



# Spatial dimensions of Antonio Gramsci's contribution\*

Nuno Ornelas Martins 

Católica Porto Business School and CEGE, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Rua Diogo Botelho, 1327, Porto 4169-005, Portugal (e-mail: nmartins@porto.ucp.pt)

Received: 20 March 2017 / Accepted: 10 July 2017

**Abstract.** In this article I explore the spatial dimension of Antonio Gramsci's thinking, which possesses an innovative methodological approach to spatial analysis, within what can be termed an ethnographical or anthropological approach. Such an approach engages in an analysis of an overall form of life in each spatial context, in order to overcome the absence of statistical data that can adequately describe the socio-economic processes Gramsci is attempting to characterize. Furthermore, Gramsci's category of organic intellectual also helps bridging the gap between hegemonic forces and spatio-ethnographic context, thus helping to understand the permanent reproduction and reconfiguration of the economy and society.

**JEL classification:** B41, R14, Z13

**Key words:** Space, hegemony, ethnography, surplus, migration

## 1 Introduction

Antonio Gramsci's *Prison notebooks*, written after his arrest in Italy by Mussolini's regime, had a great influence in various fields, including the fields of political science, cultural studies and philosophy. But Gramsci's influence also flowed through different channels other than his writings. John Davis (2002) and Amartya Sen (2003) argue that Gramsci's thought is behind one of the more important contributions in the history of Western philosophy in the twentieth century, namely Ludwig Wittgenstein's (1963) book *Philosophical Investigations*, in which Wittgenstein abandons his earlier approach, while attributing to Piero Sraffa, a close friend of Gramsci (Naldi 2000), the most consequential ideas of *Philosophical Investigations*, which are connected to an ethnographic approach (Sen 2003).

Davis (2002) and Sen (2003) find several commonalities between Wittgenstein and Gramsci who, they argue, influenced Wittgenstein through the intermediation of Sraffa. But they do not further scrutinize the ethnographic dimension of Gramsci's work. Doing so is particularly relevant when addressing regional studies because this ethnographical approach is strongly intertwined with a spatial dimension in Gramsci's writings. In fact, I shall argue that important

---

\* For most helpful comments on an earlier draft I am most thankful to John B. Davis, and to the editor and referees of this journal.

notions connected to the Gramscian literature, such as the idea of an organic intellectual (someone who helps maintaining the structure of society by organizing consensus) is ultimately connected to spatial and ethnographical aspects. An organic intellectual is someone who bridges the link between hegemonic forces in society and local traditions which pertain to a given spatio-ethnographical context.

Such a spatial dimension is connected to Gramsci's own life trajectory. Gramsci was born in 1891 in the small town of Ales, within the rural landscape of the island of Sardinia, in Italy. He completed his secondary school in Cagliari, and subsequently went to the University of Turin, where he studied with Matteo Bartolli, who was much concerned with the spatial aspects of linguistics. At Turin, Gramsci witnessed the process of industrialization in the factories of Fiat and Lancia, and started his political activity by writing to socialist newspapers. The dichotomy between the rural countryside and urban centres, with special emphasis on the process of industrialization leading to the migration from the countryside to urban centres, was a salient feature in this geographical context, and contributed to the emergence of various structural aspects of Gramsci's thought, connected to this spatial dimension.

This spatial dimension in Gramsci's thought plays a key role in his overall understanding of the economy and society, and in concrete topics with which his name is usually associated, such as the notion of hegemony, understood as the dominance of a given social class due to the power it exercises over culture and values. This spatial dimension has been noted by Bob Jessop (2005), who argues that the very categories used in Gramsci's philosophy of praxis are not only historicized, but also spatialized, as can be seen in a clearer way in Gramsci's discussion of the Southern Question in Italy. More recently, a volume was edited by Michael Ekers et al. (2013) where various aspects of this spatial dimension are explained in more detail.

Here I shall focus on one aspect where this spatial dimension appears in a clearer way, namely the process of production and distribution of surplus value. I shall not be concerned with whether Gramsci adopts or not the orthodox Marxist approach to the production of surplus value. As I shall argue below, Gramsci, like his friend Sraffa, highlights the influence of David Ricardo on Karl Marx, which means that, in his view, even Marx's own analysis is significantly influenced by classical political economists like Ricardo. The analysis to be undertaken here presupposes the existence of a surplus, but is consistent with a broader definition of the economic surplus that can fit various classical authors besides Marx – see Sraffa (1960) – who focus on how the economic surplus is produced and divided across social classes.

Gramsci (1992, p. 167) notes that it is difficult to obtain statistical data on some social classes, since it is difficult to find a category that would 'encompass them', and thus suggests the identification of certain 'forms of life' as a possible way of finding some information about the relative weight of those classes. The idea of immersion in a given 'form of life' is subsequently used by Wittgenstein (1963), and can be traced back to Gramsci through the intermediation of Sraffa. As Sen (2003, p. 1242) notes, Wittgenstein told Rush Rees that 'the most important thing that Sraffa taught him was an "anthropological way" of seeing philosophical problems'. Sen (2003, p. 1242) also notes that Brian McGuinness emphasises, when discussing Wittgenstein, 'the ethnological or anthropological way of looking at things that came to him from the economist Sraffa'. Davis (2002) and Sen (2003) note several commonalities between Wittgenstein, Sraffa and Gramsci, but do not discuss in further detail how this ethnological or anthropological approach can be seen more clearly in Gramsci's writings.

To understand a social position, and the associated language game, to use Wittgenstein's (1963) term, means to be a part of it, as in ethnographical research often undertaken within social or cultural anthropology, where the researcher is involved with the community being studied. Gramsci sees such an ethnographical or anthropological approach as a useful alternative when in the absence of adequate statistical data. In the cases Gramsci is analysing, those

difficulties in obtaining adequate statistical data spring from the difficulties in defining social classes adequately. Gramsci's solution constitutes an interesting methodology to be used in regional science, as a qualitative approach to be used in conjunction with, or in the absence of, quantitative data.

Gramsci refers to various specific locations, especially in Italy, but also across the world, as examples of concrete places where he studies the economic and social reconfiguration driven by the production and distribution of surplus value, and the migration of workers due to industrialization, using this ethnographical or anthropological methodology, which informs his well-known approach to hegemony. Gramsci's writings in this regard contain an important analysis of migration, hegemony and industrialization from a spatial perspective, while noting the articulation between the city and the country.

Here I shall explore this relatively neglected aspect of Gramsci's thought, which shows that hegemony must be understood in terms of a continuous process of socio-economic reconfiguration of interconnected geographical areas, in which the ability of social groups placed in certain geographical areas for producing and appropriating surplus value is crucial. I will do so by drawing upon Gramsci's *Prison notebooks*, a complex set of fragmentary notes that remained unfinished at the time of Gramsci's death, and continue to require much interpretation and contextualization in order to find the various lines of thought driving Gramsci's reasoning.

