

〔Paper Presentation〕 国際グラムシ学会 報告

Gramsci Study in Japan: Our achievements and further problems

Koichi OHARA * & Hiroshi MATSUDA **

1. A brief retrospection of Gramsci study in Japan

The reception of Gramscian concepts in our country could go back to the beginning of the 1960's. Unfortunately, due to severe controversies excited over the political strategies of left-wing forces at that time, his concepts could not be but received superficially and for their immediate political interests.

Notwithstanding, we can call the 1960's and 1970's a dawn of Gramsci study in Japan because an important cornerstone for its further study has been placed upon during this period. We owed much particularly for the study and translations of Gramsci's writings by Kiyotomo Ishido (1904-2001) and other senior scholars.

The publication of a critical edition of the "Prison Notebooks" supervised by Valentino Gerratana in 1975 in Italy also gave a new momentum to the study of the Italian thinker in our country. Under these circumstances, in early 1980's a project of publishing the critical edition of "Prison Notebooks" for Japanese readers has started but, to our regret, such an important undertaking has been suspended only with the publication of 1st Volume (only Notebook 1 and 2 contained). This fact itself has shown that Gramsci study in Japan as a whole had not yet arrived at a due stage of development.

Following earnest joint works and study efforts by individual scholars and researchers, an international symposium commemorating the 50th anniversary of the death of Antonio Gramsci has been held in Tokyo in 1987 with the participation of Aldo Natoli from Italy. The minutes of proceedings have been carried in a book entitled "Gramsci and our times".

Immediately after the symposium, we have successively seen such historical upheavals as the "break down of Berlin Walls" and the "collapse of Soviet Union". These sudden changes have created a new political and economical as well as cultural and ideological situation in advanced capitalist countries, among them Japan, and have forced us to search for and build up a new paradigm. In this context, Gramscian thoughts, particularly his concept of hegemony have been anew illuminated under various aspects.

"The crisis consists, said Gramsci, precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new

* Member of Coordinating Committee of IGS (International Gramsci Society)

** Professor of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Ritsumeikan University

cannot be born: in this interregnum, morbid phenomena of the most varied kind come to pass” (Q3 § 34, p.32-33). In our country, as a result of the failure of the so-called bubble economy, critical symptoms were produced and got deepen in the political, economic, social and cultural fields of national life.

Meantime, Professor Eisuke Takemura and Professor Seiji Honkawa suddenly died one after another. We would like to memorialize their efforts and the achievements of interpretation and clarification of Gramscian concepts in conformity with the critical edition of the “Prison Notebooks”.

In mid-November of 1997 an international symposium commemorating the 60th anniversary of the death of Gramsci, co-sponsored by Italian Embassy in Japan was organized at the Italian Institute of Culture in Tokyo. This became a true international forum summarizing past ten years of results of Gramsci study and research in different countries.

Commemorating this initiative, Mr. Kiyotomo Ishido has delivered a conference on “Hegemony concept and the road for social transformation” and Mr. Kaoru Kataghiiri and Professor Hiroshi Matsuda (Japan), Professor Giuseppe Vacca (Gramsci Institute Foundation of Italy), Professor Joseph A. Buttigieg (IGS-USA), and Professor Kang Ok Cho (ROK) have respectively given speech about the study results and actual problems in their countries. And active discussions have been followed in two subcommittee meetings. The minutes of proceedings, supplemented by papers from Russia, Spain and Germany, have been carried late 1999 in the volume “How is Gramsci read in the world”.

In Japan there exist now mainly two organizations, namely the Kyoto Gramsci Society (KGS) and the Tokyo Gramsci Society (TGS), respectively associated with a number of scholars and researchers in Kyoto, the ancient Capital, and in Tokyo. For over ten years the former has been engaged in organizing a series of workshops and in regularly publishing the KGS News Letters. During these years KGS has twice featured articles on the study of the critical edition of “Prison Notebooks” in the quarterly magazine “Study of Materialism”. The second special issue contained the following articles: “Significance and Problems of Study of the critical edition of “Prison Notebooks” by Hiroshi Matsuda, “Logic and perspective of “Human being” concept in Gramsci” by Tomihisa Suzuki, “Implications of the Marx’s Preface to Critics of Political Economy in Prison Notebooks” by Koichi Ohara, “Formation of Historism in Gramsci” by Satoe Kawakami, “Gramsci and his “adaptation” of Croce’s Philosophy by Minoru Tabata and “Re-reading of “Some themes on Southern Question” by Kang Ok Cho.

