

**THE ORGANIC INTELLECTUAL AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE
COLLECTIVE WILL OF THE SUBALTERN CLASS IN TUNE WITH HUMAN
FORMATION**

***O INTELLECTUAL ORGÂNICO E A CONSTRUÇÃO DA VONTADE COLETIVA DA
CLASSE SUBALTERNA NA DIREÇÃO DA FORMAÇÃO HUMANA***

***INTELLECTUAL ORGÂNICO Y LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA VOLUNTAD COLECTIVA
DE LA CLASE SUBALTERNA EN SINTONÍA CON LA FORMACIÓN HUMANA***

Pedro Pereira dos SANTOS¹
Escolástica SANTOS²
Daniele Kelly Lima OLIVEIRA³

ABSTRACT: This work of bibliographical procedure, is based on the Gramscian perspective and aims to reflect on the concept of organic intellectual and the construction of collective will in line with human formation, which is a process of development of multiple dimensions of the historical subject and which requires the dialectical articulation between objective and subjective factors. The study shows that the activity of the organic intellectual of the subaltern class has a double dimension: the deconstruction of the dominant hegemony and the construction of a new hegemony committed to human formation. It also reveals that knowledge committed to human emancipation needs to be appropriated and incorporated by historical subjects to change and transform the world.

KEYWORDS: Organic intellectual. Collective will. Human formation.

RESUMO: *Este trabalho de procedimento bibliográfico, fundamenta-se na perspectiva gramsciana e visa refletir sobre o conceito de intelectual orgânico e a construção da vontade coletiva em sintonia com a formação humana, que é um processo de desenvolvimento de múltiplas dimensões do sujeito histórico e que requer a articulação dialética entre os fatores objetivos e subjetivos. O estudo demonstra que a atividade do intelectual orgânico da classe subalterna tem dupla dimensão: a desconstrução da hegemonia dominante e a construção de uma nova hegemonia comprometida com a formação humana. Revela também que o*

¹ Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), Teresina – PI – Brazil. Adjunct Professor in the Department of Fundamentals of Education (DEFE) and Leader of the Center for Studies and Research in Education and Human Emancipation (NESPEM/UFPI). Doctorate in Education (UFC). ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0312-0000>. E-mail: santos.pedropereira@gmail.com

² Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), Teresina – PI – Brazil. Adjunct Professor in the Department of Fundamentals of Education (DEFE) and Leader of the Center for Studies and Research in Education and Human Emancipation (NESPEM/UFPI). Doctorate in Education (UFC). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3407-9496>. E-mail: escol.santos@ufpi.edu.br

³ State University of Vale do Acaraú (UVA), Sobral – CE – Brazil. Adjunct Professor in the Pedagogy Course and Coordinator of the Research and Studies Group Education, Social Movements, Public Policies and Diversity (GPEEMPODERAR/UVA). PhD in Education (UFC). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8891-7328>. E-mail: dankel28@yahoo.com.br

conhecimento comprometido com a emancipação humana precisa ser apropriado e incorporado pelos sujeitos históricos a fim de se modificar e transformar o mundo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Intelectual orgânico. Vontade coletiva. Formação humana.*

RESUMEN: *Este trabajo de procedimiento bibliográfico se basa en la perspectiva Gramsciana y tiene como objetivo reflexionar sobre el concepto de intelectual orgánico y la construcción de la voluntad colectiva en línea con la formación humana, que es un proceso de desarrollo de múltiples dimensiones del sujeto histórico que requiere una articulación dialéctica entre factores objetivos y subjetivos. El estudio muestra que la actividad del intelectual orgánico de la clase subalterna tiene una doble dimensión: la deconstrucción de la hegemonía dominante y la construcción de una nueva hegemonía comprometida con la formación humana. También revela que el conocimiento comprometido con la emancipación humana necesita ser apropiado e incorporado por los sujetos históricos para modificar y transformar el mundo.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Intelectual orgánico. Voluntad colectiva. Formación humana.*

Introduction

This reflection arises in a historical context marked strongly by the advance of the forces of the extreme right, which threaten, above all, the freedom of expression of teachers in the classroom, as evidenced by the attempts to approve the School without Party program, henceforth SwP.

