin and unfold from the ideological superstructure. The endeavour of attaching primacy to the ideological superstructure ran against another school of Marxists lead by Plekhanov, which insisted on economic determinism. However, it will be wrong to argue that Gramsci was contradicting Plekhanov, given the spirit of Marxism. Because there is no sanctity about uniliniarity or a particular symmetry of application of Marxist principles and tenets. Marxism is dynamic, it is growing and evolving, and therefore, it is essentially a store house of different methods, and as Lenin said,
"There cannot be any ultimate and ordered blueprint for achieving revolution". All would depend on historical and contextual specifications which should go in no less measure into forging of a revolutionary strategy for a given society.

Gramsci discovers the revolutionary starting point in the ideological superstructure and advocates the necessity of creating an evolutionary brand of intellectuals who are to be assigned the responsibility of educating the masses in proletarian ideology, to fight until they destroy the hegemony of the ruling class ideology. Speaking about revolution Gramsci contains that an intellectual revolution is not performed by simply confronting one philosophy with another. It is not just the ideas that require to be confronted, but the social forces behind them, and more directly the ideology these forces have generated and which has become part of what Gramsci calls "Common Sense".

It is only natural that the ruling class ideology becomes a part of "common sense". It is natural and psychological that any prevailing
ideology is taken as granted because of its familiarity. History shows us that most of men accept things on the basis of familiarity. Gramsci says that

"In acquiring one's conception of the world one always belongs to a particular grouping which is that of all the social elements which shares the same mode of thinking and acting. We all are conformists of some conformism or other, always man in the mass or collective man". <3>

As a result, it is only natural for men to carry the hegemony of the ruling class ideology as a part of their "common sense".

Assuming the importance of the role of intellectuals in revolution, Gramsci asserts that it is the business of "philosophy of practice" (Marxism — Gramsci could not use Marxian terminologies in prison for the fear of censorship and coercion) to create a brand of intellectuals
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who would educate the masses in proletarian ideology. But he also recognizes the magnitude of the task. On the first place, Philosophy of praxis itself must stand firm because for philosophy of praxis, the challenges are from many directions and are powerful. Secondly, it has to deal with age old beliefs and "convictions" which got rooted into the minds of the mass. Recognizing the difficulty in creating an organic group of intellectuals, Gramsci says that philosophy of praxis

"......is still going through its populist phase creating a group of independent intellectuals is not an easy thing; it requires a long process with actions and reactions, coming together and drifting apart and the growth of very numerous and complex new formations". (4)

It is further difficult because people are unable to go beyond a limit. They are unable to go beyond and comprehend reality due to various compulsions under which they exist. Gramsci says that they are unable to go beyond certain point because there
"...still remains below the level of the possession, the state and of the real exercise of hegemony over the whole of society which alone permits a certain organic equilibrium in the development of the intellectual group". (5)

Thus, the task of creating a group of intellectuals becomes very challenging. Only a society which has an organic equilibrium which doesn't have the hegemony of the ruling class ideology is conducive in creating a revolutionary brand of intellectuals. On the other hand, creation of organic intellectuals are aimed at educating the masses in proletarian ideology, so that the hegemony of the ruling class ideology should be destroyed. This position of Gramsci amounts to a paradox, on the face of it. In reality, the paradox, let me call it as the "paradox of hegemony" is only apparent, taking into consideration another factor in which Gramsci was greatly interested, the aspect of historical maturity. Thus it only proves the extent of difficulty in creating a revolutionary brand of intellectuals.
Organisation of the mass depends on yet another aspect, which Gramsci calls a theory practice nexus. Many places in "Quaderni" Gramsci is found speaking of the unity of theory and practice. And for the theory practice nexus, what we need again are the intellectuals. Gramsci says that there can be no organisation of the proletariat without the theoretical aspect of the theory practice nexus being distinguished concretely by the existence of a group of people "specialised" in conceptual and philosophical elaboration of ideas. <6>

Thereby it is utmost importance for Gramsci to create the group of people who are specialised in conceptual and philosophical elaboration of ideas, who are nothing but the intellectuals.