On the other hand, TGS was organized, as a forum of cultural exchange, in April 1998, five months after the said symposium and has been engaged in organizing various talks and discussions and in publishing its own bi-monthly bulletin “La Citta Futura” for the exchange of opinions and information on Gramsci. In 1999, TGS, co-sponsored by the Trotsky Study Center, has organized a free discussion on the historical and intellectual crossing between Trotsky and Gramsci and in autumn 2000, co-sponsored by the Trade Union Movement Institute, has organized another forum to discuss about the Italian road and other experiences of socialism in

20th Century.

Both of them have continued to carry out their study works, in maintaining relationship of exchange and cooperation between them. Thus I can tell you now that we are arriving at the stage of formally establishing an IGS-Japan.

2. Some characteristics and problems on recent Gramsci study in Japan

Since in Japan we have not yet a full translation of the critical edition of “Prison Notebooks”, the study of Gramscian concepts has been characterized by scrupulous analysis of the structure of Prison Notebooks as a whole, through critical reading of original Italian texts of the critical edition. We believe this kind of study work is extremely important;

In the first place because it will allow us to correctly understand the continuity and discontinuity within Gramsci’s writings before his imprisonment, in others words, to find out moments of further development of his reflections in Prison Notebooks.

In the second place because it will permit us to correctly grasp the main implications of individual study of each Notebook or each subject of a Notebook. Namely, in order to draw correct conclusions from such an individual study it is indispensable to make a structural approach to a cosmos of the Prison Notebooks.

And in the third place because it will enable us to identify certain “limits and inconveniences” included in the first edition (so-called Togliattian Edition) of Prison Notebooks and also to find and overcome eventual limits and inconveniences contained in the critical edition itself.

We would like to emphasize that this kind of analysis is not only philologically important but also indispensable from the viewpoint of seizing and verifying any actuality or any modernity in Gramscian concepts developed almost 70 years ago. In this sense we cannot but agree with the impressions expressed by G. Baratta in his recent book “The Roses and Notebooks” as follows;

“Leggere Gramsci è stato per me, in questi quindici anni, una continua sorpresa : la sorpresa di trovarmi di fronte a testi estremamante aderenti a un vissuto di altri tempi, ma altresì ricchi di università e capaci di stimolare interrogativi del passato sulle vicende del presente; capaci anche promuovere dialoghi e aggregazioni tra « intellettuali », e « semplici », tra cultura e senso comune”. (p.22)

From such a standpoint mentioned above, we would like to portray some characteristics and problems we are now faced with at the present stage of Gramsci study in our country.

It seems internationally and commonly recognized that a radical turning adopted by the Comintern at the end of 1920’s has incontestably cast a certain shadow on the process of reflections by Gramsci in prison.

One can interrogate: If the relationship between Gramsci and Comintern can be taken as some kind of “rupture” or “discrepancy”, is it true and correct to affirm that the “Turi Notebooks”

constitute a climax of the Prison Notebooks and the “Formia Notebooks” are a simple extension or supplement of the “Turi Notebooks”?

Because, with the prospect of being released from the prison and free before long, Gramsci might have been so ambitious to tackle with special notebooks on the basis of a new study plan. (G.Baratta uses the term “re-elaboration (certainly still creative) of special Notebooks” in one of notes included in the book “The roses and Notebooks” p.315) So could we term Gramsci’s works of re-elaboration in the time of Formia his “ultimate struggle”, or the results of the final stage at which Gramsci’s reflections in prison could have arrived. Anyhow, we believe that it is extremely important to examine and identify this question, because it will make a useful contribution not only to understanding the structure of Prison Notebooks as a whole, but also to tracing comprehensively a process of development of Gramsci’s hegemony concept, particularly of the cultural aspects of hegemony and to making clear actualities of Gramscian concepts in our days.

Here I would like to emphasize that most of the subjects which Gramsci started to study in his special notebooks such as the history of subaltern groups, the folklore, popular culture and literature, the journalism, Lorianism, the linguistic problem, etc., had not sufficiently been explored by the so-called traditional Marxist scholars. And a Gramscian method of study has been of an extremely practical character and Gramsci’s standpoint was always to know how hegemony is organized and executed in civil society, not to study for study’s sake.