This program was created by Lawyer Miguel Nagib in 2004 and transformed into a bill at the request of Rio de Janeiro state deputy, Flávio Bolsonaro, of the Christian Social Party (PSC - RJ), who presented it on 13 May 2014. In Then, the deputy's brother, councilor Carlos Bolsonaro (PSC - RJ), also introduced it to the City Council - RJ.

In an attempt to approve the SwP as part of the national education guidelines, two more bills were presented: one passed through the Chamber of Deputies (PL no. 867/2015), by parliamentarian Izalci Lucas, from the Brazilian Social Democracy Party (PSDB) and another in the Senate (PL no. 193/2016), by Senator Magno Malta, of the Republican Party (PR - ES).

The bills that aim to institute the SwP at all levels of Brazilian education aim, above all, to silence teachers, who are thus prevented from problematizing, in the classroom, about a set of themes, such as gender, sexuality, feminism, machismo, social inequality, class struggles, among others.

The denial of the teacher's freedom of expression is explicitly expressed in paragraph IV, item III of the PL (no. 867/2015), which states that there is a process of political party indoctrination of students in the schools, carried out by the teacher, who intends to train them as political activists, motivating them “to participate in demonstrations, public acts and demonstrations”.

The SwP - even in a country like Brazil, marked by extreme social inequality - advocates the silence of the teacher. Thus, he cannot problematize the problems of an economic, political, social and cultural order, nor criticize moral and religious convictions, as he may be denounced as a doctrinaire by families and students who disagree with his analysis. Thus, it appears that SwP defenders separate the act of educating from the act of instructing. In their view, educating would be a family and church task, while teachers should only convey concepts from textbooks without relating them to problems in the students' context.

Thus, a teacher is chosen who is hostage to the individual conceptions of families and students, whose worldview often reproduces content that validates the bourgeois corporate project that is based on the fundamental contradiction between capital and labor. This puts the teacher at a disadvantage as an intellectual who critically captures and re-elaborates common sense.

In the counter-current of the SwP, which reduces the role of teacher to the task of bourgeois sociability, we will reflect on the concept of organic intellectual and his task in the process of building collective will in a context of deepening the structural crisis of capital and the pandemic of COVID-19.

The concept of intellectual as a unit of the diverse

The concept of intellectual in Gramsci (2005, p. 84) is quite broad, as he himself acknowledges in a letter written in prison on 7 September 1931, stating that:

[...] I greatly expand the notion of intellectual and I am not limited to the current notion, which refers to great intellectuals. This study also leads to certain determinations of the concept of the State, which is usually understood as a political society (or dictatorship, or coercive apparatus, to shape the popular mass according to the type of production and the economy of a given moment), and not as the balance of political society with civil society (or the hegemony of a social group over the entire national society, exercised through so-called private organizations, such as the Church, unions, etc.), and it is especially in civil society that intellectuals operate (our translation).

The strict concept of intellectual and State deeply disturbed Gramsci. He realized that the first concept - understood in an intrinsic way - defined the intellectual as one who thinks, coordinates and manages the world of production, politics and culture, while non-intellectuals like those who only carry out activities, especially in the world of work. He was also distressed by the restricted concept of the State, conceived only as a set of political-legal-administrative apparatus separate from the 'private' apparatus of civil society, which resulted in a dichotomized view of the correlations of forces in the hegemonic process.

For Gramsci (2005), this dichotomy that permeates both the concept of intellectual and that of the State is characteristic of the sociability of capital and manifests itself as one of the obstacles to the revolutionary struggle. Certainly, the concept of a strict State contributes to the legitimation of a unilateral vision, present mainly in the working class, which understands the power of the ruling and dominant class centered only in the state machine, neglecting its extension in the scope of civil society.

But, for Gramsci (2005), the strict concept of intellectual is also problematic insofar as it reproduces the idea that this attribute is valid only for those who think the world through the theoretical, technical and scientific way, while the majority belonging to the working class is seen as an ignorant mass that must be guided towards the reproduction of bourgeois sociability.

In this perspective, Gramsci understands that the intellectual is defined only by the intrinsic attributes of the profession, such as writing, researching and creating theories, which results in a negative view about most subjects who, for not carrying out this activity, are disqualified and seen as not intellectuals.

