

Durakoğlu, A. ve Güney, Ü. (2015). Antonio Gramsci's Democratic Model of Education. *Turkish Journal of Sociology*, 2015/1, 3/30, 25-37.

## Antonio Gramsci's Democratic Model of Education

Abdullah Durakoğlu\*, Ülkü Güney\*\*

**Abstract:** This study discusses the ideas of the Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) with respect to the democratic model of education. It considers hegemony as one of the basic concepts to analyse the relation between dominance and leadership. The theory of hegemony is an integral part of Gramsci's discussion about the questions of education in *Prison Notes*. To reproduce hegemony Gramsci assigns important roles to intellectuals in the education system as they may contribute to or counteract the reproduction of hegemony through teaching. This study covers Gramsci's critique about the modern educational system and reveals that such critique does not target the problem of whether the relation between education and politics should be eliminated. In this context, the study results expose that, for Gramsci, democratic education could be possible through the effect of education on politics, not the effect of politics on education.

**Keywords:** Gramsci, education, hegemony, intellectuals, philosophy of praxis.

## Antonio Gramsci'nin Demokratik Eğitim Modeli

**Özet:** Modern toplumun portresini ortaya koyan İtalyan filozof Antonio Gramsci (1891- 1937), kurumların siyasi önemine ilişkin analizleriyle tanınır. Bu kurumların başında da eğitim gelmektedir. Gramsci'nin demokratik eğitim modeline ilişkin düşüncelerinin ortaya konulduğu bu çalışmada ağırlıklı olarak onun eğitim ve siyaset ilişkisi üzerine olan düşüncelerine yer verilmiştir. Çalışmadaki temel kavramlardan biri hegemonyadır. Gramsci, hegemonya aygıtı olarak devleti görür. Okul ve eğitim, devletin hegemonyasını yeniden inşa etmesine yarayan alandır. Hegemonyanın eğitim sisteminde yeniden üretilmesinde entelektüellerin rolü büyüktür, çünkü geleneksel entelektüeller olarak görülen öğretmenler okullarda siyasi bir görev icra ederek hegemonyanın yeniden üretilmesine hizmet etmektedirler. Bu çalışma Gramsci'nin modern eğitim sistemine getirdiği eleştiriyi kapsamaktadır. Gramsci, eğitim ve siyaset arasındaki ilişkiyi sorun olarak görmemekte, aksine böyle bir ilişkiyi doğal ve olması gereken olarak nitelendirmektedir. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın sonunda Gramsci'nin demokratik eğitimin, siyasetin eğitim üzerindeki etkisiyle değil de, bunun aksine eğitimin siyaset üzerindeki etkisiyle mümkün olabileceğini düşünmekte olduğu anlaşılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Gramsci, eğitim, hegemonya, entelektüeller, praksis felsefesi.

\* Yrd. Doç. Dr, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü Öğretim Üyesi, adurakoğlu06@gmail.com.

\*\* Yrd. Doç. Dr, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü Öğretim Üyesi, guney.ulku@gmail.com.

### **Introduction**

Education, which is one of the most contested battlegrounds in the history of modern societies, is the terrain in which ideological differences become visible. Each government that comes into power endeavours to establish an educational system that suits its own political philosophy. Indeed, education is observed to be one of the fields with which the power of the rulers can be perpetuated. When Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), a Sardinian born politician and philosopher, began to write about the education system, Italy was in political turmoil, and regime changes were on the agenda.

Industrialisation in Italy had just begun. On the other hand, disputes about land and scattered political differences were causing chaos (Poulantzas, 2004). After joining the First World War, the expectations of Italy about this imperialistic war of division could not be fulfilled, and the country plunged into an economic crisis (Yalçın, 1978). The financial crisis and chaos resulted in the emergence of various ideological streams (Armaoğlu, 1983). The Bolshevik Revolution had found broad echo in Italy, after which, factory occupations and industrial actions became commonplace (Yalçın, 1978). The city of Turin in Italy had a considerable working class population, which was ready for an upheaval. During this time, Gramsci was residing in Turin, who became politically active in the Italian Socialist Party (Mayo, 2011). The chaos caused by the conflicts and actions enabled the strengthening of the Fascist Party under the leadership of Mussolini. In 1922, the Fascist Party came into the power (Yalçın, 1978). At this time, Gramsci was in Moscow. He returned to Italy in 1924, and two years later, he was arrested despite his political immunity. Gramsci spent 11 years in prison. During his time in prison, he produced his writings, which became well known as ‘Prison Notebooks’ and letters (Mayo, 2011).