Let’s state more concretely. As is well known in our country too, Cultural Studies Group and Subaltern Studies Groups—both of them have still today fair influences over the Gramsci study in our country—have often made references to Gramsci’s writings. But, as Professor Joseph A. Buttigieg pointed out in his essay on Subaltern Categories of Gramsci, both of these studies groups relied on an English anthology more condensed than the old thematic edition of the Prison Notebooks and they could refer only partially to cultural aspects of hegemony deeply developed in each of “Formia Notebooks”, such as: Notebooks on Popular Culture, Folklore, Popular literature, Journalism, Philology and so on. Since we have French or Spanish translations of Italian critical edition or English or German editions under translation, we believe it is quite possible and important to overcome such kind of shortcoming and to develop qualitatively higher than ever contemporary cultural studies in different countries.

Another example. We have studied Notebook 22 (Americanism and Fordism), one of the Formia Notebooks, but in this study we have been rather inclined to analysis of Fordism than an analysis of Americanism, which constitutes an important aspect of cultural hegemony. Why such a weakness? Because we failed to situate Notebook 22 as an integral part of the cultural hegemony concept of Gramsci.

In a broader perspective, under the present international circumstances characterized by the IT revolution and globalization, it is increasingly important to clarify implications of the contemporary hegemony system, structure, relationship and struggle through a cultural approach in a board sense to Formia Notebooks, and in this context Gramsci is often invoked.

The situation requires us to re-situate and re-elaborate cultural aspects of Gramscian hegemony in such a new international perspective.

3. History of Japan and Actuality of Method of Gramsci in Japan

The “Prison Notebooks” study group of TGS has translated Notebook 25 (Subaltern Notebook) and Notebook 27 (Folklore) and is now about to translate Notebook 28 (Lorianism). As for the Subaltern Notebook, we have published it in full as a pamphlet with the Buttigieg article “About Subaltern Categories of Gramsci” as an introduction. This pamphlet has been made use of at our joint study meeting and read by not a few scholars and researchers interested in this problem.

Keeping in mind those special notebooks, I would like to explain our ideas about a new history textbook for middle school, which has been recently compiled by an “association for making a new national history textbook” and authorized by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports of our country.

As is well known, in the past Japanese ruling circles succeeded in compiling a state history textbook based upon Shintoist and Tennoist outlook of national history, imposing it on the people and driving them toward the wars of aggression. As soon as this new history textbook was made public, a number of Japanese intellectuals and citizens expressed serious concern and criticisms concerning the descriptions of the textbook, because of the editors’ specific outlooks regarding state, history and culture which have characterized it. Fortunately so far most of public middle schools have not decided to adopt this history textbook, but an ideological basis fostered among Japanese mass people by those of the association has by no means been eliminated, but still continues to have certain influence over them. This fact should never been ignored. Hundreds of thousands copies of this history textbook have been sold only for more than one month since last July when it had been put on sale at ordinary bookstores.

Professor Akira Itoh, member of the Tokyo Gramsci Society, analyzes the motifs of the editors of the new history schoolbook in the following five points.

1. Japanese version of historical narcissism. In other words, presupposing that Japanese people is a homogeneous nation, they try to praise the ability of Japanese nation to assimilate foreign cultures into Japanese “pure” culture. In fact they proclaim that Japanese civilization is superior to four World Civilizations (Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Indus and Hwang Ho Civilizations).
2. They try to portray 100 years of Japanese modern history as the history of struggle against the oppressions by western great powers and for a Japanese “legitimate” sphere of existence in East Asia, and to justify Japanese aggressions against China and Korea as well as the Pacific War as the result of this struggle, proclaiming that Japan was a “star” of liberating Asia from the domination by western powers.
3. The revival of state authoritarianism peculiar to an advanced country. According to them,

if China and Korea were invaded by western powers, independence and security of Japan would be exposed to a great threat, and Japanese struggle against the Sinocentrism in China and Korea was a historical mission of Japanese nation, which represented the modern civilization in Asia.