This prism that disqualifies the working class, positioning it as incapable of being its own guide - which in turn needs to be directed by another class that is foreign to it - validates a power system that justifies and reproduces the relationship between managers and managed. This power that subjugates the working class to those who lead and dominate is supported by the fundamental contradiction between capital and labor.

Thus, those who belong to the hegemonic class appropriate a significant part of the material and cultural collection to become intellectuals and leaders, while the wealth-producing class - which has little access to systematized knowledge - is considered to be without reason, needing to be tutored by those who think the world scientifically. This is one of the factors that leads Gramsci to expand the concept of intellectual, overcoming the dichotomy between wise ruler and ruled ignorant.

Such conceptual expansion breaks with the idea of ignorance as something natural for a certain class and reveals that this conception results from a long historical process of passivation of the working class (DIAS, 1996). Thus, ignorance is revealed as something that is not peculiar to certain social groups, but the product of a model of society that, to maintain itself, needs a system that is sustained in the condition of subordination, in which those who produce wealth are subject to capital ordering.

The Gramscian expansion of the concept of intellectual demonstrates the class element that permeates the human being's formative process in bourgeois society, in which the children of the working class have access to a model of education based on immediate ends aimed at the labor market, while the children of the hegemonic class have another educational model that prepares them to exercise command and dominion functions in the current sociability.

It was aware of this subordinate relationship between leaders and the directed, that Gramsci (2005) also expanded the concept of the State, understanding it both as a political society in which force predominates, as a civil society in which consensus prevails. The State is, therefore, a dialectical unit of unstable balance between the domination of subversive forces and the consensus of allied forces in function of the reproduction of the bourgeois order.

This power that oppresses and conquers in order to institute the civilizing project of the dominant and ruling class requires the activity of the intellectual, understood by Gramsci (2005) as a historical subject who, linked to class interests, assumes the task of elaborating and disseminating a determined conception of the world that contributes to the strengthening of the class identity that it represents.

Gramscian analysis of the intellectual requires a double dimension. In the first, the intellectual emerges as a subject who performs a function articulated to social interests. Intellectual activity stems from objective economic, political and social demands and requires a subjectivity that identifies itself with the interests, ideas, values and beliefs of the class it represents, systematizing them in a conception of the world that is disseminated in society.

This look that articulates the intellectual to the set of social relations, allows us to understand him as a subject who develops a political-organizational function in the social order in which he lives. Thus, the concept of intellectual is expanded in such a way that it encompasses all those who expend psychophysical energy to develop actions of organization, articulation, direction, transformation or even maintenance of a certain social order.

The Sardinian thinker thus defends that, in general, every human being is intellectual, because there is no action devoid of thought. Those who act need to think - even at the level of common sense - in order to realize what was idealized. Everyone thinks and feels when doing something, which demonstrates the completeness of the human race. In this sense, Gramsci (2014, p. 53, author's highlights, our translation) states that there cannot be "[...] human activity from which all intellectual intervention can be excluded, the *homo-faber* cannot be separated from *homo sapiens*".

This expanded view that captures the historical subject as an intellectual is based on the principle that "the human species is fundamentally one and, therefore, all are at the same time worker and intellectual" (DEL ROIO, 2018, p. 147, our translation). Based on the principle of omnilaterality that is directly related to the concept of human formation - by dialectically articulating intellectual and manual activity - Gramsci (2005) extends the concept of intellectual, encompassing the diversity that belongs to the human race.

In the second dimension of the Gramscian gaze, intellectuals are captured based on intrinsic criteria that allow them to be differentiated in degrees. At this moment, the concept of an expanded intellectual that considers the human being as a thought, a will and an action, includes in itself the dimension of plurality that allows us to understand the diversity of subjects who professionally exercise the function of intellectual and others who deal with theory to solve more immediate problems.

For Gramsci (2014), both are intellectuals, because when they act in the world they need to think and put into practice what was thought. However, not everyone who thinks about thought, action and language take on this task professionally. In this perspective, a philosopher and a community leader are intellectuals, however, they differ as the former is a professional in the critical-rational activity, while the latter was not formed as a specialist to exercise this social function.