This short history of Italy is insofar interesting for us as it provides the political-historical context that shaped Gramsci’s ideas about education among others. This study mainly aims to discuss (provide a deeper understanding of) Gramsci’s analyses of the interaction between politics and education. In that context, we aim, to expose Gramsci’s view on the problems emerging between politics and education and possible solutions he provided. Within this framework, the main focus of the discussion is the concept of *Hegemony*. The notion of hegemony was used for the first time by Gramsci in the Marxist context. Hegemony is reproduced by the permanent consent of the subaltern (Fontana, 2013). Consent is implemented in a cultural sphere. Since education is one of the cultural spheres in which hegemony is reproduced, it also constitutes the space in which consent is sought by the ruling classes (Fontana, 2011). For Gramsci, the seemingly democratic education system

is in reality a tool for the reproduction of the capitalist system, and thus inequality. He also criticises the current education system for re-establishing the authoritarian structure of the society. Gramsci asserts that the instruction of children in early ages in vocational education instigates inequality. Instead, he proposes that children ought to go through the classical education system (comprehensive schools), what he calls Unitarian. According to Gramsci, the Unitarian system enables an empowering education for the children of the working class (Mayo, 2011; Fontana, 2011).

Gramsci assigns key responsibilities to intellectuals in education. By differentiating between organic and traditional intellectuals, he ascribes different roles to them. Traditional intellectuals, according to Gramsci, reproduce the existing hegemony because they are closer to the authorities, whereas organic intellectuals are more involved in empowering the working class, thereby enabling the control of the authorities (Gramsci, 2012a). Within this framework, we suggest that the relation between politics and education is a compulsory one and that this relation ought to be established through education. In this context, then education mainly aims to raise awareness and to empower the masses against hegemony.

In the following sections, we will give an account of Gramsci's critique of a modern school system by framing the discussion with the notion of hegemony that is seen as central to the educational philosophy. This part will follow Gramsci's critique on the role of intellectuals in which Gramsci critically assesses the role of traditional intellectuals as one that supports the current system of inequality between the social classes. The subsequent part will discuss Gramsci's concept of an ideal education. By criticising the current system of vocational schools that promotes the class division in the society, Gramsci proposes a uniform preparatory school for all children, which aims at eliminating the separation between the classes, and thus inequality. The section on the ideal intellectual will discuss the role of the intellectual on education as suggested by Gramsci. For the realisation of an empowering education for working class children, Gramsci assigns a central role to the organic intellectuals. The final section will conclude the discussion and present a critical summary of the topics.

### **Hegemony and the Critique of Modern Education Systems**

Antonio Gramsci, who presented a portrait of modern society, is well known for his analyses about the political significance of institutions. He believed that politics cannot be perceived only in terms of the state and government, because many human activities and institutions, which appear to be apolitical, actually have political significance. Education is the most im-

portant one among these institutions (Ives, 2011). Even Gramsci's writings on the state and civil society display criticism of educational institutions. The contents of these writings involve elements of the analysis of the educational systems in Western capitalist social formations (Mayo, 2011). Gramsci structures the concept of education within the philosophy of praxis. He offers his views on human nature in line with the specific aspects of the philosophy of praxis. According to Gramsci, human is chiefly a process. Human is clearly a process of his actions. In other words, human is his own history, his creation of himself. Therefore, we cannot mention a pre-specified human nature. Human nature is a formation that specifies itself slowly through the dialectics of social relations. The educational aspect, which is implicitly present in Gramsci's philosophy of praxis, mostly appears in the process of the formation of personality. Humans mobilise their own will in this process and concretely apply an abstract will, thereby forming their own personality (Lombardi, 2000). It is apparent that Gramsci's philosophy of praxis emphasises on the activist himself. He calls on people to act and thereby be subjects.

