

The theoretical-methodological contributions of Lenin and Gramsci to contemporary educationⁱ


 @percursos_revista


 /revpercursos

Giovanni Semeraro


Fluminense Federal University

Niterói, RJ – Brasil

 lattes.cnpq.br/6956417347930716

 orcid.org/0000-0003-4230-3598

gsemeraro07@gmail.com

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5965/19847246252024e0211>

Para citar artigo:

SEMERARO, Giovanni. The theoretical-methodological contributions of Lenin and Gramsci to contemporary education. *PerCursos*, Florianópolis, v. 25, e0211, 2024.



The theoretical-methodological contributions of Lenin and Gramsci to contemporary education

Abstract

The main goal of this work is to analyze Lenin and Gramsci's formulations for education. The text is divided into four sections. Throughout the article, we present the links and affinities between Lenin and Gramsci, highlighting their continuities and differences. Furthermore, we address the theoretical-practical principle of hegemony from the perspective of Lenin and Gramsci regarding politics and knowledge production. Finally, we reflect on the current thinking of education in the context of the crisis of capitalism, considering the actions of reactionary and conservative forces that aim to sustain the imperialist system.

Keywords: Gramsci; Lenin; education.

As contribuições teórico-metodológicas de Lênin e Gramsci para a educação contemporânea

Resumo

O objetivo do presente artigo é analisar as formulações de Lênin e Gramsci para a educação. O texto está dividido em quatro seções. Ao longo da exposição, apresentamos os elos e as afinidades entre Lênin e Gramsci, mas também ressaltamos as continuidades e diferenças entre eles. Além disso, abordamos o princípio teórico-prático da hegemonia na perspectiva de Lênin e Gramsci no plano da política e da produção do conhecimento. Por fim, refletimos sobre a atualidade dos pensadores para a educação no contexto de crise do capitalismo, considerando a atuação das forças reacionárias e conservadoras que visam sustentar o sistema imperialista.

Palavras-chave: Gramsci; Lênin; educação.

1 Links and affinities between Lenin and Gramsci

Contemporaries operating in distinct contexts, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov (Lenin) and Antonio Gramsci, two prominent revolutionaries of the early 20th century, share profound affinities in theoretical, political, and educational spheres.

Lenin is not merely a brilliant political strategist who organized the masses, laid the groundwork, and led the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution of 1917 that shook the world. He is also a broad-visioned theorist who deepened and materialized Marx's worldview through "concrete analyses of concrete reality," exposed the imperialist maneuvers of World War I (1914-1918), and skillfully led the response to the civil war of 1918-1920 and the boycott by Western countries alarmed by the events in the USSR. Furthermore, Lenin proved to be a visionary and bold leader during the process of "socialist transition". By laying the groundwork for industrialization and modernization in a vast country held back by czarist rule, he implemented an unprecedented education program for a largely rural and illiterate population. He also dismantled the old state apparatus and organized the Soviet state with comprehensive economic, political, and cultural planning, spreading electricity and launching the "three revolutions" (industrial, agrarian, and cultural), summarized in the slogan: "electrify industry and elevate culture" (Lenin, 1981a, p. 78).

For Lenin, the inseparable link between industrialization and general culture, production and education, technical-scientific development and political engagement of the population were fundamental conditions for consolidating the revolution and paving the way for the construction of a new civilization. In line with Hegel, who had rescued the profound meaning of work as the creative achievement of the human being and the shaper of the social fabric, and in tune with Marx's critique that revealed the contradictions of work in the brutalizing and alienated system set up by the bourgeoisie (Semeraro, 2013), Lenin launched "general and polytechnic education", free and compulsory up to the age of 16 (Lenin, 1981a, p. 58), to offer everyone access to the sciences and to the heritage of knowledge historically accumulated by humanity.