## 2 Americanism and the parasitic classes

The *Prison notebooks* consists of a series of fragmentary notes written by Antonio Gramsci after his arrest on November 1926 during Mussolini's Fascist regime. Piero Sraffa, a Cambridge economist and a close friend of Gramsci, provided him access to various books and periodicals during his stay in prison, and remained in contact with him through Tatiana Schucht, the sister of Gramsci's wife Julia Schucht, who had moved to Moscow with Gramsci's two sons. After Gramsci's death in 27 April 1937, Tatiana Schucht made sure that the material written by Gramsci in prison would survive, as it did, becoming a widely influential text.

The edition of the *Prison notebooks* to be used here is the critical English edition by Joseph Buttigieg, published in three volumes in 1992 1996 and 2007, which draws upon Gramsci's original manuscripts, and is modelled on Valentino Gerratana's 1975 critical Italian edition of the *Prison notebooks*. I shall use the page numbers of the critical English edition by Joseph Buttigieg, but I will also refer to the notebook and paragraph where the note is located whenever referring to a given note for the first time, so that the reader who uses other editions can find the textual evidence to be used here.

Gramsci had the intention of organizing the various fragmentary notes he left into a more systematic form. This can be seen by the fact that each note possesses a title that indicates where it would fit within this more systematic structure, and also by Gramsci's own indications on the connections between the notes. This more systematic structure was never concluded by Gramsci. Perhaps as a consequence of this, a tendency emerged for using Gramsci's ideas as a component of the overall structure of thought of the various authors who draw upon his writings, rather than trying to find Gramsci's own line of reasoning through exegetical work. This tendency is reinforced by the fact that Gramsci is widely cited when addressing topics such as cultural hegemony and politics, but reference to Gramsci's actual text is much less frequent when engaging in a reconstruction of his thought. This state of affairs is surely connected to the difficulties in reconstructing Gramsci's line of reasoning from the fragmentary notes he left. Doing so is an extremely complex task, which I shall undertake by referring always to

Gramsci's own text, so that the reader can best understand and interpret the meaning and context of each note.

According to Gramsci, the overall process of production and distribution of surplus value is influenced not only by the relative weight of different social groups, but also by the relative weight of, and interconnections between, the population living in rural and urban areas. The appropriation of surplus value acquires specific characteristics in the countryside, where what Gramsci (1992, p. 167) called 'parasitic' social groups that possess a great capability for appropriating surplus value lead to the formation of nearby cities characterized by the lack of industrial activities, which stand in contrast to cities where the process of production and distribution of surplus value contributes to industrialization.

At the same time as surplus value circulates between rural and urban areas, workers also migrate from the rural countryside to urban centres. The migration of workers occurs not only to those urban centres that depend upon the parasitic appropriation of surplus value, but also to the urban centres engaged in the process of industrialization. The latter urban centres witness a rationalization of economic activity where parasitic social groups become less common. But the permanent flow of workers from the rural countryside to urban centres, a result of the greater birth rate in the countryside and the reduction of employment in the countryside relatively to urban centres, leads to a continuous reconfiguration of the economy and society, posing a permanent challenge to the maintenance of hegemony, as Gramsci argues.

A particularly interesting set of notes for understanding this process are those under the heading of 'Americanism', in which Gramsci identifies the economic, social and cultural changes taking place in America, and its significance for global historical change. A central line of thought in Gramsci's analysis of America is the contrast between America and Europe. An important aspect of Gramsci's view of Americanism is what Gramsci (1992, p. 167) calls, in paragraph 61 of notebook 1, the 'rationalization of the population', by which he means 'that there do not exist numerous classes without a function in the world of production, in other words, absolutely parasitic classes'. Gramsci (1992, p. 167) notes that the European 'tradition', in contrast to America, 'is characterized precisely by the existence of these classes, created by the following social elements: state administration, clergy and intellectuals, landed property, commerce'. Gramsci (1992, p. 167) also notes that '[t]he older the history of a country, the more have these elements left, over the centuries, sedimentations of lazy people who live on the "pension" left by their "ancestors"'.

Gramsci (1992, p. 167) notes that it is difficult to obtain statistical data on these 'parasitic classes' since it is difficult to find a category that would 'encompass them', and suggests the identification of certain 'forms of life' as a possible way of finding some information about the relative weight of these classes. This leads to the use of what may be termed an ethnographical or anthropological approach, in which the analysis of an overall form of life within a certain location plays a key role. In particular, Gramsci (1992, p. 167) notes that '[t]he considerable number of large and medium-sized urban clusters without industries is one of these indications, perhaps the most important one'.

The fact that Gramsci sees large and medium-sized urban clusters without industries as probably the most important indicator of the existence of parasitic classes shows how he considers industrialization to be a crucial element of the historical transformation which he identifies with the phenomenon labelled as 'Americanism'. America, under this perspective, stands in contrast to the European 'tradition', in which parasitic classes prevail. In fact, the various notes on 'Americanism' suggest that Gramsci sees Henry Ford's industrial methods as an important driver of change, by requiring specialized workers who are in short supply, and hence receive higher wages, while creating also a larger internal market for consumption, and leading also to the need of new social and cultural forms of disciplining the labour force.

This is a topic to which I shall return. For the time being, the point I wish to highlight is Gramsci's (1992, p. 167) emphasis on 'large and medium-sized urban clusters without industries' as 'perhaps the most important' indicator of the existence of parasitic classes. This suggests that Gramsci takes the form of urbanization to be intimately connected to the underlying process of appropriation of surplus value by a given social class, as I shall argue below.

Gramsci (1992, p. 168) connects the existence of the parasitic classes to '[s]mall and medium-sized property not in the hands of peasant farmers but of small-town and village bourgeois who turn it over to primitive share-cropping (that is, rent in kind) or in perpetual lease'. Gramsci (1992, p. 168) adds that '[t]he enormous size of this petty or middle bourgeoisie of "pensioners" and "rentiers" has created in Italian economic literature the monstrous figure of the so called "producers of savings" that is, of a large class of "usurers" which not only extracts its own sustenance from the primitive labour of a specific number of peasants, but also manages to save'.

The rural countryside is the economic basis of those parasitic classes, which include, besides the 'producers of savings' who live on the labour of peasants, also those involved in services provided to the 'producers of savings' in urban centres. Gramsci (1992, p. 168) also includes in the parasitic classes 'relatively young and able-bodied men who after 25 years of State employment (sometimes at age 45 and in very good health) no longer do anything but live on their pensions'. Gramsci (1992, p. 168) further notes that the predominance of parasitic classes leads to an attitude in society where 'manual labor becomes "disgraceful"'.

Gramsci (1992, p. 167–168) gives the Italian city of Naples as an example of an urban location where 'the Southern landowners spend the income from their agrarian property', noting how the economic activity of the city 'is structured around tens of thousands of these landowning families, of greater or lesser economic importance, with their retinues of personal servants and lackeys'. Gramsci (1992, p. 168) takes this socio-economic structure to be of the utmost importance for explaining historical processes, for he writes that '[t]his structure of Naples (it would be useful to have precise data) explains much of the history of the city of Naples'.