4. The resurrection of the argument that Japanese nation is homogeneously united under the single state of Emperor (Tenno). As they cannot verify the national integrity of Japanese people and Tenno historically nor scientifically, they try to emphasize that from ancient times in Japan the beliefs in Tenno have existed among the people and to seek evidences of such a national integrity from Japanese traditional religion. According to them, the myth is not a fact but the Japanese people used to commit their dream to the myth and this dream should be considered as the "truth of history".
5. Men's chauvinism, according to which masculine values should be praised as historically recognized.

Time does not permit me to account for each of these points, but what the editors of the history textbook are aiming at is quite clear. While they have the conviction that the history of Japan should be portrayed and reviewed as history of such a "liberator" of Asia and strong and prosperous nation reigned over the world as in the past, they give special importance to Japanese traditional "myth" and "legends" as a unique reason capable of scientifically justifying the "integrity" of the Japanese nation and the "purity" of Japanese culture and they try to admire as bearers of history "those who served and died for the state" and to work on world outlooks or outlooks of life of mass people with those "myth" and "legends" in which their primitive consciousness is deeply rooted.

Of course, we should not exaggerate a danger in positions as expressed by editors of this history schoolbook, nor make light of them because of its anachronism and ridiculousness. We can not but recall the alarming words expressed by Gramsci in Notebook 28, saying that one should never neglect Loria's arguments however ridiculous and anachronistic they may sound.

"Every period has its own lorism more or less complete and perfect, every country has its own: the Hitlerism has shown that in Germany one bred, under the apparent domination by a serious intellectual group, a monstrous lorism that has destroyed the official crust and has been diffused as scientific concept and method of a new "official character". (.....) But that he could have been a "pillar" of culture, "teacher", and that he could have found <spontaneously> a hugest public, it is the very fact that makes us reflect about the weakness of banks of criticism which still existed, even in normal times: it should be considered that in abnormal times with exploded passions, it would be easy for Loria supported by the concerned forces, to overflow from every bank and to turn into a swamp for decades a still weak and delicate surroundings of intellectual civilization" (Q28 § 1, pp.2325-2326.).

It will be quite easy to criticize and refute the arguments of Japanese Loria united in such an association, by saying there is nothing scientific in them. But it may be dangerous to affirm that their arguments about the "purity" of Japanese culture and "integrity" of Japanese nation,

by making use of “myth”, “legends” and “folklore”, could never become a “pillar” of culture and find a “hugest public”. It will be more dangerous particularly in the time of crisis when frustrations have been accumulated among the people without finding any way out of the crisis. Gramsci emphasized the importance of studying folklore in Notebook 27: “tutte le religioni, anche le piu dirozzati e raffinati, siano « folclore » in rapporto al pensiero moderno” (Q27 § 1, p.2312.) and “Il folklore non deve essere concepito come una bizzarria, una stranezza o un elemento pitoresco, ma come una cosa che è molto seria e da prendere sul serio” (ibid.p.2314. Gramsci also attaches importance to studying the close relation between folklore and “common sense” which is philosophical folklore. Ibid. p.2311.). When we think over the issue of the history schoolbook, a Gramscian approach to “folklore” and “people’s moral” opposed to an “official” world outlook or “official” moral, is rich in lessons. It means that the Gramscian method and approach will never diminish but rather increase its credibility for us as an instrument of analysis. Can we say, however, that we succeed in building up our persuasive alternative ideas or projects opposed to some ideological kernels put forward by the new history textbook? Of course we cannot seek answers or solutions for this in Gramsci nor in his Prison Notebooks. It depends only on our joint and creative efforts to do it.

As is known, Gramsci paid an important attention on the question: how the ideological structure of a ruling class is organized and pointed out : “The press is the most dynamic part of this ideological structure, but not the only one. Everything that directly or indirectly influences or could influence public opinion belongs to it: library, school, associations and clubs of various kind, even architecture, the layout of streets and their names (Q3 § 49). And we can certainly now add to them extremely various kind of performances deployed on TV and every image even on home pages of PC internet services and cellular phones, all of which did not exist in the time of Gramsci.