Creating a revolutionary brand of intellectuals, therefore, becomes absolutely inevitable. The question is, how to create a revolutionary brand of intellectuals? Gramsci assigns this task of creating a revolutionary brand
of intellectuals to nothing less than philosophy of praxis itself. Further, Gramsci assigns one more task to the philosophy of praxis, that is educating the popular masses. To quote him

"The philosophy of praxis had two tasks to perform: to combat modern ideologies in their most refined form, in order to be able to constitute its own group of independent intellectuals; and to educate the popular masses whose culture was medieval. This second task, which was fundamentalism, given the character of the new philosophy (Marxism), has absorbed all its strength............

............And yet the new philosophy was born precisely to supersede the highest cultural manifestation of the age, classical German philosophy, and to create a group of intellectuals specific to the new social group whose conception of the world it was". <7>

Thus, creation of revolutionary brand of intellectuals, either for combating the sophistication of bourgeois ideology, or combating hegemony, or organising proletariat to march towards a revolution, becomes one of the important tasks of the philosophy of praxis. Finding
solutions to all erstwhile maladies Gramsci prescribes Marxism to all; particularly in societies such as developing ones. He says that

"The philosophy of praxis presupposes all cultural past....... The philosophy of praxis is the crowning point of this entire movement of intellectual and moral reformation, made dialectical in the contrast between popular culture and high culture. ........ it is a philosophy which is also politics, and a politics which is also philosophy ". <8>

For Gramsci, Marxism becomes the crowning point in all intellectual endeavours; rather a kind of culmination of reason. This philosophy does not merely stay behind clouds; it rather comes down to concrete situations with solutions concrete. Perhaps it may be due to the practical sphere in Marxian philosophical frame work that Gramsci coined the expression philosophy of praxis substituting for the term Marxism to evade censors eyes in the prison.

True that for Gramsci the philosophy of praxis is at the zenith, but then he finds it as a
solution to rather every problems. Speaking about the unity of theory and practice, he says that

".....in the most recent developments of the philosophy of praxis the exploration and refinement of the concept of unity of theory and practice is still only at an early stage. There still remain residues of mechanism, since people speak about theory as a "complement" or an "accessory" of practice, or as the handmaid of practice". <9>

Gramsci is against treating theory as a handmaid of practice. Practice that is not based on theory, on the other hand is empty. It is a full fledged theory that gives rise to meaningful practice. But if the theory is not practiced or impractical, then such theory is as good as not existing. Marxism is a theory that is functional in practical fields. This is an important contribution of Gramsci to Marxism. It is due to this reason that We speak of Marxism as a world of thinking and doing. It is neither thinking only, nor doing only, it is both taken together.

Gramsci finds that some idealists such as Benedetto Croce, and G Gentile having incorporated
some elements of philosophy of praxis. He calls them "Pure intellectuals", because they only think, but do nothing. An element of practice is absent in them. These 'pure intellectuals' were elaborators of widespread 'ideologies of dominant class': but they also carried some element of Philosophy of praxis through their elaboration.

Offering criticism to Croce and Gentile like Italian idealist, Gramsci accuses them in the following manner:

"One of the greatest weaknesses on immanentist (Italian Idealism) philosophies in general consists precisely in the fact that they have not been able to create an ideological unity between the bottom and the top, between the simple and the intellectuals". <10>

While accepting many innovations of Croce, Gramsci also finds that their mistakes are grave. The gap between the common folks and elite — in the sense intellectual elites could never be converted. As a result, the intellectuals and their innovative ideas ever remained Greek to the masses. On the other hand, to ensure mobilisation of the
masses, one has to ensure yet another thing, that is active participation of the masses in the intellectuals exercises directly or indirectly.

Gramsci's conception of ideology is often called as "historicist conception of ideology" by most of the intellectuals. There by an understanding of Gramscian concept of ideology is an understanding of historicist concept of ideology. Both Lucacs and Gramsci are using the concept in the same way. Therefore, Gramsci's understanding of what history is an important aspect in understanding his concept of ideology. Gramsci says that

"The philosophy of an age is a process of combination of philosophies, intellectual groups, the masses, etc. It culminates in overall trend, which becomes a norm of collective action and becomes concrete, complete history". (11)

Perhaps no one before and after has ever made such concrete and precise statement about what history is other than this master dialectician itself. Philosophy of an age is a combined form of
different philosophies belonging to that age, encompassing both intellectual groups and masses etc. This results in a trend or world view of the societies, which eventually leads to objective action on the path of societies. This becomes history. Further, he speaks of something such of "historical bloc". By "historical bloc" Gramsci means the inseparable participation of history and philosophy into one another. He says that