Inspired primarily by Marx's inseparable link between production and education for the working class (Marx; Engels, 2004, p. 68-69), he implements the "unified labor

school" aimed at developing individual aptitudes, qualifying workers to master advanced theories and techniques in various spheres of modern production, and combining the world of work with the construction of a society led by the "proletariat" (Lênin, 1981a, p. 81).

In his address at the First All-Russia Congress on Education on August 28, 1918, Lenin explicitly rejected the notion of purely vocational instruction reserved by the ruling class for the working masses, designed to produce efficient and subservient labor while excluding comprehensive general and technical-scientific education integrated with societal life and political formation.

The school system was transformed into a tool for bourgeois class domination, permeated by elitist ideology, with the aim of producing subservient workers and skilled laborers to serve capitalist interests. The war revealed that modern technological marvels serve as instruments for the mass extermination of workers and the extraordinary enrichment of capitalists who profit from conflict [...] we openly declare that a school detached from life and politics is nothing but falsehood and hypocrisy (Lenin, 1981a, p. 61).

In Lenin's view, therefore, linking education to the real challenges of the productive system and social life, as well as political formation and action, become fundamental in the learning process. This is because the struggle "against the old society founded on exploitation" is essential for unveiling the contradictions of capitalist society and serves as a means to unleash the full potential of the population, thus preparing the proletariat to "fulfill its role as educator, organizer, and leader, without which the disintegration of capitalism is impossible" (Lenin, 1981a, p. 104).

On the other hand, Lenin also criticized the "Proletkult" (Proletarian Cultural and Educational Organization) program, initiated by Bogdanov and continued by Lunacharsky, which aimed to fuel popular political activism through a simplified, propagandistic "proletarian culture" that disparaged modern culture and the accumulated experience of traditional education. Indeed, in his Address to the First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education in 1919, Lenin cautioned against the misconception that one could become a communist through mere slogans and superficiality. He

emphasized the necessity of developing a robust scientific and cultural foundation, critically assimilating the wealth of human knowledge from which communism itself had emerged (Lenin, 1968).

There is no doubt that Lenin and the October Revolution profoundly shaped Gramsci's political thought and activities. Among the numerous texts demonstrating this connection, the article "Lenin, Revolutionary Leader," written on March 1, 1924, on the occasion of his death, openly expresses Gramsci's admiration for the "comrade and revolutionary leader: initiator of a new process of development in history" (Gramsci, 2004b, p. 237). However, Gramsci, averse to fanaticism and idolatry, emphasizes that Lenin's exceptional personality must be understood within the broader context of Russian and global historical developments. Lenin's leadership and the party's role are thus highlighted as "integral components of the working class, embodying its most vital interests and aspirations" (Gramsci, 2004b, p. 236). Without resorting to imposition or deception, Lenin's political activity is indeed extraordinary due to its "expansive" nature, characterized by a continuous bottom-up movement and a constant exchange throughout all social capillaries, fostering an ongoing circulation of individuals (Gramsci, 2004b, p. 240).

The connections between Gramsci and Lenin are numerous and unmistakable. It suffices to note that Gramsci's involvement in Turin's "Factory Councils" and the "Red Biennium" (1919-20) was clearly inspired by the Soviet experience and the Russian Revolution. In several articles penned between 1919 and 1920, Gramsci emphasizes collective participation and mutual education, highlighting Marx's concept of "self-government of producers" from *The Civil War in France* (1982, p. 37). Rather than focusing on the "dictatorship of the proletariat," Gramsci stresses that the revolutionary process should lead to the creation of a new state simultaneously "grounded in production", political organization, and the cultural development of the masses¹

Thus, in various educational activities and the "school of labor" (Gramsci, 2004a, pp. 324-325) that he promoted among Turin's workers, Gramsci focused primarily on the political-economic transformations and educational reforms instituted in the USSR, while also incorporating aspects derived from B. Croce, G. Lombardo Radice (Gramsci, 2004a),

¹ Por exemplo, GRAMSCI, 2004, vol. 1, p. 257ss; p. 361ss; p. 383ss

and the *Clarté* magazine (by Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse). During his time in Moscow from June 1922 to November 1923, he closely observed the experience and debate surrounding the "unified labor school" introduced by Lenin and Krupskaya (Lenin, 1977, p. 167).