Then Gramsci interrogates: “What can an innovative class set against the formidable complex of trenches and fortifications of ruling class?” He at once responds : “the spirit of cleavage—that is, the progressive acquisition of the consciousness of one’s historical identity [...]: all of this requires complex ideological work, the first condition of which is an exact knowledge of the field that must be cleared of its elements of human mass (Q3 § 49). Further in Notebook 25 he pointed out : “The historian should note and verify the line of development toward the integral autonomy, from the most primitive phases, and should note every expression of “Sorelian” « spirit of cleavage »” (Q25 § 5, p.2288.).

For Gramsci the spirit of cleavage does not mean, as in Sorel, the destruction, the negation of the existing “without an implicit construction, affirmation” (Q13 § 1, p.1557.), but the “acquisition of historical identity” or the “integral autonomy”, which will be further materialized in a collective will. And it is important for us to know how we can find “spirit of cleavage” in a Gramscian sense in Japanese civil society which is the ground for hegemony, namely how we can realize the acquisition of Japanese historical identity opposed to ultra-nationalistic concepts of “integrity” of Japanese nation and of “purity” of Japanese culture.

In a long term of perspective, for us, Japanese scholars of Gramsci who have as one of main objectives to conduct a earnest study on the ideological structure of ruling class and on the possibility of setting a counter-hegemony against their “formidable complex of trenches and fortifications”, it is increasingly important to find and identify “spirits of cleavage” among the popular consciousness and struggles, to make disappear a “separation between modern culture and popular culture or folklore” (Q27, § 1. P.2314.), and to develop them into an intellectual and moral reform and the formation of “national and popular collective will toward the accomplishment of a superior and total form of modern civilization” (ibid, p.1560). We aware that this task requires us extraordinary intellectual and creative efforts.

With such consciousness we are engaged in study of Gramscian concepts and his “Prison Notebooks”.

4. Actualities of the concept of Gramsci on “organic crisis”

First I would like to recall a gist of my speech delivered at the last IGS congress (Naples) with relation to the actualities of Gramscian thoughts in the following terms.

Today, the interest in Gramsci is becoming ever higher on international scale, because, we could say, Gramsci has not only “announced in advance” the collapse of “real socialism”, but also provided us with still effective “references” of ideas and concepts, for paving a democratic way out of the deep crisis of contemporary capitalist societies. Gramsci was one of small number of intellectuals of 20th century that had criticized the “parthenogenesis” of ideology. When one sifts an actuality of this or that idea, he should first know if the idea is or not still capable of “defining a determined situation”.

Besides, for us, living in a different historical situation, an intellectual freshness of varied problematics put forward by Gramsci, in other words, an actuality in the sense of “Gramscian method” has never lost.

From such a viewpoint, and by placing in sight a new situation that took place in our country, I would like to make a few reflections on Gramsci’s concept on “organic crisis” and its actualities.

Mr. Kimhide Mushakouji, one of well-known scholars of international political sciences, has mentioned the concept of hegemony of Gramsci, pointing out “this idea should be applied for with a view to overcoming a “Nippon-centrism in today’s Japanese civil society” and advocating that it is important to set up a “hegemony by progressive civil forces”.

As a critical situation—it could be termed the “organic crisis” extending from political and economical to socio-cultural and human dimension—has deepened in our country, the interest in Gramsci’s crisis and hegemony concept has been increased in various fields in order to seize a character and an essence of the crisis and to form an alternative (counter-hegemony) to it.

Having defeated “Ulivo Coalition” in political elections held last May, Mr. Berlusconi, “King of Media”, has again arrived to the power in Italy. And in Japan, the Liberal Democratic party,

the biggest party of the majority, has followed up a “Koizumi sensation” with its overwhelming victory and serious defeat of “progressive forces” in the elections to the House of Councilors of late July of this year. For an analysis of such political and cultural situation that took place in our country, Gramsci’s concept on crisis is very suggestive. I would here like to deal with manuscripts C about the “organic crisis” of the “Machiavelli Notebook” (Q13 § 23).

Firstly, Gramsci called the attention to the fact that the decline of hegemony of a ruling class over the different strata of people does not straightly nor automatically offer an opportunity to the opposing forces, but it creates a certain critical situation also for the same forces. Gramsci states: “A un certo punto della loro vita storica i gruppi sociali si staccano dai loro partiti tradizionali, Quando queste crisi si verificano, la situazione immediata diventa delicata e pericolosa perché il campo è aperto alle soluzioni di forza, all’attività di potenze oscure rappresentate dagli uomini provvidenziali o carismatici”. (pp.1602-1603.)