It is intuitive that the look of an enlarged and intrinsic dimension allows to understand the human being as a non-professional and professional intellectual. This understanding seems to be supported by the dialectic pair to be and not to be. Thus, the teachers are professional intellectuals, because throughout a formative trajectory they have accumulated knowledge to assume this function in a given society. However, they are not professional intellectuals as they work in another area without proper formation.

Thus, those who are professionals in a certain area, may not be in others, which demonstrates that Gramsci (2014) understood the dialectical movement between knowledge and non-knowledge contained in the philosophy of praxis. Thus, the concept of intellectual

circumscribed only to intrinsic attributes is overcome and another emerges, understood as a unit of the diverse, because it synthesizes in itself the multiplicity of historical subjects who assume the task of systematization, organization and diffusion of ideas, beliefs and values in a particular model of society.

From the traditional intellectual to the organic intellectual of capital

Based, then, on the unity-diversity binomial, Gramsci (2014) understands that the traditional intellectual is the one who originated in the feudal historical bloc and who assumed the task of connecting the servants to the dominant elite of the time. Thus, they are traditional intellectuals, priests, lawyers, doctors, etc. - who, although they continue to exist and assume more complex functions in bourgeois sociability, have their origin linked to the model of society preceding the capitalist mode of production.

For Gramsci (2014), this intellectual is usually won over by the bourgeois class to contribute to the elaboration, re-elaboration and implantation of their conception of the world. For Del Roio (2018, our translation), this means that “[...] capital uses intellectuals that emerged from the bowels of the feudal era [...], these [...] contribute a lot to the reproduction of order, to its naturalization”.

For Semeraro (2004, p. 71, our translation), the traditional intellectual is the one who has a bookish, encyclopedic knowledge, a position of superiority, little involvement with the political issues of his historical time and that “[...] is unable to understand the system of production and hegemonic struggles, where the determinant game of economic and political power boils”.

However, this same intellectual may also be won over by subordinate groups⁴ and classes. Gramsci (2014) recognizes that the historically governed class needs to create its own intellectuals, but understands that it is not an easy task, because it requires financial resources and a long formation time.

Aware of this, the author stresses that the subordinate class needs to invest in the formation of its intellectuals. Although the conditions for the full emancipation of individuals are not in place in capital society, it is necessary that this formative process has human

⁴ From the exhibition by Del Roio (2018) we understand that, in the Gramscian perspective, there is a difference between subaltern groups and classes. The first refers to social parcels, such as traditional intellectuals, extracts from merchants of the feudal order, artisans and classes that did not build their own class identity, as they are deeply linked to the dominant logic. The subordinate class - even though still dependent on bourgeois ideology - formed by peasants and workers, demonstrates greater organicity and needs to organize itself politically to bring together all the subordinate groups in the political program to overcome the sociability of capital.

formation as its horizon, while it must conquer traditional intellectuals who demonstrate identification with the struggle for emancipation human.

The traditional intellectual thus becomes the object of dispute among the social classes. It can contribute both to the reproduction of the bourgeois order, as well as to the construction of a political program that aims to overcome subalternity, understood as a historical condition of passivity and denial of the autonomy of groups and classes that are governed by the ruling and dominant class.

As Marx points out in the work *German Ideology* (1845-1846), the ideas prevalent in each historical period belong to the ruling class. This means that the class that exercises power over the others does not dominate only in the material structure, because it also intends, in the superstructure, that its conception of the world be incorporated by the working class.

Marx (2007) understands that the power of the dominant class results from the dialectical articulation between structure and superstructure. In this sense, the subordination of the working class is an expression of both economic and political, social and cultural power exercised by the ruling class.

In the aforementioned work, Marx (2007) urges us to think that the dominant ideas require subjects who produce them in a way linked to certain social groups. In other words, ideas are produced and express interests arising from the correlation of forces in each socio-historical context. It is in this sense that Gramsci (2016, p. 83, our translation) states that:

Ideas and opinions do not 'spontaneously' arise in the brain of each individual: they had a center for formation, irradiation, diffusion, persuasion, there was a group of men or even an individuality who developed and presented them in the current political form.