"History and philosophy in this sense are indivisible, they form a bloc". <12>

Following the Marxian spirit that "Philosopher ought to change the world" rather than merely interpreting it, Gramsci finds that ideology plays an important role in changing the world. Gramsci says that history of philosophy
"....is the history of attempts made and ideological initiatives undertaken by a specific class of people to change, correct or perfect the conceptions of the world that exist in any particular age and then to change the norms of conduct that go with them; in other words, to change practical activity as a whole". <13>

Here, Gramsci is found speaking of ideology as that which attempts to change the world of the given particular time. The changes envisaged are so drastic and complete, that it aims at changing practical activity as a whole. He is also prescribing a test to ideology. Agreement or non-agreement of the mass in a given ideology becomes the test for him. In other words, if the mass is convinced in a given ideology then such ideology can be said to have qualified the test, and if not, it should be considered as not qualified. To quote Gramsci

"class adhesion or non-adhesion to an ideology is the real critical test of the rationality and historicity of modes of thinking". <14>
Thus, revolutionary ideology should be such that mass could be mobilised with it, and if it fails to reach the heart of the people, then something is definitely wrong with the rationality and the historicity of the modes of thinking, as Gramsci puts it. Further, if ideology could reach the people, then it can be counted as the beginning of revolution. One hundred percent acceptance of ideology means that the people are fully ready for revolution. Thus, a total adhesion of ideology is a clear indication of total readiness towards revolution. Gramsci says that

"If a social group is formed which is one hundred per cent homogeneous on the level of ideology, this means that the premises 'exist one hundred per cent for this revolutionising: that is that the "rational" is actively and actually real". <15>

Further, he says that

"......that only a totalitarian (unified, all absorbing) system of ideologies gives a rational reflection of the contradiction of the structure and represents the existence of the objective conditions for the revolutionising of praxis". <16>
By the expression totalitarian, Gramsci gives the meaning of a unified, and all absorbing ideology. Ideology for Gramsci is a part of superstructure, that is why he is talking about contradictions at the structural level. Contradictions at the level of structure or base should be understood and rationally reflected by revolutionary ideology which is at the level of superstructure. However, I shall return to the structure—superstructure aspect a little later in this chapter itself. Marx himself had referred to this point. Marx says that man acquires consciousness of structural conflict on the level of ideologies, in his work, "Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy".

Gramsci says that any conception of the world, or philosophy is facing a fundamental problem. Elaborating the problem, he says that

"This problem is that of preserving the ideological unity of the entire social bloc which that ideology serves to connect and unify". <17>
Here Gramsci gives the example of the Catholic church. The Catholic church had always to face two strata of people and their faith. One were the intellectuals and the other were common people. These two, by virtue of their being, had two drastically different requirement from the church. What the common people needed could not satisfy the intellectuals and the requirements of the intellectuals may appear as atheistic and unGodly to the common people. Nonetheless, church had to keep both people's faith intact. They had to connect and unify the differences somehow. For ideology too, the task is somewhat similar. It should take care of the ideological unity of all strata of society (intellectuals as well as common people), which he calls as social bloc.

Gramsci is found doing an analysis on the term ideology itself. The word ideology means a science of ideas. Science means analysis, analysing a complex phenomenon into its simpler components in order to facilitate comprehension. Therefore science of ideas could mean analysis of ideas. Analysis of ideas would amount to investigating into the origin of ideas. Such an investigation shows that ideas were primarily --169--
sensations. And thus, ideology was an aspect of sensationalism to eighteenth century French materialism. Gramsci says that both Freud and De Man were the last of ideologues. The fact that DeMan was an ideologue made Croce and Croceons very curiously enthusiastic. Gramsci says that the author of popular manual (Bukharin) also remained trapped in ideology. Croce was enthusiastic about DeMan because they both were opposed to revolutionary Marxism, which, obviously, Antonio Gramsci could not stomach.