Furthermore, Gramsci is also familiar with M. M.'s perspective. Pistrack, drawing on historical-dialectical materialism, advocated against abstract teaching in favor of an integrated approach combining science, labor, social life, and politics. Summarized in the book *Fundamentals of the School of Labor* (Pistrack, 2000), this educator's extensive experience portrays the school not only as a place to assimilate scientific knowledge and modern work techniques but also as an environment where students learn to self-organize, collectively analyze societal issues, and prepare to transform and lead society.

It is through Gramsci's intense journey as a political activist, intellectual, and educator that we find the origins of various concepts related to the new "method of knowledge" and the formation of proletarian political consciousness. These ideas emerge in his pre-prison writings and are particularly developed in the notes of the *Prison Notebooks*, providing a fundamental basis for understanding the genesis of the "unitary school" concept, which is elaborated and condensed primarily in Notebook 12. As we sought to demonstrate in our analysis of this notebook (Semeraro, 2021), Gramsci expands upon the concept of the "unified labor school" developed in the USSR, drawing on his study of other pedagogical currents. He offers a perceptive critique of modern proposals stemming from the "new school" and "active school" movements, including the positions contained within the "Dalton Plan" educational system (Gramsci, 1996). According to Gramsci, these "progressive" schools, rooted in liberal ideology and centered on student autonomy, fail to address the crucial task of educating the working and subordinate classes for leadership roles in society, both collectively and as individuals (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1183-1185, own emphasis).

However, Gramsci's work shares several key elements with Lenin's thought: the role of the party, the function of intellectuals, mass mobilization, worker-peasant alliances, the formation of a "united front," the construction of a democratic-popular state, Jacobinism, and the international dimension of communism. It is therefore unsurprising that several analysts consider that "the emergence and development of

Leninism on the world stage was the decisive factor in Gramsci's entire evolution as a thinker and as a politician of action" (Togliatti, 1973, p. 423)².

2 Continuity and differences between Gramsci and Lenin

However, despite sharing Marxist foundations and aligned political goals, Lenin and Gramsci exhibit distinct characteristics. Portrayed by Gramsci as "the greatest statesman of contemporary Europe" (2004a, p. 240) and "the foremost modern theorist of the philosophy of praxis in the realm of political struggle and organization," (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1235), Lenin developed his ideas and refined his political positions through an intense process of mass mobilization and "war of movement" that culminated in the 1917 Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet state. These aspects lead Gramsci to perceive a close connection between Lenin and Machiavelli, both pragmatic politicians who, despite operating in different eras and contexts, sought to link national leadership and the masses with the structure of the state (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1578).

Conversely, Gramsci, situated within a distinct socio-political context, emerges as the intellectual and political activist advocating for long-term revolutionary change in the complex societies of advanced "Western" capitalism. The article thus examines the structural and superstructural dimensions that underpin the power of the ruling class, which remains poised to suppress threats to its status and deploy various forms of "passive revolution." In response to the overwhelming form of "passive revolution" implemented by fascism in Italy, Gramsci outlines strategies for hegemonic contestation to be waged in all spheres by the working classes and popular forces through an intensive process of consciousness-raising, cultural struggle, and political organization.

Thus, distancing himself from the idyllic vision of the "great day" of the revolution, not least because the revolution in the USSR was moving towards a process that required "a prolonged and tenacious struggle on the terrain of capitalism" (Lenin, 1981b, p. 58), Gramsci put greater emphasis on the "war of position", always with a view to breaking with capitalism and overcoming bourgeois society. In this regard, unlike the "East," where "civil society was primordial and gelatinous," Gramsci considers that in the

² See: VACCA, Giuseppe. *Saggio su Togliatti e la tradizione comunista*. Bari: De Donato, 1974.