Gramsci (1992, p. 168) notes that this phenomenon, observed in Naples, occurs in other Italian cities, for it 'is repeated in Palermo and in a whole series of medium-sized and small cities, not only in the South and in the Islands but also in Central Italy (Tuscany, Umbria, Rome) and even in Northern Italy (Bologna, to some extent, Parma, Ferrara, etc.)'. In fact, Gramsci (1992, p. 169) takes this phenomenon to be quite generalized across the world, for he writes that '[t]his situation is not unique to Italy; to a large extent it is true of all of Europe, more so in southern Europe, and increasingly less so toward the North. (In India and China it must be even more abnormal than in Italy, which explains the historical stagnation.)'

Europe (especially southern Europe), and to a greater degree India and China, stand thus in opposition to North America, since in North America it is the classes connected to industrialization, rather than parasitic classes connected to the exploitation of peasants, that predominate. Gramsci (1992, p. 169) notes that the 'formidable accumulation of capital' in America, even despite its higher wages, is explained by the 'nonexistence of these viscous sediments from past historical phases', which has 'made possible a healthy base for industry and especially for commerce, and it makes it increasingly possible to reduce transportation and commerce to a subordinate activity of production – an activity absorbed by industry itself'. Remember that earlier in this note, Gramsci placed commerce as one of the parasitic activities in Europe. In America, in contrast, commerce, like transportation, is organically integrated with industry, and thus becomes also part of a productive set of activities.

The American productive structure leads also to a simplification of the superstructure of political and ideological forms. Gramsci (1992, p. 169) notes that in America '[h]egemony is born in the factory and does not need so many political and ideological intermediaries',

in a context where ‘the “structure” dominates the superstructures more directly and the superstructures are rationalized (simplified and reduced in number)’. The lesser importance of parasitic classes in America, where classes associated with productive activities predominate at the time Gramsci is writing, leads thus to important changes at a cultural and political level too, which will be further addressed at a later stage below.

So far, we have seen that geography plays a crucial role in Gramsci’s analysis of historical transformation. A certain type of urbanization constitutes an indicator of the existence of parasitic classes that prevent progress, as it becomes manifest in the existence of urban centres without industrial activity. The emergence of those urban centres is connected to certain forms of life, expressed in particular attitudes towards manual labour. It is now necessary to understand how these urban centres emerge, and how they can be distinguished from other urban centres where productive classes associated with industry predominate.

In another note on Americanism, paragraph 135 of notebook 1, Gramsci (1992, pp. 220–222) discusses an article where Carlo Pagni examines N. Maximo Fovel’s (1929) book *Economia e corporativismo*. In this discussion, Gramsci explains in more detail his views on the role of industrial activity in America, and the economic structures underlying the parasitic classes. Gramsci (1992, p. 221) writes that what he finds interesting in Fovel’s book is ‘his conception of the corporation as an autonomous industrial-productive bloc destined to resolve in a modern way the problem of the economic apparatus in an emphatically capitalistic manner, opposing the parasitic elements of society which take an excessive large cut of surplus value, and the so-called “producers of savings”’.

Gramsci (1992, p. 221) notes that in this conception ‘[t]he production of savings should, therefore, be a function of the productive bloc itself, through a growth in production at lower costs and through the creation of greater surplus value which would allow higher profits, and hence greater capitalization within firms – and not through the intermediary of the “producers of savings” who, in reality, devour surplus value’. In the urban centres connected to the ‘producers of savings’, surplus value is wasted in services provided to the parasitic classes without any productive purpose. In the urban centres connected to industrialization, in contrast, the corporations emerge as an organizational form in which surplus value can be reinvested in productive activities, rather than wasted in the parasitic classes. Of course, whether corporations actually behave in this way, or become mere rentiers, depends upon the overall historical context.

A central notion used by Gramsci in this analysis is the notion of ‘surplus value’. The process of production and distribution of surplus value is central to the process of socio-economic change. If the surplus value produced by the agricultural labourers in the countryside is appropriated by the parasitic classes, we have a crystalized socio-economic structure characterized by historical stagnation. If the surplus value is used in productive activities connected to industrialization, in contrast, we find a development of socio-economic activity driven by the productive classes. To understand the notion of surplus value, it is now important to focus on Gramsci’s own perspective on the analysis of the classical political economists and Marx.

### 3 Gramsci and classical political economy

Gramsci’s analysis of the underlying process of production and distribution of surplus value is grounded on Marx’s analysis. But it is important to understand in which way Gramsci interprets Marx’s theory, which he sees as a continuation of classical political economy. Effectively, the distinction Gramsci makes between a productive class that uses surplus value in productive activities, and a parasitic class that wastes surplus value, which is present in Marx’s analysis,

goes back to classical political economy, which, according to Sraffa, was developed before Marx into its more advanced stage by Ricardo (1821), as Sraffa's (1951) notes, not least when making reference to a 'standpoint, which is that of the old classical economists from Adam Smith to Ricardo' (Sraffa 1960, p. v).

The importance that Gramsci attributes to Ricardo can be seen in a letter written on 30 May 1932 to Tatiana Schucht, in which Gramsci asks her to enquire Sraffa on a series of observations connected to the role of Ricardo in the history of philosophy. In particular, Gramsci is wondering whether Ricardo can be seen as a key figure not only in the history of economics, but also in the history of philosophy, due to the way in which 'Ricardo helped to direct the early theoreticians of the philosophy of praxis toward going beyond Hegelian philosophy and toward constructing their new historicism, rid of every trace of speculative logic' (Gramsci 1992, p. 435).

That is, Gramsci is wondering whether the influence of Ricardo on Marx may have been great enough to influence not only Marx's economic studies, but also Marx's overall philosophy of praxis. Gramsci (1992, p. 435) points out 'two fundamental concepts in economics, the "determined market" and the "law of tendency"', which he attributes to Ricardo, and argues that these concepts may have led Marx from the 'idealist and speculative discourse of classical German philosophy' to a 'realist, immediately historical "immanence" in which the law of causality of the natural sciences has been rid of its mechanistic character and identified synthetically with Hegelian dialectical reason'. Gramsci (1992, p. 435) notes that these ideas are still 'somewhat confused', but he believes that '[o]ne needs to find out how and to what extent did classical English economics, in the methodological form elaborated by Ricardo, contribute to the further development of the new theory'.