Gramsci's philosophy of praxis assumes the presence of an absolute identity between action and interpretation. Therefore, Gramsci considers philosophy, history and politics to be interrelated. Ultimately, everything is politics (Fontana, 2013). Gramsci also correlates education and politics; for him, if a state is in the position of an educator, it means that it is using moral and intellectual power. He criticises contemporary educational systems in this respect (Fontana, 2011). The concept that directs his critiques is 'hegemony'. The concept of hegemony is central to Gramsci's educational philosophy.

The etymological history of the Greek word hegemony dates back to Ancient Greece, meaning leadership denoted to the politico-military dominance of a city state upon other city states<sup>1</sup>. Gramsci redefines this concept and uses this term to mean consent and leadership rather than dominance (Ives, 2011; Sassoon, 2012). In Gramsci's philosophy, hegemony is roughly defined as 'a social condition in which all social realities are imposed by, or through the support of, a single class' (Mayo, 2011). In opposition to the school reforms of the fascist regime that separate 'classical' and 'vocational' schools, Gramsci proposes a wide educational service for all children in the form of 'comprehensive schools'. His ideal education would not ruin the future of a child for the sake of an early and narrow vocational specialisation. According to Gramsci, contemporary educational institutions were reinforcing hegemony. In other words, these institutions were serving the interests of the ruling classes, particularly of the bourgeoisie (Mayo, 2011).

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, Fifth Edition. (1994), p. 1215.

Gramsci considers the state an instrument of not only the government but also hegemony, and he regards the school as a tool used by the state. For him, the state should be regarded as the organiser of hegemony, because it aims to eliminate certain customs and attitudes and replace them with others (Poulantzas, 2004). Gramsci thinks that education in modern schools is political, and he alleges that it is necessary to revert to the type of schools envisioned by ancient people (Fontana, 2011). The central political concern of this Unitarian school system is to abolish the prevailing separation between 'humanistic' and 'technical-functionalistic' school types. Unitarian schools are those of a universal culture. In such schools, pupils receive an education that gives them the awareness of being independent and the ability of an active life (Gramsci, 2012a). According to Gramsci (1966a), a modern school runs a permanent degeneration process. The main paradox is that this type of school is regarded as democratic and alleged to be democratic. Vocational schools seem to contribute to democracy as they can create new stratifications within themselves. For example, an unqualified labourer in such a school may transform into a qualified worker. However, this transformation cannot be regarded as a tendency towards democracy. The actual democratic tendency is only possible if every citizen can have a management capacity and if the society observes this tendency as a condition for the former to be possible. On the contrary, vocational schools aim to make social differences permanent.

### **Critique on the Role of Traditional Intellectuals in Education**

According to Gramsci, a social class working on behalf of the state plays a hegemonic role by presenting and spreading to the public cultural and ideological belief systems that are universally accepted to be taught. This social class is made up of traditional intellectuals. Therefore, intellectuals are the organisers and educators of society. Thus, hegemony is perceived as a tool that enables the establishment of a permanent system of consent, which justifies a predominant social order by surrounding the complex web of the reinforcing ideas brought forward and expressed by dominant social groups, i.e. intellectuals (Fontana; 2013). Gramsci apparently uses the concept of hegemony to express a group of complex and strongly interconnected ideas created by many intertwined layers. According to him, a group or class becomes hegemonic over all other groups in the society when they manage to create an intellectual and moral leadership in a manner such that these groups become their allies. For Gramsci, the enlightened people, who are the envoys of the dominant class, are intellectual leaders (Fontana, 2013). Educators also come from among these enlightened people. Therefore, such a relation with education is also a relation of hegemony.