"West" there existed a "robust chain of fortresses and casemates" within society (1975, p. 866). In this context, in where "the massive structure of modern democracies both as state organizations and as a set of associations in civil life" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1566-1567) is very solid, the "war of position (or harassment)" becomes more decisive than the "manoeuvred war (and frontal attack)".

Gramsci noted that "Lenin had understood the need for a shift from the war of maneuver, successfully applied in the East in 1917, to a war of position" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 866), emphasizing that "this question of political theory is the most important one raised in the post-war period, the most difficult to resolve, and potentially the most successful if achieved." Indeed, the war of position, "concentrated, difficult, in which exceptional qualities of patience and inventiveness are required and which demands an unheard-of concentration of hegemony [...] once won, is definitively decisive" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 802). Based on this, Gramsci conceptualizes the State as "the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities through which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but also manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1765). Transcending the common misconception of the state as a detached, repressive apparatus, Gramsci reconceptualizes it as an "organic and more comprehensive entity" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 763), dialectically intertwining political society and civil society (Gramsci, 1975, p. 866).

Similarly, Gramsci expands his understanding of the party, without diminishing its essential role in organizing subaltern classes, by presenting it as a "collective intellectual" (1975, p. 1523). This concept envisions the party as an open space for developing knowledge and responsibility among all its members, fostering a continuous dialectic between leadership and spontaneity, thought and action, thereby overcoming tendencies towards vanguardism and power centralization.

These concise yet notable references amply demonstrate that Gramsci's engagement with Lenin's ideas, while building upon and expanding Marx's thought, was not a mere mechanical transposition but rather a dialectical and creative process. In fact, Lenin himself had indicated the necessity of guiding political action based on the demands arising from concrete situations and historical particularities in which political struggles occur (Lenin, 1981c, p. 107).

Thus, from his pre-imprisonment writings through his prison notes, Gramsci emphasizes the need for Marxism's translatability across centuries, nations, and cultures. This process involves not only adapting language and concepts but also theoretical reformulation and the creation of new political modalities, grounded in a meticulous understanding of national and international characteristics (Gramsci, 1975, p. 866). Furthermore, Gramsci expanded beyond the traditional focus on working-class and peasant struggles, becoming one of the Marxist thinkers most attuned to broader historical, cultural, and literary dimensions. His exploration of the complex world of the "subaltern" (Gramsci, 1975) broadened the concept of class and the scope of social and political struggles, a trajectory evident in his pre-prison writings (Gramsci, 2004a, pp. 58-59).

Thus, alongside the conquest of the state apparatus and production system, Gramsci emphasizes the critical importance of "superstructural" elements, asserting that any "economic" reform must be intertwined with an "intellectual and moral reform" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1561). This aligns with the philosophy of praxis, which eschews the separation of theory from practice, superstructure from structure, humans from nature, subject from object, and individual from society (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1457). Gramsci challenges the supposedly "natural" division between rulers and ruled, leaders and followers, and educators and students, deconstructing the deeply ingrained notion of intellectuals as an exclusive "aristocracy of knowledge." On the contrary, it presents a new conception of culture and the intellectual, reconfigured by the processual organicity between the intellectual and the people, knowledge and feeling, science and popular creations (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1505).

Building on these premises, Gramsci expands the concepts of culture and intellectual to such an extent that he declares "everyone is an intellectual," each with their own specificity (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1516). This bold assertion aligns with his other striking declarations that "everyone is a philosopher" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1375) and "everyone is a 'political person' and a 'legislator'" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1668). Given that cultural creations are the collective work of society, it is necessary to transform "philosophy into a cultural movement" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1380) so that it can "generate an ethic, a way of life" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 2185-2186) that expands the potential of all

members of society. This introduces a theoretical-political perspective that challenges caste systems, monopolies, and elitism, creating an epistemological break from the dominant conceptions of the time. It opposes not only B. Croce's neo-idealist positions and G. Gentile's fascist reform but also the Church's paternalism and liberal currents, including "new school," "active school," and pragmatism approaches (Semeraro, 2021).