Evidence of the influence of the classical political economists on Marx can also be found in Marx's own contributions. In the first volume of *Das Kapital* published in 1867, Marx (1999, p. 483) traces what he calls 'classical political economy' back to the contributions of William Petty, and identifies Adam Smith and David Ricardo as its key exponents. Marx (1999, p. 483) distinguishes classical political economy, which 'has investigated the real relations of production in bourgeois society', from 'vulgar economy, which deals with appearances only'. Marx is also critical of classical political economy. But Marx sees classical political economy as a scientific endeavour that possesses important insights on the production and distribution of surplus value that can be developed into a more sophisticated theory, in contrast with vulgar economy, which focuses on superficial phenomena and produces no scientific insights. Marx's analysis of classical political economy can be seen in more detail in Marx's (1910) *Theorien über den mehrwert*, where Marx analyses the various theories of surplus value. Gramsci had a French translation of this work in prison, and it is among the works Gramsci asked Tatiana Schucht to send him in a letter from 25 March 1929.

Gramsci's questions on the connections between Marx on the one hand, and Ricardo and the classical political economists on the other hand, are directed to Sraffa. And there would be few people in a better position to answer Gramsci's questions. Sraffa engaged in a lifelong research on classical political economy, and reached the conclusion that Marx's theory is indeed best interpreted as a development of classical political economy, in an approach where the central question is the production and distribution of surplus value, as noted by Pierangelo Garegnani (1984, 1998). The *Royal Economic Society* had appointed Sraffa as the editor of Ricardo's collected works in 1930 (Porta 1986; Gehrke and Kurz 2002), a project in which he worked on for a decade, and was at an initial stage when Gramsci sent his letter in 30 May 1932. After having been appointed the editor of Ricardo's works, Sraffa discussed his editorial problems with Gramsci through Tatiana Schucht.

Sraffa's edition of Ricardo's collected works was not completed by the time Gramsci died in 1937, and it is difficult to know to what extent Gramsci would share all of Sraffa's conclusions

regarding the classical theory of the production and distribution of surplus value. But Gramsci's overall conception clearly identifies a line of continuity between Marx's theory, and the classical political economists, within an overall conception where the emphasis of economic theory is on the production and distribution of surplus value. The more general conclusions reached by Sraffa (1951, 1960) in his analysis are in line with Gramsci's overall vision expressed at a time when Sraffa was beginning his edition of Ricardo's works.

When developing those more general conclusions, Sraffa (1951, 1960) highlights how the classical-Marxian approach is radically different from the subsequent marginalist analysis that became dominant in economic theory. The classical authors and Marx possess a circular conception of the socio-economic process, which is a continuous process of socio-economic reproduction. In this circular conception, agriculture constitutes the basic sector for the definition of the surplus. This is so because agriculture is the only sector where outputs can be used as inputs within the circular process of reproduction, and thus any reduction in output prices also reduces input prices, maintaining a surplus that sets the constraints for overall economic activity, as Sraffa (1960) explains while drawing on Ricardo.

The circular nature of the process of socio-economic reproduction was highlighted in a clearer way by François Quesnay, as Marx (1910) and Sraffa (1960) noted, who placed agriculture at the centre of his analysis. Quesnay distinguished between a productive class of farmers, the sterile class of artisans, and the landowners who receive rents without engaging in production. Central to Quesnay's analysis is whether the surplus produced in agriculture is used in productive activities, leading to economic prosperity, or in wasteful consumption, leading to economic decline.

Smith extends Quesnay's analysis, arguing that it is not only agriculture, but also other sectors that contribute to the economic surplus, through the division of labour, within what can be seen as an agro-industrial sector integrated with commercial activities. But in so doing, Smith maintains Quesnay's overall scheme, where the central question of economic analysis is whether the surplus is used by social classes that employ it in productive uses, or parasitic classes that waste the surplus in luxurious consumption. Ricardo, in turn, draws upon Smith's analysis, while also maintaining that the central question of economic analysis is whether the surplus is used by social classes that employ it in productive uses, or parasitic classes that waste the surplus in luxurious consumption, such as the landlords who receive rent.

This overall scheme adopted by the classical political economists appears clearly in Gramsci's conception, which is also a conception where a contrast is made between productive classes who use surplus value in productive activities, and parasitic classes who use surplus value in wasteful consumption, respectively. For Gramsci, economic development is connected to the use of surplus value by a productive social class, rather than by those that Gramsci identifies as the parasitic social classes. According to Gramsci, the productive classes are those connected not only to the process of industrialization, but also those involved in agricultural activity, such as the peasants. For it is the peasants who produce the surplus value that is appropriated by the parasitic classes, which includes all the rentiers who live on a fixed income without contributing to the productive process, connected for example to state administration, clergy and intellectuals, landed property, or commerce of goods and services for the producers of savings, as noted above.

Gramsci is thus continuing a line of reasoning that had been developed before by the classical political economists and Marx. In fact, even Marx's analysis of class struggle draws upon the classical study of society in terms of social classes. The great difference between Marx and classical political economists in this regard is that, after seeing the emergence of large joint-stock companies, Marx reaches the belief that capitalist owners are increasingly disconnected from productive activities, in a context where workers are supervised by other workers who engage in management activities, replacing the capitalist entrepreneur (Martins 2013).

In this context, even if corporations engage in productive activities, as Marx and Gramsci suggest they do, it often happens that at some stage the capitalist owners cease to be entrepreneurs, and become mere rentiers, part of the parasitic social classes, leaving workers as the only productive class, as Marx and Gramsci noted on various occasions. Smith and Ricardo, in contrast, saw capitalists as a social group engaged in productive activities connected to leadership and supervision. But the underlying study of the production and distribution of the surplus between productive or parasitic social classes is the same as the one employed afterwards by Gramsci, with the key difference being connected to a new historical setting, where ownership of large corporations becomes separated from management activities. Furthermore, the interplay between town and country, which was very important for classical political economists like Cantillon, Quesnay or Smith, also plays a central role for Gramsci, which can be seen more clearly in the spatial dimension of his work studied here.

#### 4 Hegemony and the intellectuals

Gramsci's study of the parasitic classes goes beyond the scope of the analysis of the classical political economists, since Gramsci is addressing various aspects other than the economic aspect, such as the construction of hegemony, which can be fruitfully articulated with the classical study of the dichotomy between the city and the countryside. In this section I will address this topic, which can be seen more clearly in Gramsci's analysis of concrete cases, such as the Italian case.

The role of the parasitic classes in hindering progress appears also in Gramsci's analysis of the concrete Italian situation, when Gramsci (1992, p. 222, original emphasis) notes that '[t]he disappearance of *rentiers* in Italy is a condition of industrial change, not a consequence'. But Gramsci (1992, p. 222, original emphasis) notes that the Italian state is not heading in this direction since, on the contrary, '[t]he state is increasing the number of *rentiers* and creating closed social formations'.

Gramsci (1992, p. 222) argues that 'Americanization requires a specific environment, a specific social structure, and a certain type of state'. Gramsci adds that '[t]he state is the liberal state, not in the sense of a liberalism in trade, but in the more essential sense of free initiative and economic individualism, which by spontaneous means, through its own historical development, succeeds in establishing a regime of monopolies'. Like Marx, Gramsci places large joint-stock companies, which succeed in obtaining monopolistic positions, at the core of capitalist development, through their role not only in the co-ordination of economic activity, but also in capturing surplus value that can be reinvested.