Gramsci (1966) suggests that three types of schools in Italy make social differences permanent by providing education for separate segments of the society. For him, vocational schools provide education for workers and peasants, technical schools provide education for the petite bourgeoisie and classic schools provide education for the ruling class. In addition, in 1931, the Italian Parliament discussed vocational education with respect to whether vocational schools would have a structure that ended within itself in such a way that these schools would be practice-oriented and would not allow for transfer of students to even technical schools. The issue of transfer from vocational schools to classic schools was removed from the agenda in the beginning of that discussion in the Italian Parliament (2012b).

Pointing out this structuring of education, Gramsci suggests that children are kept in a cradle under the pretext of education. According to him, the cradle should not cover their entire life as it is only necessary for a certain period of human life. By using this analogy, Gramsci suggests that education enslaves people. Vocational schools can be indicated as the most striking example of this situation (Lombardi, 2011). According to Gramsci, on the one hand, educators in vocational schools train agriculturalists and technicians to make social differences permanent, and on the other hand, they deprive lower classes of universal education, which is necessary for them to question the hegemony of the ruling classes. Gramsci's goal deals with socio-cultural, moral and intellectual mechanisms that enable the development of a holistic personality. Once these mechanisms are combined, they will ensure the creation of a political and historical subject that has self-consciousness and self-discipline, thereby managing themselves (Fontana, 2011). It is apparent that Gramsci considers traditional educators as the members of a predominant class that serve the current system. His approach towards educators can be only perceived within his theory of the enlightened, i.e. intellectuals. Gramsci's views about the current class of intellectuals gain importance in this respect.

Gramsci defines intellectuals as mediators that 'organically' connect the ruling class and the lower classes. In this way, they make the power structure acceptable for the allied and subordinate groups. In other words, the function of intellectuals is to transform the interests and values of a certain social group into 'common values and interests' and to create a certain lifestyle and worldview. Therefore, hegemony can be defined as a tool that enables the establishment of a 'permanent consent' system justifying a predominant social order by surrounding the complex web of the reinforcing and articulated ideas brought forward and expressed by dominant social groups such as intellectuals (Fontana, 2013).

Suggesting that one of the duties performed by intellectuals is hegemony, Gramsci believes that primary school teachers are village intellectuals that also perform a political duty. According to him, primary school teachers, similar to priests, lawyers and doctors, perform the duty to organise state dominance by establishing a relation between villagers and regional administrations (Gramsci, 1967). In this context, Gramsci describes the educator as an administrator working in the school and educational sector. Gramsci believes that every educator is a student and every student is an educator in the modern education system, and he alleges that the relation between educator and student spreads to all segments of the society. He perceives this relation as the driving force behind change and transformation. Therefore, suggesting that an educational relation is a social and political relation is also the description of a hegemonic relation. Hence, every educational relation is a hegemonic relation, and every hegemonic relation is an educational relation (Fontana, 2013). As it can be seen, Gramsci suggests that educators have an absolute dominance over masses through their educational roles. This situation makes masses dependent on intellectuals.

### **Gramsci's Concept of an Ideal Education**

Gramsci asserts that an ideal education aims to ensure the independence of masses from intellectuals, and he prepares his pedagogy as a solution for the problem of education. Criticising the compulsory education laws in Italy, Gramsci states that making laws will not be sufficient for increasing the rate of literacy. According to him, laws can only make it compulsory to go to school, not to benefit from school. Unless literacy is perceived as a need, it is almost impossible to mention schools. According to Gramsci, Italian schools are confined and peculiar to the typical bourgeoisie. These schools provide culture as a privilege to those with economic independence, and the oppressed classes are deprived of this privilege. However, Gramsci desires that all young people be equal and able to reach a targeted cultural level in line with their intelligence and talent (Lombardi, 2011). He explains that such an ideal cannot be realised in modern schools and justifies the reason for the same. Gramsci's justification is related to the studying behaviour that he calls a habit. As it is well known, such behaviour mostly affects a pupil's success at school.