From these premises emerges Gramsci's ambitious and captivating project in Notebook 12, which establishes a profound and inseparable link between "organic intellectual," "unitary school," and "integral education." These concepts are interwoven with the world of work, politics, philosophy, history, and popular culture, aiming to transform every citizen into a "'leader' (specialist + politician)" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1551). This transformation involves the simultaneous development of scientific-professional and socio-political skills, essential components for individuals to express their abilities in the productive sphere while collectively learning the art of self-governance, ultimately leading society towards the creation of a new civilization.

3 The theoretical-practical principle of hegemony in politics and the construction of knowledge

According to Gramsci, the ambitious goals of this revolution can only be achieved through the establishment of hegemony forged in the political struggles of the working classes and marginalized groups. As is well known, among the various connections with Lenin, Gramsci (1975)³ adopts and expands the concept of hegemony, which originates from the philosophy of praxis rooted in Marx's thought, encompassing "in embryonic form the ethical-political aspect of politics or the theory of hegemony and consensus, as well as the aspects of force and economics" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1315). In paragraph 12 of this same notebook, when rescuing the "gnoseological" potential of ideology and hegemony, Gramsci observes that

The proposition presented in the introduction to the *Critique of Political Economy*, which posits that individuals become aware of structural conflicts through ideological frameworks, should be interpreted as

³ See: Q4, §38, p.465 and Q7, §33, p.882

having epistemological significance rather than merely psychological or moral implications. It follows that the theoretical-practical principle of hegemony also possesses an epistemological dimension, and thus it is in this field that one must seek Ilyich's maximum theoretical contribution to the philosophy of praxis. Ilitch effectively advanced philosophy as a discipline through his contributions to political doctrine and practice. The establishment of hegemonic structures not only forges new ideological terrain but also catalyzes a transformation in consciousness and epistemological approaches, constituting both an epistemological and philosophical phenomenon (Gramsci, 1975, pp. 1249-1250).

Gramsci thus demonstrates that ideologies not only possess concrete consistency, as they trigger historical and political effects, but also that the process of knowledge acquisition and the development of one's worldview are closely linked to political action aimed at achieving hegemony. This is evident in his assertion that "critical self-understanding occurs through a struggle of political 'hegemonies' and opposing directions, first in the field of ethics, then in politics, ultimately leading to a higher elaboration of one's conception of reality" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1385).

Thus, as with the construction of personality itself, it is through the struggle for hegemony that a social group, party, or nation, grounded in material conditions, comes to understand itself, articulate its position, and develop its own societal vision. This process enables them to gain active consensus from a significant portion of the population, not merely through domination and force, but primarily through intellectual and moral leadership (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1519). From this perspective, hegemony is not merely about "command" and directives issued from above or externally, but rather is rooted in mass consciousness, knowledge, and political participation. It relies on the "power of attraction" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 2012) that emerges when the hegemonic system socializes economic, political, and cultural processes, fostering the expansion of society as a whole. Consequently, Gramsci posits a fundamental link between democratic processes and hegemonic structures: "In the hegemonic system, democracy exists between the ruling group and the governed groups, insofar as economic development and its corresponding legislation facilitate the gradual integration of the governed groups into the ruling group" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1056).