These conditions do not exist in Italy, Gramsci argues, because in Italy the surplus value is captured by rentiers. Furthermore, Gramsci (1992, p. 222) notes that the Italian corporative regime 'protects a certain minimum standard of life for the employed, which would itself collapse and provoke serious upheavals if there were free competition'. But even in a situation such as Italy's, Gramsci (1992, p. 222) sees possibilities for a change, and adds that the corporative regime 'could move ahead with very small imperceptible steps which would modify the social structure without sudden shocks'. This remark, and the reference to the modification of the social structure through small steps, is indicative of Gramsci's overall conception of the nature of socio-economic change. This conception is one in which economic structures, ideological formations and the state play all a key role in a deeply interconnected process, and thus changes must take place through carefully thought steps.

A central element to understand this question is Gramsci's analysis of ideology, which helps understand the cultural differences between various geographical areas, and its spatio-ethnographic context. In paragraph 49 of notebook 4 we find a very important note titled

‘The intellectuals’ (where in the original manuscript we find that Gramsci wrote ‘Gli Intellettuali’ with letters distinctively larger than the letters used in the titles of other notes). This note contains essential elements of Gramsci’s analysis of ideology, and of the way in which ideological forms are distinctively shaped in rural life and urban life.

Gramsci (1996, p. 199) notes that ‘[e]very social group coming into existence on the primal basis of an essential function in the world of production creates together with itself, organically, a rank or several ranks of intellectuals who give it homogeneity and a consciousness of its own function in the economic sphere: the capitalist entrepreneur creates along with himself the economist, the scientist of political economy’. The intellectual, for Gramsci, is essentially an ‘organizer of masses of men’, who possesses certain capacities for becoming an organizer. But Gramsci (1996, p. 199) notes also that ‘every social group emerging into history out of the economic structure finds or has found – at least in all of past history – pre-existing categories of intellectuals that moreover seemed to represent a historical continuity uninterrupted even by the most complicated changes in social and political forms’. This leads to a distinction between the ‘organic’ intellectuals, who play a role as organizers, and the ‘traditional’ intellectuals, who may have been organic intellectuals in previous social and political forms, but are not so in the present.

The distinction between ‘organic’ and ‘traditional’ intellectual raises the question of who can be considered an intellectual. An ‘organic’ intellectual is an organizer that plays a role in the existing mode of production, but such a definition does not encompass a ‘traditional’ intellectual who may not play a significant role in the present social and political forms. Gramsci (1996, p. 200) argues that ‘the most widespread methodological error’ consists in looking ‘for the essential characteristic in the intrinsic nature of intellectual activity rather than in the system of relations wherein this activity (and the group that personifies it) is located within the general ensemble of social relations’.

For Gramsci, we cannot understand intellectual activity without understanding the general ensemble of social relations in which it is located. This means that to understand Gramsci’s conception of intellectual activity, we must first understand his conception of human activity as part of an ensemble of social relations. In paragraph 151 of notebook 8, Gramsci (2007, p. 321) writes, while including also a remark in square brackets, that ‘[h]uman nature is the ensemble of social relations that determines a historically defined consciousness, and this consciousness indicates what is “natural” and what is not [and human nature is contradictory because it is the ensemble of social relations]’. Indeed, Gramsci (2007, p. 321) criticizes the idea of a human nature independent from social relations, for he notes that ‘[p]eople also speak of “second nature”; a certain habit becomes second nature, but was the “first nature” really “first”?’’, while adding that ‘this commonsense mode of expression’ contains itself an ‘indication of the historicity of human nature’. In this note, Gramsci takes ‘natural’ to mean simply ‘normal’, ‘habitual’ or ‘conventional’, that is, a word that indicates historical specificity (Martins 2013, pp. 226–227).

So what we call ‘human nature’ is always historically shaped by the ensemble of social relations. The ‘ensemble of social relations’ in an idea taken from Marx’s sixth thesis on Feuerbach, where Marx notes that human essence is the ensemble of social relations (Martins 2013, pp. 210–211). In paragraph 123 of notebook 1 we find again important remarks on the historicity of human nature, when Gramsci (1992, p. 211) notes that ‘perhaps a few days after birth the child accumulates sensations and images which multiply themselves and become complex with the acquisition of language’. This makes the idea of ‘spontaneity’ problematic, as Gramsci (1992, p. 211) notes, since human beings are shaped by their historical context soon after birth.

In paragraph 33 of notebook 1, Gramsci (1992, p. 120) provides further critical remarks of the idea of a fixed human nature, present in eighteenth century references to a state of a ‘natural

savage', noting that 'Freudian psychology has given rise to a kind of eighteenth-century literature; the "savage", in modern form, has been replaced by the Freudian type'. Gramsci (1992, pp. 404–405) further clarifies his critique of Freud's psychoanalysis and of the "noble savage" corrupted by society' on a letter to Tatiana Schucht from 30 December 1929. The historicity of human nature further highlights the need of an ethnographical or anthropological approach to studying social phenomena, and to understanding ideology and hegemony in terms of the social relations that constitute a human being, to be studied while immersed in the overall cultural context.

In paragraph 177 of notebook 8, Gramsci (2007, p. 337, original emphasis) goes as far as arguing that 'objective reality' means simply something that is universal to all human beings, since 'the subject knows objectively insofar as knowledge is real for the whole human race *historically* unified in a unitary cultural system'. Gramsci (2007, p. 337) adds that '[t]he struggle for objectivity is thus the struggle for the cultural unification of the human race', where '[t]his unification process is the process of objectivization of the subject, who becomes increasingly a concrete universal, historically concrete'. Gramsci (2007, p. 337) notes that '[e]xperimental science is the terrain on which this objectivization reached its maximum realization; it is the cultural element that has contributed the most to unifying humanity'. So even notions such as objectivity, including those used in science, are always historically situated, and simply mean that the ensemble of social relations led to cultural unification, from which universality springs. Gramsci (2007, p. 338) notes that '[w]e know phenomena in relation to man, and since man is a becoming, knowledge is a becoming, as well, and so is objectivity, etc'.

The idea of becoming captures the processual aspect of social reality, which is in continuous reproduction and transformation. In paragraph 35 of notebook 7 Gramsci (2007, p. 186) stresses again this idea, and writes that the idea '[t]hat "human nature" is the "ensemble of social relations" is the most satisfying answer, because it includes the idea of becoming – man becomes, he changes continuously with the changing of social relations – and because it negates "man in general"'. It is the continuous change of social relations that leads to the emergence of contradictory aspects in human nature, as forms connected to previous social relations persist through historical change, including traditional intellectuals that no longer play an organic role in society.

Since human beings are historically constituted through existing social relations, we can then see the great importance not only of an ethnographical or anthropological approach as a method of study, but also of organic intellectuals in shaping society, which is a society that does not tend to a natural state that can be defined independently of an historical context. This is why the role of existing social relations, and the organic intellectuals that reproduce those social relations, is so important in understanding historically specific hegemonic forms.