According to Gramsci (2012), the children of workers and peasants in modern schools cannot even display studying behaviour expected from them, as well as the children of traditional intellectual families. The reason for this is the fact that students are not passive receivers. For example, a child who learns reasoning needs to produce solutions to study effectively. This child has to study significantly to learn and he/she has to exert himself/herself to con-

trol his/her physical movements; in other words, he/she has to pass through a phase of psychosomatic apprenticeship. Therefore, studying is a very tiring task as it requires the experience of a specific apprenticeship period not only mentally but also neurotically. In other words, studying is a habit that is formed through an adaptation process, effort, pain and distress. However, many people believe that the difficulty of studying is not real as they only find physical effort difficult and tiring. Gramsci believes that the child of an intellectual family can easily get over the psychosomatic adaptation process because he/she has numerous advantages compared to others even when he/she gets into the class for the first time. It is apparent that there is a significant difference between classes even in the habits of studying. Gramsci believes that the differences between classes cause inequality in almost every area, and his aim is to eliminate them.

As per Gramsci, if we want to eliminate the separation between classes, we should neither increase the number of vocational schools nor develop them. We should, in fact, create uniform preparatory schools, which will guide young people in their vocational choice and enable them to be individuals that think, work and are able to direct and control the ruling classes. In its deepest sense, the uniform school proposed by Gramsci should be the basic tool for the society to form a generation, and thus, this service should be provided by the state. Such uniform school should be organised in a way such that it will overcome any potential separation among social classes and open its doors for everyone (Lombardi, 2011). Therefore, for Gramsci, a school reform is not a problem of creating vocational schools of different types; it is a problem of developing schools, which will ultimately make children ready for choosing their occupation and bring them up to become individuals that can criticise or control those who rule (Fontana, 2011).

Standing out for preventing vocational schools from being incubation machines that bring up little wisenheimers for specific vocations, Gramsci proposes a wide educational service with a strong humanist foundation for all children. Education proposed by him has to have a structure that will not pose any risk of early specialisation (Mayo, 2011). In other words Gramsci (1966a) is on the side of the humanist uniform school of liberal education. According to him, through vocational guidance initiatives, it is possible to advance from such a uniform school to a specialised school as follows. In such an education, primary school, which is thought to be the first stage, should not last longer than three or four years. At this stage, students should learn how to read, write and calculate, as well as learn about geography, history and 'rights and responsibilities', which are not considered very important in the current educational system. Gramsci believes that such teaching is necessary



for the educational system to have a humanist structure. To better understand this view, one should know what Gramsci means by 'humanism'. Gramsci states that humanism is the affirmation of the entire humanity. He also emphasises that humanists do not consider culture as something solely consisting of knowledge. Culture is also life. The objective of humanists is the education of the human soul. Considering this idea, information on the 'rights and duties' should not be regarded as pure knowledge. These should be primarily considered as a doctrine necessary for the life of individuals. It is apparent that the information to be provided to individuals regarding the 'rights and responsibilities' according to Gramsci's pedagogy is qualified as a precondition of a humanist education (2012b).

Emphasising that information on 'rights and duties' was neglected in his period, Gramsci also points out the importance of adding to the curriculum a lesson covering general information on state and society. Gramsci mentions a compulsory and unitary school. One of the most important functions of this school is to develop the character of people. According to this view of Gramsci, a school cannot be considered as an institution where the only activity is providing students with information.

Gramsci sees the educational system in England until the First World War as an example for a

humanist education (2012a). Founded on humanitarianism, it did not exclude any citizen, including the poor ones, on the condition that they were intelligent and it did not consider the culture as something purely consisting of knowledge. The highest educational target of England was to bring up gentlemen. The term gentleman does not only mean a good natured person, but it also means a person who has a moral discipline, self-control and a sense of balance that enables him to voluntarily value the benefits of his society above his own benefits. A gentleman is a cultured person; however, this does not only imply the richness of intellectual knowledge. This term also means a person with the competency to fulfil his duty and to understand every opinion and belief that is sincerely expressed. Thus, it can be asserted that English education did not primarily aim to develop the mind and furnish it with information, but its main aim was to develop the character. However, this type of education was replaced with scientific education in England after the First World War. Because of this fact, new universities were established in big industrial centres. Consequently, the science gained such a prominence that even cultured and aristocratic young people started to see classical education as a waste of time. Gramsci alleges that this phenomenon was becoming increasingly more common throughout the world. According to him, a tendency towards this new culture is very widespread. In compliance with

this, evening schools and private courses have been started for adults, which provide technical and practical training.