There is no doubt, therefore, that Lenin and Gramsci's most significant theoretical and methodological contribution lies in their development of a set of theoretical tools and political activities rooted in the "most modern philosophy of praxis," whose "essential feature consists precisely in the historical-political concept of 'hegemony'" (Gramsci, 1966, p. 570). In line with Lenin, who, despite not having the opportunity to fully develop this concept (Gramsci, 1975, p. 866), "had conferred renewed value to the cultural front of struggle and constructed the doctrine of hegemony as a complement to the theory of the State-as-force" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1235), Gramsci demonstrates not only the necessity of valuing the superstructure and the revolutionary potential of various political subjects (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1603), but also that the attainment of hegemony is the primary strategy for acquiring knowledge, organizing politically, and learning to democratically govern society.

In opposition to voluntarism and "sporadic and disorganized subversivism" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 957), Gramsci firmly believes in the necessity of grounding analysis in material conditions, objective reality, and the role of the party (Gramsci, 1975), aspects particularly emphasized by Lenin (1979) in *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*. But in addition to the material base, the "relations of force" and the "hegemonic apparatus", Gramsci also emphasizes the components of subjectivity, creativity and the construction of one's own conception of the world by the working classes and the subalternized. Thus, the attainment of hegemony is situated within the dialectical process between objectivity and subjectivity, structure and superstructure, and understood as the "supremacy" of a social group that successfully combines force and consensus, "domination and direction" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 2010).

According to Gramsci, productive forces alone do not inherently possess progressive capabilities; rather, they must be accompanied by the development of "collective will," organized political initiative, and the subjective dimensions of the working class and popular masses. In doing so, it challenges both positivism and idealism, as well as any theory that ascribes to metaphysical entities or abstract essences the power to shape the course of history. On the contrary, Gramsci states that absolute immanentism (Frosini, 2010, p. 137-146), politically organized human action, "revolutionary historicism", constitute the basis of knowledge and the engine of history.

This demonstrates that reality is not solely composed of material things, mere facts, individuals, and the imponderable, but also encompasses a realm of possibilities that emerge when fearless and politically organized individuals decide to unite their wills, take initiative, and strive for alternative societal visions.

Therefore, Gramsci transforms the classic philosophical question “*What is man?*”, into: “What can man become, that is, can man master his own destiny, can he ‘make’ himself, can he create his own life?” (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1344). With this “reversal of the traditional position of the philosophical problem” (Gramsci, 1975, p. 119), in line with Marx who “thoroughly renews the way of understanding philosophy” (Gramsci, 1975, pp. 433-35) and “initiates a new phase in the history and global development of thought” (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1425), it is no longer possible to construct knowledge or elaborate a worldview that holds any meaning without considering concrete reality, social relations of production, class divisions, and the struggles initiated by active subjects in the social fabric aimed at creating higher levels of civilization.

4 The relevance of Lenin and Gramsci for education

At the dawn of the 20th century, Lenin and Gramsci confronted a severe capitalist crisis, with Russia still mired in semi-feudal conditions, the collapse of the old European order, and the “disintegration of colonial systems and their spheres of influence” (Gramsci, 1987, p. 103). Amid tumultuous historical challenges, they boldly engaged in theoretical discourse and political action, mobilizing the masses to spark revolution. Their efforts aimed to contextualize national struggles within the broader framework of establishing “a new global order that would unify the world's collective consciousness” (Gramsci, 1987, pp. 156-161).

At the dawn of the 21st century, we face an unprecedented crisis of capitalism, exacerbated by neoliberal policies and economic financialization, amid a global landscape where national issues are increasingly intertwined with international dynamics and the looming threat of planetary collapse. Just as fascism and Nazism emerged as purported solutions to the crises of the last century, today we witness the rise of reactionary and far-right forces. These movements seek to bolster an imperialist system characterized by

unprecedented concentrations of economic and military power, escalating violence, political degradation, labor exploitation, mass migration, indigenous genocide, and environmental devastation—factors that contribute to recurring epidemics and diseases, including mental health issues.