Organic intellectuals provide the key for articulating hegemony at a broader (national or possibly international level) with the regional level, in which traditional forms of life and social relations prevails. This is a central element for understanding Gramsci's analysis of the state, which remains very influential in political science. Whether a state is a liberal or a corporative one, or of any other type, depends on how hegemony is permanently reproduced and transformed through those who act as organic intellectuals. Gramsci (1996, p. 202) refers to the local 'priest, lawyer, teacher, notary, doctor, etc.', as examples of someone who bridges the gap between hegemonic ideas and specific spatio-ethnographic contexts, thus organizing consent at a local level.

Gramsci (1996, p. 200) notes that 'the relationship between the intellectuals and production is not direct, as in the case of the fundamental social groups, but mediated, and is mediated by two types of social organization: (a) by civil society, that is, by the ensemble of private organizations in society; (b) by the state'. Gramsci (1996, p. 200) further adds that '[t]he intellectuals have a function in the "hegemony" that is exercised throughout society by the

dominant group and in the “domination” over society that is embodied by the state, and this function is precisely “organizational” or connective’. So the intellectuals are the organizers of ‘social hegemony’ and the ‘consent’ (Gramsci 1996, p. 200).

## 5 Intellectuals and their geographical context

The spatial dimension of organic intellectuals appears not only in the way in which they bridge the gap between hegemony and specific spatio-ethnographic contexts at a regional or local level, but also in the way in which they are themselves influenced by the specific geographic context at the national or international level. Since organic intellectuals are themselves influenced by the surrounding social relations, there will emerge different types of intellectuals in different geographical contexts at an international level, leading to different organization of the state apparatus, and its articulation with spatio-ethnographic aspects through the organic intellectuals.

Gramsci (1996, pp. 204–208) notes how different types of intellectuals exist in Italy, France, Russia, England, Germany, United States, South and Central America, India, China and Japan. Gramsci (1996, p. 204) notes that the ‘cosmopolitan function’ of Italian intellectuals ‘is both cause and effect of the fragmented state of the peninsula from the fall of the Roman Empire until 1870’. For France, in contrast, we find, according to Gramsci (1996, p. 204) a ‘harmonious development of all the nation’s energies and, especially, of the categories of intellectuals’. Gramsci (1996, p. 204) argues thus that in the French revolution of 1789 ‘a new social group surfaced politically in history’ which was ‘already fully equipped for all its social functions, and therefore it fought for total domination of the nation’. Gramsci (1996, p. 204) further adds that ‘[t]his massive intellectual establishment explains the intellectual functions of France in the second half of the eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century, an international and cosmopolitan function of irradiation of an expansion that had the character of organic imperialism’, in contrast to the Italian cosmopolitanism which was connected to the migration of intellectuals which precluded rather than enabled ‘the development of the national base’.

In Russia we find yet another historical configuration, since, as Gramsci (1996, p. 204) notes (while adding a remark in square brackets), ‘the political [commercial] organization was created by the Normans (Varangians) and the religious organization by the Byzantine Greeks; at a later time, the Germans and the French provided the protoplasm of Russian history with a strong skeleton’. In England, Gramsci (1996, p. 205) argues that, in contrast to France, ‘[t]he new social group that came into existence on the basis of modern industrialism has grown remarkably on the economic-corporate level, but in the intellectual-political level field it gropes its way in the dark’. This is so, Gramsci (1996, p. 205) argues, because ‘the old landed class is joined to the industrialists by a kind of suture similar to the one by which in other countries the dominant classes are joined to the “traditional” intellectuals’. Gramsci (1996, p. 205) adds that the English case appears also in Germany, but is aggravated by the fact that Germany, like Italy, ‘has been the seat of a universalistic, supranational institution and ideology (the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation)’, leading industrial development to take place in a semi-feudal framework until November 1918.

Gramsci also refers to the development of the categories of intellectuals outside Europe, addressing not only the case of America, but also the cases of India, China and Japan. Gramsci (1996, p. 207) notes that the case of Japan should not be confused with the cases of China and India, since ‘Japan comes close to the English and German type of development – that is, an industrial civilization that develops within a semifeudal framework – but, as far as I can tell, more like the English than the German type’. Gramsci (1996, p. 207) also notes that ‘[i]n China there is the problem of the script, an expression of the total separation of the intellectuals from the people’. This is an aspect of China that Gramsci addresses several times throughout the

notebooks, noting how mandarin is a difficult language, used mainly by the elites as a form of distinction. This distinction also occurs in India, for Gramsci (1996, p. 207) notes that '[i]n India and China one encounters the phenomenon of the enormous gap between the religion of the people and the religion of the clergy and the intellectuals; it, too, is related to the separation between the intellectuals and the people'.

America, in contrast, is characterized by the absence of traditional intellectuals. But this absence led to different patterns across the American continent. In the United States, the absence of traditional intellectuals enabled, according to Gramsci (1996, p. 206) a 'massive formation of all the modern superstructures on an industrial base', as already noted above when discussing Gramsci's notes on Americanism. Gramsci (1996, p. 207) notes that 'the category of traditional intellectuals does not exist in South and Central America either, but the situation does not present itself in the same terms as in the United States'. This is so, Gramsci (1996, p. 207) argues, because 'at the root of development in these countries we find the Spanish and Portuguese civilization of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, characterized by the Counter-Reformation and by militarism'. For Gramsci (1996, p. 207), this means that 'the most resistant crystallizations in these countries are the clergy and the army, two categories of intellectuals that, in part, carry on the traditions of the European mother countries'. Gramsci (1996, p. 207) adds that '[f]urthermore, the industrial base is very limited and has not developed complicated superstructures: the majority of intellectuals are of the rural type, and since large estate holdings and extensive property ownership by the church predominate, these intellectuals are linked to the clergy and the big landowners'.

When discussing the intellectuals of South and Central America, Gramsci refers again to rural structures of production and appropriation of the surplus, and to the category of intellectuals of the rural type. Effectively, earlier in this note, and in a more general context, Gramsci (1996, p. 201) makes a distinction between 'the urban and the rural type of intellectuals', which is most helpful for further understanding the geographical aspects of the process of production and distribution of surplus value discussed above. The distinction between intellectuals of a rural type and of an urban type is central to understanding the geography of production and distribution of surplus value throughout the world.

Gramsci (1996, p. 201) notes that '[i]ntellectuals of the urban type are rather closely tied to industry', are 'on average, very standardized', and 'have the same function as subalterns in the army: they establish the relationship between the entrepreneur and the industrial masses, they execute the production plan drawn by the general staff of industry'. Intellectuals of the rural type, in contrast, 'bring the peasant masses into contact with the local or state administration (lawyers, notaries, etc.), and because of this function they are of greater political significance: this professional mediation is, in fact, hard to separate from political mediation' (Gramsci 1996, p. 201–202).