"Philosophy of Praxis" makes distinct and definite advancements from such views, though the term ideology contained a negative value judgment in Marx. Gramsci says that

"'Ideology' itself must be analysed historically, in the terms of philosophy of praxis, as a superstructure". <18>

Gramsci says that in assessing the value of ideologies there had been a mistake. To make his argument clear, he makes a distinction between "necessary superstructure" of a particular
structure, and "arbitrary elucubrations" of particular individuals. He says that,

"One must therefore distinguish between historically organic ideologies, those, that is, which are necessary to a given structure, and ideologies that are arbitrary, rationalistic, or 'willed'.". <19>

This mistake occurs due to not maintaining this distinction. It is due to calling both by the same name ideology and giving same equal status to it. Unfortunately the second sense of them has been widespread. Ideology came to stand for arbitrary or willed thought structures. As a result, in all theoretical analysis the term of ideology came to be used in only in the negative sense. This is why, Marx had been using the term as false consciousness only. Gramsci says that the phenomenon of calling "organic ideologies" as well as "arbitrary ideologies" by the same name has "denatured" the concept of ideology. Quoting him,

"The bad sense of the word has become widespread, with the effect that the theoretical
analysis of the concept of ideology has been modified and denatured". <20>

Gramsci maintains a theory of base and superstructure. While base consists of contradictions, superstructure consists of everything else. Ideology, and even philosophy of praxis belongs to superstructure. He is also passionate about explaining the question of freedom and necessity. To quote him,

"Structure and superstructure form a "historic bloc". That is to say the complex, contradictory and discordant 'ensemble' of the superstructure is the reflection of the 'ensemble' of the social relations of production". <21>

What Gramsci means by saying historical bloc is precisely this:

".......historical bloc in which precisely material forces
are content and ideologies are form, though this distinction between form and content have purely didactic value....".<22>

The superstructure is nothing but the reflection of the base, the substructure. The contradictory and discordant appearances of the substructure is due to the contradictions in the relations of production, which are at the base as substructure.

There is also a reciprocity existing between structure and substructure, and Gramsci calls this reciprocity is a necessary one. The necessary character of reciprocity makes it, what Gramsci calls it, a dialectical process. To quote him,

"......the necessary reciprocity between structure and substructure, a reciprocity which is nothing other than the real dialectical process". <23>

Gramsci was a man of praxis. He was for concrete evaluation or analysis of concrete
situations, and for concrete solutions. In one word, Antonio Gramsci was a man of the field. It is this aspect of praxis that made Gramsci popular among many Neo-Leftists movements all over the world, and one can always find an emotional loyalty among the Neo-Marxists to Gramsci. Gramsci was a man of action. This aspect becomes explicit in his following passage.

"...it (Marxism) is a philosophy that has been liberated (or is attempting to liberate itself) from any unilateral and fanatical ideological elements; it is conscious full of contradictions, in which the philosopher himself, understood both individually and as an entire social group, not only grasps the contradictions, but posits himself as an element of the contradiction and elevates this element to a principle of knowledge and therefore of action". <24>

The role that philosophy of praxis ought to play has been very clearly stated in the above passage. Philosophy of praxis is conscious full of contradictions and on the basis of this complete awareness of contradictions, the philosopher
becomes himself an element of contradiction. Further, he makes this element a principle of knowledge, and makes every one else aware of this knowledge. Then there is only one thing for him to do, that is to go for concrete action to remove these contradictions. Gramsci says that all philosophies of the past were manifesting contradictions. It is difficult for us to understand this, because taken individually we can not see or feel any element of contradictions in philosophical theories. Gramsci says that we must look at the ensemble of various philosophies; we must take them together in order to understand their manifestations of contradictions. Taken together, we can find that they conflict one another and contradict one another. Conflict between different philosophical systems at the level of superstructure is due to the contradictions at the level of base, which are social contradictions.

Gramsci finds the starting point of philosophy of praxis in what he calls "CATHARTIC" movement. By Catharsis Gramsci means a passage from purely economic to the ethico-political movement. This implies the superior elaboration of the structure into superstructure in the minds of men.
It also implies passing from 'objective to subjective' and from 'necessity to freedom'. As a result of this Catharsis, structure ceases to be an external force dominating man. It changes and creates a new ethico-politico form and to emancipation. Gramsci says that

"to establish the "cathartic" movement becomes therefore, it seems to me, the starting point for all the philosophy of praxis, and the cathartic process coincides with the chain of synthesis which have resulted from evolution of the dialectic". <25>

Later, Gramsci sets out to analyse the relationship between state and ideology. He talks about two kinds of societies. One, the western societies, were civil societies predominant. On the other hand ion eastern societies, he finds the state as prominent. From the relationship of state and ideology, Gramsci deduces a new concept, the concept of HEGEMONY. Hegemony is understood to be the ability of a class to dominate by assuming moral and intellectual leadership, without
resorting to coercion. Referring to the political development of the concept of hegemony Gramsci says