The dominant ideas, beliefs and values are constructs of individuals or groups that developed them in order to disseminate them to be absorbed, actively or passively, by a group of subjects, constituting a certain worldview. Thus, what the historical subject thinks, feels, does and says brings marks of the correlations of forces that weave the context in which he lives. In other words, human thought, language, affections and action express, to a large extent, the hegemonic ideology, understood as a world conception consisting of a set of principles, beliefs and values peculiar to the ruling and dominant class.

This class condition that, dialectically, dominates the uprisings and directs the allies resulted from a long process of building power based on both the material sphere and the superstructural dimension. This means that the power that historically subordinates the

working class has its foundation in the logic of extraction, accumulation and reproduction of wealth, and that it requires justification and legitimation to be reproduced in the plane of the superstructure.

Gramsci (2014) understands that the condition of dominant and ruling class is constituted as such both by the role it plays in the world of production, and by the prevalence of its conception of the world that was elaborated and disseminated by the organic intellectuals who assume the task of connecting governors and subordinates, the latter being understood as those who did not assert themselves as masters of themselves in the economic, political, social and cultural spheres.

The organic intellectual of capital assumes a connective function, for it articulates the dominated because towards the apparently universal interests of the ruling class. In this process of strength and persuasion, subaltern groups and classes identify with the project of the hegemonic class, since antagonistic interests are hidden and the discourse of pseudo-freedom at the individual level is defended.

In this sense, the intellectual of the hegemonic class is a link builder between governors and governed. For that, it uses the conviction for the elaboration of the consensus of allies and the force for the disciplining of the insurgents. This tactic aims to form a collective will in line with the worldview of those who govern, keeping most of the historical subjects in the condition of subordinates.

Dias (1996, p. 34, our translation) understands that subordination is not an intrinsic condition, peculiar to those who are dominated and directed historically, but results from a system of power that aims to pass on the working class due to bourgeois hegemony - which is a “class rationality that makes history and that forces other classes to think about that history that is not theirs”- consisting of theories and principles, as well as values, beliefs and passions.

The dominant rationality is elaborated by the organic intellectuals created by the bourgeois class to justify, disseminate and reproduce a civilizing mode that is sustained by the contradictory capital-labor relationship. In it, those who buy the workforce produce the intellectuals to build and strengthen their identity as a leader and dominant and to destroy initiatives of struggles of the subaltern classes whose horizon is human emancipation. For Gramsci (2014, p. 15, our translation):

Every social group, born on the originating ground of a social function in the world of economic production, creates for itself, at the same time,

organically, one or more layers of intellectuals that give it homogeneity and awareness of its own function.

Gramsci (2014) dialectically articulates the emergence of intellectuals to the interests of the world of production and to the needs of the construction of class identity. The creation of the intellectual is immediately linked to the economic-corporate interests of the class that originated it, and at the same time, to the political, cultural and ideological interests that constitute the hegemonic project.

Gramsci (2014) articulates material structure and superstructure to understand the role of the intellectual in the set of social relations. The organic intellectual is not a neutral subject - as the SwP defends - because what he produces theoretically expresses, to a large extent, his commitment to the class to which he is linked.

Thus, the activity of the organic intellectual of the bourgeois class has a dual function. It organizes and disseminates the dominant ideology, but, at the same time, it disorganizes subordinate groups and classes so that they do not build their identity and give up fighting collectively to overcome the sociability of capital.

The intellectual of capital contributes to the legitimation of the hegemonic collective will through a process that dialectically unites the subordinates due to the political program of the ruling classes, but which fragments them around an alternative proposal of human emancipation. The activity of this intellectual aims to order the subordinates due to the interests of others, as well as to disorganize them in order to avoid their intellectual and moral elevation in the progress for the construction of the socialist alternative.

In the novel *The Leopard*, by Giuseppe Tomasi, which portrays the correlations of political forces that culminated in the process of unification of Italy, there is an instigating dialogue in which the character *Tancredi*, nephew of *Prince Fabrizio Corbera*, says: “[...] If we want everything to stay as it is, everything must change” (LAMPEDUZA, 2002, p. 42, our translation).