According to Gramsci (1996, p. 202), the intellectual of the rural type has not only a greater political significance, but also a greater social significance, since 'in the country, the intellectual (priest, lawyer, teacher, notary, doctor, etc.) represents a social model for the average peasant, who aspires to escape from his condition in order to improve himself'. Gramsci (1996, p. 202) further adds that '[t]he peasant always thinks that at least one of his sons could become an intellectual', which would help 'raising the social level of the family and facilitating its economic life through the connections he is bound to have', which also means that '[t]he attitude of the peasant towards the intellectual is twofold: he admires the social position of the intellectual and, in general, the position of the state employee, but he sometimes feigns to disdain it; in other words, his instinctive admiration is interlaced with elements of envy and burning anger'.

The centrality of the rural intellectuals for understanding the process of production and distribution of surplus value that takes place in the countryside, and indeed all economic, social

and political aspects in rural areas, is again stressed when Gramsci (1996, p. 202) argues that '[i]t is impossible to understand anything about the peasants without taking into consideration their effective subordination to the intellectuals', which also means that 'every development of the peasant masses to a certain extent is linked to and depends on the movements of the intellectuals'. Gramsci (1996, p. 202) further notes that urban intellectuals do not possess the same influence, noting that '[f]actory technicians do not exercise any political influence on the instrumental masses, or at least that phase has already been superseded'. Quite the contrary, Gramsci (1996, p. 202) argues that sometimes 'the instrumental masses – at least, through their own organic intellectuals – exercise an influence over the technicians'.

## 6 City and country

The differences between intellectuals of the rural type and of the urban type are connected to the different processes of production and distribution of surplus value identified above. Urban intellectuals are integrated into an overall productive structure, while being indeed influenced by the overall process of production, and can thus have a role in the use of surplus value for productive purposes. Rural intellectuals, in contrast, are not integrated into the productive structure, and are indeed part of the parasitic classes identified by Gramsci (1992, p. 167), connected to 'state administration, clergy and intellectuals, landed property, commerce'.

Of course, the rural areas and the urban areas do not remain fully separated. Gramsci (1992, p. 171) notes in paragraph 62 of notebook 1 that, at an international level, 'the working generations are being swollen by masses of foreign immigrants who modify the base: as in America, a certain division of labour is taking place (skilled as well as managerial and organizational functions for the indigenous population and unskilled labour for the immigrants)'. This change in the urban population happens also at a national level, as a consequence of the fact that, as Gramsci (1992, p. 171) notes, '[i]n every country the same relationship is established between the city with its low birth rate and the prolific countryside, creating a rather serious economic problem; industrial life demands a general apprenticeship, a psycho-physical adaptation to the conditions of work, nutrition, housing, etc. which are not "natural": the acquired urban traits are passed on as a legacy'.

The fact that the countryside possesses a high birth rate, while the city possesses a low birth rate, a fact connected to the forms of life in both areas, leads to a continuous flow of migration from the countryside to the city, posing challenges to hegemony in the city. As Gramsci (1992, p. 171) argues '[t]he low birth rate requires a continuous expenditure for apprenticeship and brings with it a continual change in the sociopolitical composition of the city, hence also raising a problem of hegemony'.

In paragraph 138 of notebook 2, Gramsci (1992, p. 357) notes that industrial life in the city requires a more qualified worker, and explains how one cannot ignore that 'the new technique based on rationalization and Taylorism has created a new and original psycho-technical qualification and that the workers with this qualification are not only few in number, but are still in the process of formation, which is why those with the "right bent" are sought after competitively with high wages'. Furthermore, Gramsci (1992, p. 358) notes that 'the American industrialists like Ford' tried to argue that their industries require 'a new form of relations', which is no surprise, since 'in addition to the economic effect of high wages, they also tried to obtain certain social effects of spiritual hegemony, and this is normal'.

This attempt at spiritual hegemony is manifest in various dimensions of social life. Gramsci (1992, p. 171) argues elsewhere that 'American industrialists take an interest in the sexual relations of their employees – the puritan mentality, however, conceals an obvious necessity: there cannot be intense productive labour without a regulation of the sexual instinct'. Urban

industrial life thus poses various problems for hegemony, which are addressed by the organic intellectuals of an urban type in order to maintain the levels of industrial productivity. This is especially necessary in a context where migration leads to a change in the urban population, bringing into the cities rural population with different forms of life.

It is not only the maintenance of hegemony in the city, but also the maintenance of hegemony in the country that is affected by migration, by disturbing the existent economic relationships. As Gramsci (1992, p. 355) notes in paragraph 137 of notebook 2, 'one of the reasons for the complaints about the rural exodus is to be found in the interests of landowners who see wages go up because of the competition from urban industries and a way of life that is more "legal", less exposed to the despotism and abuse which characterize everyday rural life'.

This despotism becomes manifest in various dimensions of social life in the country, including sexual life. According to Gramsci, sexual life assumes different forms in the country, where a despotic form of life prevails, and in the city, where a more 'legal' form of life prevails (and in America assumes the form of a puritan mentality aimed at bringing the worker into a form of life compatible with efficiency in production activities). The more despotic form of life in the country enables the existence of a greater number of situations of abuse, according to Gramsci (1992, p. 170), who thus notes that 'most monstrous sexual crimes take place in the countryside'. In connection to these problems, which assume different forms in the city and in the country, Gramsci (1992, p. 171) writes that '[t]he most important question is the protection of the feminine personality: until woman has truly attained independence in relation to man, the sexual question will be full of morbid characteristics and one must exercise caution in dealing with it and in drawing legislative conclusions'. Rather than trying to address the problem through legislation aimed at specific problems, the more general problem to address is the emancipation of women, which constitutes the best means for addressing these questions connected to the forms of life in the city and in the country.

As for the dichotomy between city and country, Gramsci also suggests various ways in which it can be addressed. In this context, Gramsci (1992, p. 356) criticizes the idea of solving the contradictions between city and country by returning to a pre-industrial rural life 'on the basis of artisanship'. In fact, in paragraph 96 of notebook 7, Gramsci (2007, p. 220) notes that it is difficult to define artisanship in the present historical context, and asks: 'is the artisan who uses electric power still an artisan in the traditional sense?' Gramsci (1992, p. 356) notes that '[t]he "artisanal" utopia was founded on the textile industry: it was believed that once the distribution of electric energy over great distances becomes feasible, it would be possible to give electric powered modern mechanical loom back to the peasant family'.

But Gramsci (1992, p. 356) notes that the increase in productivity in urban industry 'poses enormous new problems of competition and of capital needs, in addition to organizational problems which the peasant family cannot resolve'. Gramsci (1992, pp. 356–357) also notes that 'the industrial utilization of time periods when the peasant cannot work', which is a fundamental problem, 'can only take place in a highly developed economy that follows a plan capable of remaining immune to the temporal fluctuations of sales which are already occurring and bring with them dead seasons even in industry'. Finally, Gramsci (1992, p. 357) argues that 'the great concentration of industry and the serial production of interchangeable parts make it possible to transfer factory divisions to the countryside, reducing congestion in the big city and making industrial life more hygienic'. Gramsci (1992, p. 357) thus concludes that '[i]t is not the artisan who will return to the countryside but, on the contrary, the most modern and standardized worker'.