Forms of expression of this crisis are indeed complicated, but its real essence is a “crisis of hegemony of ruling class” which is called as “crisis of authority” or “crisis of orthodoxy”. “Si parla di <crisi di autorità> e ciò appunto è la crisi di egemonia, o crisi dello stato nel suo complesso”. (p.1603.)

The question is not the only one. It will matter whether the opposing forces that have criticized the crisis of hegemony of the ruling class are capable of creating a new counter-hegemony.

Secondly, regarding this capability of opposing forces, Gramsci pointed out : “La crisi crea situazioni immediate pericolose, perché i diversi strati della popolazione non possiedono la stessa capacità di orientarsi rapidamente e di riorganizzarsi con lo stesso ritmo. La classe tradizionale dirigente, che ha un numeroso personale addestrato, muta uomini e programmi e riassorbe il controllo che le andava sfuggendo con una celerità maggiore di quanto avvenga nelle classi subalterne; fa magari dei sacrifici, si espone a un avvenire oscuro con promesse demagogiche, ma mantiene il potere, lo rafforza per il momento e se ne serve per schiacciare l’avversario e disperdere il personale di direzione, che non può essere molto numeroso e molto addestrato”. (p.1603.)

Gramsci here emphasizes that “crisis” is not only composed of the crisis of hegemony of the traditional leading class but also of weakness of opposing forces, saying: “I cui fattori possono essere disparati, ma in cui prevale l’immaturità delle forze progressive”. (p.1604.)

Thirdly, Gramsci calls in question the capability of a “political party” because, according to him, it should know to renew its capability of creating a hegemony and to proceed to continuously innovate itself as a part of “apparatus of hegemony”, namely “la capacità del partito di reagire contro lo spirito di consuetudine, contro le tendenze a mummificarsi e a diventare anacronistico”. (p.1604.) In other words, Gramsci emphasizes that it is important to construct such a political party to be sensitively open to any social and cultural change, deeply rooted in civil society, of constantly fostering personnel prepared for organizing a hegemony in and out of the party, without relying on any closed and dogmatic organization theory.

Otherwise, “il partito finisce col diventare anacronistico, e nei momenti di crisi acuta viene svuotato del suo contenuto sociale e rimane come compatto in aria”. (P.1604.)

Gramsci always criticizes the political party, as a form of spontaneous association germinated from the inside of civil society, for being absorbed, consolidated and institutionalized within the “political society”. We could say that he found it a role of specific association of the political party to unite the civil society and political society and to mediate each other between them. It is indispensable for us to overcome a discrepancy or rupture between political party and civil society and to renovate or re-elaborate a theory on political party as an “apparatus of hegemony within the civil society”. This is another message we must receive from Antonio Gramsci.

Meantime, a political situation in our country had been characterized by “transformist” type of hegemony that the ruling party and its adjacent political forces had tried to follow. This kind of hegemony means an “art of politics” of interparliamentary forces. As a matter of fact it was not inclined to be expansive but regressive and reductive. This type of hegemony was not able to eliminate unbalance or discrepancy between political society and civil society, but to minimize the significance of politics in political society and to increase the people’s distrust of politics and political parties in civil society at the same time.

With the distrust of politics deeply accumulated among the people for a background, at the time when the election campaign to the president of Liberal Democratic party was held in last April, the “Koizumi phenomena” had happened. Contrary to most of the forecast, Mr. Junichiro Koizumi, supported by the overwhelming majority of LDP members, has been elected as president of the party and soon after elected as Prime Minister in the Parliament. Why did Mr. Koizumi succeed in obtaining such an overwhelming support of the Japanese electorate?

It should be noted that Mr. Koizumi has his own discourse and style, different from the old type of “trasformismo”. By making the maximum use of media, the biggest apparatus of hegemony in contemporary society, he succeeded in arousing the public opinion and consensus under the populist form and in surrounding the LDP he belongs to from the outside of the party (the public opinion). In other words, by totally mobilizing the civil society including the media, he won a success in containing “transformist” groups of the party. Naturally in this sense, his political leadership has given a most “fresh” impression to a large number of Japanese voters.