In contexts similar to ours, Lenin and Gramsci's political and theoretical-methodological contributions to education remain highly relevant. They emphasize that knowledge construction and the formation of one's worldview must be intrinsically linked to concrete analysis of reality, engagement with crucial contemporary issues, and the democratically-led national and international struggles of the working classes and popular organizations. These efforts aim to establish "a new State" and create "new and higher forms of civilization" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1566).

From the two great revolutionaries - an inseparable pair representing the dialectical unity of theory and practice, force and consensus, war of movement and position, direction and spontaneity - we also learn that historical baggage, accumulated knowledge, and past experiences, while necessary, are insufficient to address the challenges of the present day. Lenin and Gramsci argue that Marxism is not a dogma, an untouchable sacred text monopolized by a few enlightened individuals, nor a sterile and repetitive scholasticism, but rather a dynamic and challenging historical-dialectical process of continuous collective creation (Gramsci, 2004a).

Increasingly essential today, the revolution to be recreated must confront both "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" (Lenin, 2012) and all forms of hollow nationalism that, failing to foster a genuine "national-popular" sentiment, treats the masses as mere cattle (Gramsci, 1975, p. 799). Thus, the polarization in Brazil between reactionary forces promoting a populist nationalism and grassroots organizations combating new forms of colonialism reflects, in a sense, the broader global struggle, given the dialectical interplay between general and specific phenomena. In fact, in one of the "harshest rejoinders in history", which would surprise Hegel himself (1999), rather than between a backward "East" and an advanced "West", today the opposition has been established between the impetus of emerging countries and a restricted group of "Western" nations that continue to attribute to themselves the prerogative of imposing

dictates on the world and exercising domination without hegemony, fomenting an increasingly sophisticated war industry, unscrupulous hybrid wars and threats of all kinds.

Contrary to the prevailing system, bound by its own arrogance, a complex and unpredictable process is emerging. This process unites various groups of nations (BRICS, CELAC, EAEU, African Union) around the so-called "Global South," most of which share a history of colonialism, dictatorships, and boycotts imposed by Western powers. Highlighting the "shared destiny" of global populations, emerging actors mobilize to establish a new world order founded on polycentrism and multilateralism, aimed at fostering socioeconomic integration while respecting diversity and promoting peaceful, cooperative, and solidary relations.

Increasingly densifying and unifying with an accelerated and irreversible process of "unity of multiple determinations", contrary to those who think that the "revolution" is not on the horizon (Bobbio, 1989), in today's world we have the gigantic task of sparking a series of revolutions at the molecular, national and international level, to lay the foundations for an effectively democratized and integrated humanity in caring for the planet. In the ongoing global geopolitical realignment and the construction of a "national-international-popular" hegemony, Lenin and Gramsci's contributions become increasingly crucial. They offer strategies to combat imperialism, neo-colonialism, "passive revolutions," and neo-fascism, while also addressing the challenges posed by new forms of "cultural industry" and scientific monopolies. These strategies are particularly relevant in countering the sophisticated dominance of big tech companies, which leverage rapid scientific advancements, artificial intelligence, and technology to influence collective unconscious, consumer behavior, political elections, and government decisions.

Now more than ever, this context demands a comprehensive knowledge base, bold national and international grassroots strategies, sophisticated political engagement, and the cultivation of a new cultural paradigm. These elements are crucial to prevent potential global power shifts from merely preserving existing structures of domination. We must avoid simply transitioning from Western to Eastern hegemony, from unbridled capitalism to a more regulated form, or from neoliberalism to economic developmentalism without elevating the intellectual and cultural standing of the masses and their political agency (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1385).