In this passage, Fabrizio understands that the movements of struggle for Italian unification in the 19th century should take place, but as long as the change was to strengthen the nobility. Everything must change, but to keep what is already in place. This means that struggles for change need to be absorbed into the politics of the ruling class.

The organic intellectual committed to the hegemonic worldview - although in a historical context different from that of Italian unification - seems to be moving in the direction of Fabrizio's assertion. It captures the revolutionary embryos of the subordinate classes and aborts them through the cooptation of their leaders and the tactic *divide et impera*

(divide and conquer) in which divided workers fight against themselves, contributing to the reproduction of the dominant sociability.

The activity of this intellectual aims to discipline subordinates to identify with the civilizing mode of capital. For that, they produce theories that ennoble the *modus vivendi* of the dominant classes and that disqualify the subordinates as lacking in civility.

Based on the dialectical logic that is the process of interpretation and critical intervention in the world, Dias (1996, p. 38, author's highlights, our translation) argues that the work of the intellectual of hegemonic power is has two dimensions:

The working classes are organized by logic and devices (parties, schools, etc.) that can express their immediate interests, however, they cannot do it with their projects. And they cannot because these devices and this logic were built to carry out another rationality. Thus, the working classes appear objectively disorganized in relation to themselves, because they are organized in relation to capitalist rationality.

In this way, the dual function of the organic intellectual of capital, who intends to organize the working class according to the dominant hegemony, is reiterated, and to disorganize it so as not to build a new hegemonic project; to unite it with bourgeois rationality and to unite it to weaken class consciousness; order it according to the current discipline and indiscipline it to prevent it from constituting itself as a collective revolutionary will.

Aware of this process of passivation of the subordinate classes, Gramsci (2014) proposes the construction of another rationality that needs to be elaborated from the world of the subordinates and return to them as a tool of struggle to conquer the condition of historical subjects, which demands the creation of a new type of organic intellectual.

The organic intellectual of the subordinate class and the formative function of the collective revolutionary will

Gramsci (2014) understands that the organic intellectual of subaltern groups and classes differs significantly from that which represents the interests of the dominant classes. The first intends to collaborate in the construction of the revolutionary theory that unveils the contradictions of the hegemonic system and organizes the political struggle to overcome domination. The second defends the maintenance of the current order and, for that, the production and diffusion of ideas that aim at the absorption of subjects and groups in favor of the small politics of the hegemonic classes.

For Semeraro (2004, p. 76-77, our translation), the intellectuals of the subordinate classes “become organic to the project of the subjugated when they consider them as subjects, not as objects. Their commitment is not to the elections [...], the maintenance of the power of politicians”, but to the intellectual and moral elevation of the governed in order to build a new civilizing project that requires overcoming the capital-labor contradiction.

The task of conserving the system of domination is not that of the intellectual of the governed classes, but of those who are “[...] employees of the dominant groups, incapable of [...] self-criticism of the class in power [...], put themselves at the service of the machine to lubricate its gears and obtain corporate interests” (SEMERARO, 2004, p. 75, our translation).

The intellectual of subalternity, different from that of the governing classes, does not ignore the common sense knowledge that is fragmentary and occasional, because it has it as a starting point for the construction of a new philosophical conception of the world, which explains in a systematic and coherent way the reasons for the condition of subordinates, aiming to enthuse and organize them for the construction of a new rationality that intends to make history (DIAS, 1996).

In an edition of the proletarian newspaper *L'Ordine Nuovo*, of 15 May 1919, in which Gramsci was the editorial secretary, he demonstrates that the revolutionary struggle implies a dialectical unity between theory, will and disciplined organization of the subordinate classes. The subordinates' struggle cannot be carried out in despair, in an untimely and undisciplined way, because it requires imperatives of its own, recognized by the Sardinian thinker: “Instruct yourself, because we will need all your intelligence. Get excited, because we will need all our enthusiasm. Get organized, because we will need all our strength” (our translation).

The revolution is not a spontaneous, irrationalist, voluntarist and immediate process, but a process that implies study for the appropriation of revolutionary theory, because without this the critical reading of the historicity of the real, the correlations of economic, political, social and cultural forces, the contradictions of the logic of capital and tactics of cooptation of leaders and followers is lost.