Gramsci alleges that capitalist industrialisation corrupts the educational system, and he exemplifies his view through England, which can be called as the cradle of capitalism. Considering this view of Gramsci, it can be stated that he regards capitalism not only as an economic ideology but also as a system leading to the corruption of institutions, relations and even morals. It is clear that a school does not only signify an institution of education and training for Gramsci. For him, schools should also establish a tie between the working world and the building of new humanism and culture. In this context, the specialisation of a handicraft worker does not make a school democratic; a school can be qualified as democratic only if it educates all citizens to have the qualifications of a ruler. Such a school will cover all branches of human knowledge. For Gramsci, this is a practical obligation and an ideal necessity (Lombardi, 2011).

### **The Ideal Intellectual**

Gramsci envisages a new model intellectual and philosopher compliant with the democratic model of education he proposes and calls it 'democratic philosopher'. A democratic philosopher corresponds to an 'organic intellectual'. Unlike a traditional intellectual, an organic intellectual is an enlightened person in a completely close and sincere relation with the public. In this context, an organic intellectual is a teacher. He/she is an educator continuously changing with the influence of the environment and in particular of the public (Fontana, 2013). An organic intellectual is exactly an organ of the public. The relation between an organic intellectual and the public can be described as a movement from the inner ring to the outer ring with the rings constantly expanding and a process realising innovation and critical transformation of social reality. This means that the duty of an organic intellectual is to direct a moral and intellectual reform and to organise this reform.

In summary, he associates culture with practice. This shows the organic intellectual's actual philosophy of praxis. His philosophy of praxis is a reform in motion (Fontana, 2013). In this context, the essential goal of organic intellectuals has come into existence for opposing traditional intellectuals who come to an end with the entrance of the society into a new development process. Gramsci names organic intellectuals as educational-cultural workers (Mayo, 2011). He regards organic intellectuals as a requirement for the emergence and development of the public as a collective and moral power, which forms the history and creates its own reality, i.e. its own action. According to Gramsci, the unity of an organic intellectual and public creates the exact philosophy

of praxis caused by its effort to realise itself as an action through its concrete historical activity. In this respect, an organic intellectual is a public intellectual who does not live in seclusion. He is also a reformist attempting to change social reality by organising and spreading a new type of culture and knowledge. An organic intellectual is an actual teacher of the public and a guide encouraging the public for a new life and practice (Fontana, 2013). Gramsci also mentions the importance of meeting the public. In this context, Gramsci's pedagogy attributes importance to the existence of an ideal educational relation between intellectuals and workers and peasants. At first glance, this relation may be thought as a scholastic relation. However, Gramsci underlines that the relation between teacher and students should be an active and mutual relation (Fontana, 2013).

It is apparent that Gramsci deals with the problem of decreasing hierarchical relations between an educator and a learner. As an alternative to such relations, he defends a relation that has to be active and mutual. Even when this type of relation is addressed alone, it can be seen how democratic Gramsci's educational system is. His method can be described as an attitude of a patient educator who acknowledges that rhetoric and demagogy are wrong (Mayo, 2011). As it can be seen, Gramsci's Unitarian school in its deepest sense should be a service of the state and a basic tool for the society to form a new generation.

While Gramsci's educational system is democratic, it includes a compulsion even if it is at a minimal level. According to him, instruction is not possible without education. With this viewpoint, Gramsci emphasises the necessity of an educator's intervention. The transfer of old culture to the current generation occurs through the labour of a teacher who first merges school and instruction with education. In this respect, Gramsci believes that an ideal educator does not only give lectures in school but also represents the critical conscious of the society by seeking to establish a dynamic and dialectic balance between social pressure and individual autonomy; projects the collective human type; undertakes a mission of mediation between global society and the personality of young persons in their growth process; and supports their development process (Lombardi, 2011).