"......the political development of the concept of hegemony represents a great philosophical advance as well as politico-practical one.......". <26>

Therefore it becomes absolutely necessary on the part of the working class to abolish bourgeois hegemony. To overthrow bourgeois hegemony, the working class must achieve ideological hegemony. Towards that, on the first place, the working class must realise hegemonic apparatus of the state. To quote Gramsci,

"The realisation of a hegemonic apparatus, in so far as it creates a new ideological terrain, determines a reform of consciousness and of methods of knowledge......". <27>
The proletariats must be made conscious of the hegemonic apparatus, that is employing in the guise of state apparatus or other appealing propaganda. It is only on the basis of this consciousness that proletarian ideology could become erected and can stand effectively. Being conscious of hegemony is rather the first step towards proletarian consciousness; ideology. To quote Gramsci,

"Consciousness of being part of a particular hegemonic force (that is to say political consciousness) is the first stage towards a further progressive self consciousness in what theory and practice will finally be one". <28>

It is not only the case that proletarian ideology depends much on being conscious of hegemony, but also such consciousness is a
prerequisite of theory-practice unity. Gramsci says that every conception of the world and every philosophy had been concerned with the problem of unity of theory and practice. Here, Gramsci speaks of the role that party plays too. For him, the parties are

"the crucibles where the unification of thereby and practice, understood as a real historical process, taken place". <29>

Parties assume great importance in practising theory, it is them that actually apply theory on the concrete field. Gramsci says that man's acquisition of consciousness of structural conflicts
on the level of ideologies in an ample evidence that it is of epistemological value, and not simply psychological or moral value. He says that

"From this it follows that the theoretical-practical principle of hegemony has also epistemological significance.". <30>

We have seen that for Gramsci, ideology is a superstructural expression of a contradictory reality. He too follows the trend away from a purely negative concept of ideology. This contradictory reality, which is the base is a 'kingdom of necessity'. Necessity is that which is opposed to freedom. Their relations, the relations of freedom and necessity is contradictory in nature. But can not co-exist. Freedom can only begin where necessity ends. But a knowledge-scientific knowledge of necessity is a prerogative to freedom. The contradictory reality which is the base is a kingdom of necessity, and the superstructure is an expression of it; which philosophy of praxis got to change.
Structure and superstructure form a 'historical bloc'. As a result, the superstructure becomes a reflection of the social relations of production. For Gramsci, superstructure are an objective reality where man gains consciousness of their positions and goals. Therefore, Marxism is a superstructure like every other class ideology. Marxism is also an expression of historical contradictions. Contradiction belongs to the base, and its expression is the superstructure. In this case too, Marxism is a superstructure like any other element in superstructure. Still, Marxism is superior. It is superior because Marxism is the most conscious expression of those contradictions.

But Marxism is also bound to disappear along with other expressions of necessity, as freedom eventually takes over. Marxism, being an expression of contradiction is tied to necessity, and not to freedom. Necessity is bound to disappear, as freedom is bound to come. Thereby Marxism too is bound to disappear or change form; and the new form supersedes the old. To me it seems that the very dynamic nature of Marxism demands that, the theory should undergo intellectual evolution from time to time. I am not inclined to
agree with Gramsci that Marxism will wither away, but I feel that Gramsci can be justified if it amounts to saying that Marxism must evolve by Gramsci's expression that Marxism is bound to be superseded. One Marxist strand of interpretation would be superseded by another and so on as the time requires change. However Gramsci says that we can go no further than making the generic affirmation that the philosophy of praxis will either disappear or be superseded. To quote him,

"But even the philosophy of praxis is an expression of historical contradictions, and indeed their most complete, because most conscious expression; this means that it too is tied to 'necessity' and not to a 'freedom' which does not exist and, historically, can not yet exist. If, therefore, it is demonstrated that contradictions will disappear, it also demonstrated implicitly that philosophy of praxis too will disappear, or be superseded. In the reign of 'freedom' thought and ideas can no longer be born an the terrain of contradictions and the necessity of struggle. At the present time the philosopher - the philosopher of praxis - can only make this generic affirmation and can go no further; he can not escape from the present field of contradictions, he can not affirm, other than generically, a world without contradictions, without immediately creating a Utopia". <31>
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