The element 'spontaneity' is not enough for the revolutionary struggle: it never leads the working class to overcome the limits of the existing bourgeois democracy. The 'conscience' element, the 'ideological' element is necessary, that is, the understanding of the conditions in which one struggles, of the social relations in which the worker lives, of the fundamental tendencies that operate in the system of these relations, of the development process that society suffers from the existence of unavoidable antagonisms in its midst [...] (GRAMSCI, 2004, p. 294, our translation).

Revolution without revolutionary theory results in surrender to the dominant rationality. Those who fight against the class that makes them subordinate cannot interpret and intervene in the world according to the political intellect of those who dominate them. They need to take theoretical, technical and scientific ownership of a new theory to counteract and overcome the dominant hegemony.

For Gramsci (1999), theory is an indispensable element in the revolutionary struggle, but one that demands a cathartic process in which the ideas that underlie the actions of the subordinates must also become a volitional force. In other words, revolutionary thinking must conquer, involve, enthuse and consciously convince subordinates to form a collective will for the struggle for human freedom. This task requires the inseparable articulation between thinking that thinks and intervenes in the world and the passion that delights those who intend to overcome the condition of subordination, as Coutinho (2018, p. 123, our translation) rightly portrays:

The revolutionary workers' movement demands, in order to carry out the construction of socialism, a theory of transformative action [...], but also a language capable of articulating this awareness to the feeling of the masses. For it is in a dramatic, symbolic, affective form that knowledge becomes a collective will.

The subordinates' revolution is based on the philosophy of praxis, on the revolutionary will and on political organization. All the multiplicity of forces of subordinates must be organized according to the horizon of human emancipation, because otherwise they will remain disciplined by forces opposed to the intellectual and moral elevation of the human being.

The hegemonic intellectual's task in becoming is immense, because he needs to know the manipulated passions of the subordinate classes, its struggle to stay alive, its axiological picture, its perception of itself and of the dominant power, the fatalistic view and/or optimistic of the world, the belief in the concept of a positive state, the legitimizing discourse of the fragmentation between material structure and superstructure, the correlations of forces, the historical process of constituting the sociability of capital, the naive belief in bourgeois democracy, among others.

This set of issues needs to be demystified by the organic intellectual committed to human emancipation. In this sense, the intellectual activity presupposes the capacity to feel the world of the subordinates and, at the same time, to reflect rationally to transform the despair, the pain of being subjugated and the joys for the conquests obtained in philosophical

and scientific thought that is transformed into a new common sense, mobilizer and organizer of the ethical-political⁵ state (GRAMSCI, 2016).

For the Italian thinker, the organic intellectual of the 'simple' feels the drama of their subjugated existence and elaborates a theory that allows radical criticism of hegemonic logic, aiming to build a new alternative social order. The struggle requires the organization of intellectuals in a party committed to human emancipation and their unity with subordinates.

Final considerations

The activity of the intellectual committed to the intellectual and moral elevation of subordinates also has a dual function. He needs to criticize and weaken the dominant rationality, to overcome it, due to the consolidation of a new hegemony of the subordinates.

It appears that, for Gramsci (2004), the work is to disaggregate the bourgeois logic and, at the same time, to build alliances with the subordinates in order to build and strengthen the emancipatory rationality that can be developed in the most diverse apparatus' deprived of hegemony, such as trade unions, residents' associations, youth and adult formation centers, neighborhood and favela movements, rural movements, youth groups, women's movements, among others.

It is necessary to overcome indifference and act, but not spontaneously and without revolutionary theory. The organization of subordinates is not done with amateurism, since it presupposes the creation of tactics that disintegrate hegemonic logic and that aim to integrate the embryonic forces of revolutionary character of the subordinates.

It would be an illusion to intend to fight, in partnership with the 'simple' ones, based on the same theories that validate their condition of subordination. The organic intellectual who educates against and beyond the sociability of capital and whose horizon is human formation (MÉSZAROS, 2011), defends the philosophy of praxis as a theory of subordinates, opposes reformism and the discourse of class conciliation, explains the fundamental contradiction between capital and labor, relates structure and superstructure in the analysis of the real, produces philosophical-scientific knowledge and contributes to the organization of the fight against the process of dehumanization of the historical subject.