Gramsci warns against the peril of constructing socialism without hegemony, which risks devolving into autocracy and "state-worship." He emphasizes that every hegemonic relationship is inherently pedagogical, necessitating permeation across all societal spheres. This pedagogical dynamic extends beyond educational institutions and interpersonal interactions, manifesting "not only within a nation, among its diverse constituent forces, but also throughout the international and global arena, encompassing national and continental civilizations" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1331). Therefore, to ascertain whether the current developments in Brazil, Latin America, and globally represent the dawn of a new era or another passive revolution allowing capitalism to regroup and emerge stronger, the theoretical and methodological contributions of Lenin and Gramsci remain essential. These insights are crucial for an education system that, in the present context, can dedicate itself to fostering political consciousness and a collective "national-international popular" will aimed at creating a new civilization. This task cannot be deferred to future generations or a distant, ever-elusive future, but must become the driving force behind our bold and creative political choices and struggles.

Foreseeing one of the greatest challenges of our generation, Gramsci noted in his final notebook shortly before his death that "all particular history exists within the framework of world history" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 2343). Similarly, in one of his last letters from prison to his son Delio, in line with "The free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Marx; Engels, 1999, p. 37), Gramsci recommends knowing and respecting "all the men of the world who unite in society and work and struggle and improve themselves" (1996, p. 808). A transformative process in which organized workers and popular masses break from capitalism and its derivatives—including labor exploitation, environmental degradation, inequalities, injustices, fascism, racism, sexism, imperialism, and all forms of domination—to achieve hegemony and establish conditions for becoming "qualified political intellectuals, leaders, and organizers of all activities and functions inherent to the organic development of a comprehensive civil and political society" (Gramsci, 1975, p. 1522).

References

BOBBIO, Norberto. **O futuro da democracia: uma defesa das regras do jogo**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1989.

FROSINI, Fabio. **La religione dell'uomo moderno: politica e verità nei Quaderni del carcere** di Antonio Gramsci. Roma: Carocci, 2010.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Quaderni del carcere**. A cura di V. Gerratana. Torino: Einaudi, 1975. 4. v.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Lettere dal carcere 1926-1937**. A cura di A.A. Santucci. Palermo: Sellerio Editore, 1996. 2 v.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Escritos políticos**. Tradução: Carlos Nelson Coutinho. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2004a. v. 1.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Escritos políticos**. Tradução: Carlos Nelson Coutinho. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2004b. v. 2.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **L'Ordine nuovo 1919-1920**. A cura di Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci. Torino, Einaudi, 1987.

HEGEL, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. **Filosofia da história**. Tradução: Maria Rodrigues; Hans Harden. Brasília: UnB, 1999.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **Cultura e revolução cultural**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização brasileira, 1968.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **Sobre a educação**. Lisboa: Seara Nova, 1977. 2. v.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **A instrução pública**. Moscou: Edições Progresso, 1981a.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **Esquerdismo, doença infantil do comunismo**. São Paulo: Global, 1981b.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **La alianza de la clase obrera y del campesinato**. Moscou: Progresso, 1981c.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **Imperialismo, estágio superior do capitalismo: ensaio popular**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2012.

LÊNIN, Vladimir Ilyich. **Materialismo ed empiriocriticismo**. Moscou: Progresso, 1979.

MARX, Karl. **La guerra civile in Francia**. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1982.

MARX, Karl; Engels, Friedrich. **Manifesto del partito comunista**. A cura di Domênico Losurdo. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1999.

MARX, Karl; Engels, Friedrich. **Textos sobre educação e ensino**. São Paulo: Centauro, 2004.

SEMERARO, Giovanni. **Intelectuais, educação e escola**: um estudo do Caderno 12 de Antonio Gramsci. São Paulo, Expressão Popular, 2021.

SEMERARO, Giovanni. A concepção de ‘trabalho’ na filosofia de Hegel e Marx. **Revista Educação e Filosofia**, [Campinas], v. 27, n. 53, p. 87-104, jul. 2013.

TOGLIATTI, Palmiro. Gramsci e il leninismo. In: AAVV., STUDI GRAMSCIANI (1958). Roma: Ed. Riuniti, 1973. p. 35.

ⁱ Article received in: 11/19/23

Article approved in: 06/04/2014