Further more, “Cesarist” elements that intend to connect and integrate political society and civil society in a authoritarian manner are remarkable in his declarations. Prime Minister Koizumi has repeatedly declared the necessity to take resolute steps for the “structural reform without any sanctuary” on one hand, and defying the strong protest and criticism from inside and outside of the country, he has enforced his official worship to Yasukuni Shrine, which is a symbol of the past Japanese militarism, on the other. This reminds us of his “Cesarist” elements.

Then, what should be counter-hegemony of opposing forces to Koizumi strategy?

It should be emphasized that one cannot strike home the “Cesarist and authoritarianist

populism” with conventional discourses of “anti-trasformismo”. In this sense it is indispensable to renovate or re-elaborate political and cultural discourses enabling to fill up a discrepancy and rupture between political society and civil society, without any “authoritarianism”. Gramsci’s reflections on this point are still today suggestive, indeed.

If the established political parties (particularly progressive parties) did not succeeded in self-renovation in this sense, they will remarkably diminish their social *raison d’être* and, as Gramsci pointed out, they could become “empty” (*svuotato*). In Japan those who do not support any determined political party are the overwhelming majority. This shows that the established parties are more or less becoming “empty” existence.

For establishing a counter-hegemony strategy, it is a key question to develop the “war of position” in order to create varied kinds of hegemony. A series of problems (culture, education, environments, gender, minority, etc.), which look like non-political at first sight, in other words, social and cultural issues in a strong sense, have a high level of hegemony. It is therefore important to create and organize counter-hegemony in these fields.

From this point of view we can estimate the adaptability of these established parties (especially progressive parties) to the civil society. Vertical and authoritarian relationship between the political party and mass movements will certainly make an obstacle to multilateral development of “war of position” in civil society.

As is above mentioned, Gramsci study is showing a new “wideness” and “depth” in various fields of sciences such as political, social, cultural and human. It is important for us to make analysis of the strength and tenacity of hegemony of modern capitalism and to make use of it as basis for constructing a new alternative hegemony. This will also be a trial to restore Gramscian message to life of our times. To conclude my paper, Gramsci study in the time of “organic crisis” and in the “interregnum of hegemony” will be able to fill up a vacuum of the study and to ferment and mature it.

(This is a full text of speech delivered at one of the round tables of the Second IGS congress which was held from September 19 to 21, at the auditorium of Federal University of Rio de Janeiro)

[付記]

本稿は2001年9月19 - 21日、ブラジルのリオデジャネイロ大学で開催された国際グラムシ学会 (IGS) での報告である。当初松田、小原両名が参加する予定であったが、松田が健康上の理由で参加できなかったため、共同報告という形で小原氏に報告していただいた。同会議での各国の報告等については稿を改めて報告したいと考えている。また邦語バージョン (本稿は報告上の制約のため縮小している) も近日中に発表予定である。

[邦語関連文献]

小原耕一「レーニンの省略とグラムシの読みかえ」(『葦牙』1996年1月号, 筆名今西直)

同「初版『獄中ノート』の『限界と不都合さ』とは何か」(季報『唯物論研究』1999年2月, 67号)

- 同 「『獄中ノート』におけるマルクス『経済学批判』序言の位置」(季報『唯物論研究』2000年5月,72号)
- 同 「グラムシとダンテ『神曲』地獄篇第十歌」(『葦牙』2000年7月号)
- 同 「グラムシと欧米における『市民社会』論の受容」(『葦牙』2001年7月号)
- 松田 博 共編著『グラムシは世界でどう読まれているか』社会評論社 2000年
共著『20世紀社会主義の意味を問う』御茶の水書房 1998年
「グラムシ思想の現代的意義に関する試論」(季報『唯物論研究』2001年8月,77号)
共編著『アソシエーション革命』社会評論社 近刊
- 小原・松田・黒沢共訳 N. ポッピオ『グラムシ思想の再検討』御茶の水書房 2000年
- H. Matsuda, Stato e rivoluzione passiva in Giappone, in AAVV Gramsci da un secolo all'altro
Editori Rivniti. 1999
- Id. Attualità del pensiero di Gramsci in Giappone, in Atti del XXII Convegno di Studi sul
Giappone, AISTUGIA. 1999
- Id. Intorno al metodo di Antonio Gramsci in Belfagor, Anno LV. n.330, 2000