This intellectual works against the SwP, which is one of the programs of the Brazilian extreme right. This movement brings together intellectuals with a low degree of knowledge

⁵ Due to prison censorship, Gramsci uses this concept to refer to socialism

and humanity that intend to annul even the partial conquests obtained by the subordinates in bourgeois sociability. In addition, they disseminate hate speech against subordinates.

In the scenario of the structural crisis of capital, intensified by the pandemic of COVID-19, the groups and governed classes live a situation of extreme despair, marked by underemployment, unemployment, high contamination rate and high lethality rate. According to data from the press consortium published on 6 October 2020, Brazil reached 147,571 deaths caused by Covid-19.

Faced with this disastrous situation and the indifference of the president of the republic and his allies, the subordinate's organic intellectuals cannot be silent. The urgent task requires denouncing the abandonment of the lives of the subjugated, involvement in solidarity movements that aim to contribute to people affected by COVID-19, creation of a disciplined political unit against the forces of capital, conducting formative activities on revolutionary theory and defense uncompromising human emancipation. This challenge is immense, but the struggle must continue even in the catastrophic moments of life.

REFERENCES

BRASIL. Câmara dos Deputados. **Projeto de Lei n. 867, de 23 de março de 2015**. Inclui, entre as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, o “Programa Escola sem Partido”. Brasília, DF, 2015. Available:

<https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/fichadetramitacao?idProposicao=1050668>.
Access: 1 July 2020.

BRASIL. Sistema Único de Saúde (SUS). **Painel Coronavírus**. Available:
<https://covid.saude.gov.br/>. Access: 2 Aug. 2020.

COUTINHO, E. G. Mito e hegemonia: a paixão segundo Antônio Gramsci ou Gramsci e Sorel: a tradução realista do conceito de mito. *In*: SCHLESENER, A. H.; OLIVEIRA, A. L.; ALMEIDA, T. M. G. (Org.). **A atualidade da filosofia da práxis e políticas educacionais**. Curitiba: UTP, 2018. p. 87-126.

DEL ROIO, M. **Gramsci e a emancipação dos subalternos**. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2018.

DIAS, Edmundo. Hegemonia: racionalidade que se faz história. *In*: DIAS, E. H. *et al.* **O outro Gramsci**. São Paulo: Xamã, 1996.

GRAMSCI, A. **Caderno do Cárcere**. Maquiavel. Notas sobre o Estado e a Política. Trad. Carlos Nelson Coutinho. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2016. V. 3.

GRAMSCI, A. **Caderno do Cárcere**. Os Intelectuais. O Princípio educativo. Jornalismo. Trad. Carlos Nelson Coutinho. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2014. V. 2.

GRAMSCI, A. **Cadernos do Cárcere**. Introdução ao estudo de filosofia de Benedetto Croce. Trad. Carlos Néelson Coutinho. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1999. v. 1.

GRAMSCI, A. **Cartas do Cárcere**. Trad. Luiz Sérgio Henriques. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005. v. 2.

GRAMSCI, A. **Escritos políticos (1921-1926)**. Trad. Carlos Nelson Coutinho. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2004. v. 2.

LAMPEDUSA, G. T. **O Leopardo**. Tradução Leonardo Cadignoto. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 2002.

MARX, K. **A ideologia alemã**: crítica da mais recente filosofia alemã em seus representantes Feuerbach, B. Bauer e Stirner, e do socialismo alemão em seus diferentes profetas. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

MÉSZÁROS, I. **Para além do capital**: rumo a uma teoria de transição. Tradução Paulo Cezar Castanheira, Sérgio Lessa. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

SEMERARO, G. (Org.). **Filosofia e política na formação do educador**. Aparecida, SP: Ideias & Letras, 2004.

How to reference this article

SANTOS, P. P.; SANTOS, E.; OLIVEIRA, D. K. L. The organic intellectual and the construction of the collective will of the subaltern class in tune with human formation. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. 3, p. 1598-1614, Sep./Dec. 2020. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24i3.14295>

Submitted: 30/06/2020

Required revisions: 20/07/2020

Approved: 26/08/2020

Published: 01/09/2020