### **Conclusion**

A close review of the views of Gramsci, who criticises the educational systems of capitalist societies by addressing the education system of his period in his homeland Italy, shows that he is not opposed to vocational schools. The focal point of Gramsci's criticism is the fact that politicians legally put into practice an educational system that will serve the interests of ruling classes for

making the current order permanent. According to Gramsci, training technical staff members cannot be considered as an objective of education. One of the objectives of education is to bring up individuals that can confront the bourgeois' cultural hegemony putting up a counter hegemony. This is Gramsci's final vision of an empowering education. In this context, Gramsci's pedagogy aims to create conscious individuals. Vocational schools alone are far from serving this purpose. Gramsci suggests that vocational education is appropriate only after a child comes to the threshold of vocational choice. According to this view, giving vocational education to an individual is only possible upon the creation of a conscious personality and through that individual's choice. Otherwise, the individual will face an imposition, and he/she will become an ordinary individual working for the interests of the rulers. Gramsci asserts that such an educational system is rather anti-democratic. According to him, an individual educated in such a system bows to the demands of rulers/administrators as he/she does not have the ability to control them. Therefore, individuals should be provided with sufficient knowledge on their rights and responsibilities. Gramsci considers the teaching of rights and responsibilities as one of the most important features of democratic education. It is apparent that Gramsci opposes the fact that politics influences education, i.e. the fact that politicians shape education for their own benefits, and he believes that the educational system resulting from this situation is rather anti-democratic.

According to Gramsci, education should be influential on politics. For the realisation of this situation, educators and those being educated should not be under the direction of politicians. There is a compulsory relation between politics and education in the educational system proposed by Gramsci. In this context, Gramsci believes that whether an educational system is democratic is not about the existence of such a relation, but it is about the form of this relation. According to him, democratic education can be realised if educators and those being educated have the consciousness to control ruling classes and if they can direct them, even if they do so indirectly.

**References | Kaynakça**

- Armaoğlu, F.(1983). 20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi. 1914-1990/ Cilt 2. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Fontana, B. (2011). Gramsci ve Eğitim. (Editörler: Carmel Borg ve diğerleri). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- Fontana, B. (2013). Hegemonya ve İktidar. (Çev: Onur Gayretli). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- Gramsci, A. (1966a). Gli Intellettuali E l'Organizzazione Della Cultura. Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore.
- Gramsci, A. (1966b). Passato e Presente. Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore.
- Gramsci, A. (1967). Aydınlar ve Toplum. (Çev: Vedat Günyol). İstanbul: Çan Yayınları.
- Gramsci, A. (2012a). Hapishane Defterleri- 2. Cilt. (Çev: Barış Baysal). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Gramsci, A. (2012b). Hapishane Defterleri- 3. Cilt. (Çev: Barış Baysal). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Ives, P. (2011). Gramsci'de Dil ve Hegemonya. (Çev: Ekrem Ekici). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- Lombardi, F. (2000). Antonio Gramsci'nin Marksist Pedagojisi. (Çev: Sibel Özbudun, Başak Ekmen). Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi.
- Mayo, P. (2011). Gramsci, Freire ve Yetişkin Eğitimi. (Çev: Ahmet Duman). Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi.
- Merkens, A. (2012). Gramsci Reader: Erziehung und Bildung, 2. Edition. Hamburg: Argument Verlag.
- Poulantzas, N. (2004). Faşizm ve Diktatörlük. (Çev: Ahmet İnsel). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Sassoon, S. A. (2012). Gramsci'ye Farklı Yaklaşımlar. (Çev: Mustafa Kemal Coşkun, Ozan Kamiloğlu). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- Yalçın, A. (1978). Faşizmin Doğuşu. Ankara: Sosyal Yayınlar.