Thus, the solution to the dichotomy between city and country lies in an extension of industrial processes to the countryside, thus avoiding the contradictions generated by the dichotomy between city and country, such as the constant rural-urban migration that poses permanent challenges to the city. Furthermore, one would expect that the extension of

productive industry to the countryside, by changing the rural form of life, would contribute for a less despotic form of life, in which the intellectuals of a rural type connected to the parasitic classes see their hegemonic influence reduced. Addressing the contradictions between city and country would thus contribute to solving the contradictions of capitalism, which can be seen in the production and distribution of surplus value across various geographical areas, and in the hegemonic social relations that this activity produces, which is organically linked to the dialectics of city and country.

## 7 Conclusion

A central idea driving Gramsci's thought is the distinction between a productive class that uses surplus value in productive activities, and a parasitic class that wastes surplus value leading to stagnation. This is an idea that goes back to the classical political economists from Petty to Ricardo, and their analysis of the distribution of the surplus. In so doing, Gramsci pays close attention to the production and distribution of surplus value in the city and in the country.

These aspects, connected to the contradictions between city and country, and to their possible resolution, remained a central concern for Gramsci. The analysis of these contradictions, and of their possible resolution, appears again in the *Prison notebooks*, as noted above, and are fundamental to Gramsci's understanding of socio-economic change, and of the various forms of life that appear in urban and rural society. The resolution of those contradictions, according to Gramsci, can occur only once city and country are reconnected, not by reverting history and returning to a pre-industrial world, but rather by integrating modern industry with the countryside, leading to a change in hegemonic forces in the city and in the country, so as to achieve a more adequate process of production and distribution of the economic surplus.

This is an issue which is still of the utmost relevance today, given the various challenges that contemporary production and distribution poses to sustainability at an economic, social and ecological level. Gramsci suggests that these problems can only be solved by addressing the contradictions between town and country. The role of organic intellectuals is crucial here. Organic intellectuals, by bridging the gap between hegemonic forces at a broader level and specific spatio-ethnographic contexts, provide a central element in the overall organization of the economy and society.

The way in which social media provide a platform for the active role of organic intellectuals renders Gramsci's analysis of topics such as industrialization, migration and hegemony particularly relevant in our days. A particularly interesting aspect of Gramsci's analysis is the way in which he overcomes the lack of adequate statistical data for analysing these problems. Gramsci suggests that given the lack of adequate statistical data, the best strategy consists of analysing the overall form of life of various social groups. This can be seen as an ethnographical or anthropological approach, which influenced Sraffa and Wittgenstein (Sen 2003). The ethnographical or anthropological approach provides an interesting methodological approach to be used in regional science in conjunction with, or whenever in the absence of, adequate statistical data.

## References

- Davis JB (2002) Gramsci, Sraffa, Wittgenstein: Philosophical linkages. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 9: 384–401
- Ekers M, Hart G, Kipfer S, Loftus A (eds) (2013) *Gramsci: Space, nature, politics*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford

- Fovel NM (1929) *Economia e corporativismo*. Sate, Ferrara
- Garegnani P (1984) Value and distribution in the classical economists and Marx. *Oxford Economic Papers* 36: 291–325
- Garegnani P (1998) Sraffa: The theoretical world of the 'old classical economists'. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 5: 415–429
- Gehrke C, Kurz HD (2002) Keynes and Sraffa's 'difficulties with J.H. Hollander'. A note on the history of the RES edition of *The works and correspondence of David Ricardo*. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 9: 644–671
- Gramsci A (1992) *Prison notebooks: Volume I, edited with introduction by Joseph A. Buttigieg, translated by Joseph Buttigieg and Antonio Callari*. Columbia University Press, New York
- Gramsci A (1996) *Prison notebooks: Volume II, edited with introduction by Joseph A. Buttigieg, translated by Joseph Buttigieg and Antonio Callari*. Columbia University Press, New York
- Gramsci A (2007) *Prison notebooks: Volume III, edited with introduction by Joseph A. Buttigieg, translated by Joseph Buttigieg and Antonio Callari*. Columbia University Press, New York
- Jessop B (2005) Gramsci as a spatial theorist. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 8: 421–437
- Martins NO (2013) *The Cambridge revival of political economy*. Routledge, London
- Marx K (1910) *Theorien über den mehrwert, edited by Karl Kautsky, 3 vols*. J.H.W. Dietz, Stuttgart
- Marx K (1999) *Capital*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Naldi N (2000) The friendship between Piero Sraffa and Antonio Gramsci in the years 1919–1927. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 7: 79–114
- Porta PL (1986) How Piero Sraffa took up the editorship of David Ricardo's works and correspondence. *History of Economics Society Bulletin* 8: 35–37
- Ricardo D (1821) *On the principles of political economy and taxation*. John Murray, London
- Sen AK (2003) Sraffa, Wittgenstein, Gramsci. *Journal of Economic Literature* 41: 1240–1255
- Sraffa P (1951) *Works and correspondence of David Ricardo*. Edited by P. Sraffa, with the collaboration of MH Dobb. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Sraffa P (1960) *Production of commodities by means of commodities*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Wittgenstein L (1963[1953]) *Philosophical investigations*. trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Blackwell, Oxford



**Resumen.** En este artículo se explica la dimensión espacial de las ideas de Antonio Gramsci, quien nos propone un enfoque metodológico innovador del análisis espacial, dentro de lo que puede denominarse como un enfoque etnográfico o antropológico. Este enfoque supone un análisis de una forma de vida en general en cada contexto espacial, con el fin de superar la ausencia de datos estadísticos que puedan describir adecuadamente los procesos socioeconómicos que Gramsci está tratando de caracterizar. Además, la categoría de intelectual orgánico de Gramsci también ayuda a cerrar la brecha entre las fuerzas hegemónicas y el contexto etnográfico-espacial, ayudando así a comprender la reproducción y la reconfiguración permanentes de la economía y la sociedad.

**抄録:** 本稿では、空間的分析アプローチのイノベーティブな方法論を唱えたAntonio Gramsciの論理の空間的次元を、民族誌学的または人類学的アプローチに分類される範囲内で探索する。これらのアプローチは、総合的な生活形式をそれぞれの空間的コンテキストで分析するもので、それにより Gramsciが特徴付けしようとした社会経済的プロセスを適切に説明することができる統計的データの欠如を補う。さらに Gramsciによる有機的知識人(organic intellectual)というカテゴリーは、ヘゲモニー的力と空間的民族誌学的背景との結び付けを手助けするものであり、したがって経済と社会の永続的な再生と再構成の理解に役立つものである。