

## ARTICLE

# GRAMSCI AND INTELLECTUALS, FROM ORGANIC TO LORIAN: A FACET TO THINK ABOUT BOLSONARISM\*

DEISE ROSALIO SILVA<sup>1</sup>

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5862-5087>  
<deiserosalio@gmail.com>

<sup>1</sup> Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). Belo Horizonte, MG, Brasil.

**ABSTRACT:** The article is about the conceptualization of intellectual developed by Antonio Gramsci in its different categories, covering the extension that it acquires in the thought of the Sardinian author, seeking to elucidate the place intellectuals assume in the political and social struggle. This is a bibliographical study mainly centered on the production elaborated by Gramsci during his imprisonment. The whole of the Prison Notebooks, the Italian Critical Edition, some of the most important commentaries on the author, and excerpts from the Letters from Prison were examined. The intellectual concept acquires great amplitude in Gramscian thought due to this action's organizational expression and indispensability in delineating the entire social fabric. From the traditional intellectuals to the organic, cosmopolitan, national-popular, and even the contentious Lorianists and Brescianists, as fundamental agents in the diffusion and consolidation of world conceptions and operative behaviors, they play an indispensable role in any political, economic, and social organization. Such a categorization of intellectuals can be translated to the present. In this way, the compendium of the Gramscian concept of intellectual shows itself as a relevant resource also in understanding our time, the current order of the Brazilian social-political fabric, which enabled the rise of Bolsonaro to power and, despite all the crisis experienced, still holds a significant percentage of supporters, elucidating that its real overcoming will require an intellectual and moral reform, ratifying the cultural struggle inherent every political struggle.

**Keywords:** Intellectuals, Gramsci, Lorianism, education, Bolsonarism.

## GRAMSCI E OS INTELECTUAIS, DOS ORGÂNICOS AOS LORIANOS: UMA FACETA PARA PENSAR O BOLSONARISMO

**RESUMO:** O artigo versa sobre a conceituação de intelectual desenvolvida por Antonio Gramsci, em suas diferentes categorias, abrangendo a extensão que adquire no pensamento do autor sardo, buscando elucidar o lugar que os intelectuais assumem na luta política e social. Trata-se de uma pesquisa bibliográfica centrada, principalmente, na produção elaborada por Gramsci durante o período do cárcere.

---

\* The translation of this article into English was funded by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais - FAPEMIG, through the program of supporting the publication of institutional scientific journals.

Foram examinados o conjunto dos Cadernos do cárcere, da edição crítica italiana, além de alguns dos mais importantes comentadores do autor e de excertos das Cartas do cárcere. O conceito de intelectual adquire grande amplitude no pensamento gramsciano, pela expressão organizativa e indispensabilidade dessa atuação no delineamento de todo tecido social. Dos intelectuais tradicionais aos orgânicos, cosmopolitas, nacionais-populares e até os contenciosos lorianistas e brescianistas, enquanto agentes fundamentais na difusão e consolidação de concepções de mundo e condutas operantes, eles assumem papel indispensável em toda organização política, econômica e social. Tal conjunto de categorização de intelectuais pode ser traduzida para o presente. Dessa forma, o compêndio da concepção de intelectual gramsciana mostra-se como recurso relevante também na compreensão do nosso tempo, da atual ordenação do tecido político social brasileiro, que possibilitou a ascensão de Bolsonaro ao poder e, apesar de toda crise vivida, ainda sustenta percentual significativo de apoiadores, elucidando que a sua real superação demandará uma reforma intelectual e moral, ratificando a luta cultural inerente a toda luta política.

**Palavras-chave:** Intelectuais, Gramsci, lorianismo, educação, bolsonarismo.

## **GRAMSCI Y LOS INTELLECTUALES, DE LOS ORGÁNICOS A LORIANOS: UMA FACETA PARA PENSAR EL BOLSONARISMO**

**RESUMEN:** El artículo aborda la conceptualización de intelectual desarrollada por Antonio Gramsci, en sus diferentes categorías, abarcando la extensión que adquiere en el pensamiento del autor sardo, buscando dilucidar el lugar que asumen los intelectuales en la lucha política y social. Se trata de una investigación bibliográfica centrada principalmente en la producción realizada por Gramsci durante el período carcelario. Se examinó el conjunto de “Cadernos do cárcere”, de la edición crítica italiana, además de algunos de los comentaristas más importantes del autor y extractos de “Cartas do cárcere”. El concepto de intelectual adquire gran amplitud en el pensamiento gramsciano, por la expresión organizativa y la indispensabilidad de esta acción en la delimitación de todo el tejido social. Desde los intelectuales tradicionales hasta el litigio orgánico, cosmopolita, nacional-popular e incluso lorianista y brescianista, como agentes fundamentales en la difusión y consolidación de concepciones de mundo y comportamientos operativos, asumen un papel indispensable en toda organización política, económica y social. Tal conjunto de categorización de los intelectuales puede traducirse al presente. De esta manera, el compendio de la concepción intelectual gramsciana se muestra como un recurso relevante también en la comprensión de nuestro tiempo, del actual ordenamiento del tejido político social brasileño, que hizo posible el ascenso de Bolsonaro al poder y, a pesar de todas las crisis vivida, aún sostiene un importante porcentaje de simpatizantes, aclarando que su real superación demandará una reforma intelectual y moral, ratificando la lucha cultural inherente a toda lucha política.

**Palabras clave:** Intelectuales, Gramsci, lorianismo, educación, bolsonarismo.

## **INTRODUCTION <sup>2</sup>**

Among the numerous formulations developed by Antonio Gramsci during his reflections and studies in prison, an ambitious research project that he intended to develop on the history of intellectuals stands out. Although he could not complete his project as he might have wished, precisely because of the limitations of prison and his health, which led to his untimely death, he contributed like no one else in this direction, so it seems impossible to talk about intellectuals without mentioning Gramsci.

---

<sup>2</sup> The original work that made the present study possible was carried out with a Capes scholarship.

To understand the importance of this formulation, it is relevant to recall the elements that make up his historicist conception and philosophical and political vision of the world. For Gramsci, knowledge is the fruit of human production established in the relationship with other subjects and the environment and is, therefore, in constant movement but acquiring greater or lesser diffusion depending on how the power relations are shown. Ideologies comprise the ideas and conceptions that are inherently connected to practical actions and historically construct reality. They are the meanings that make us read and be in the world. In this sense, knowledge and truth are also ideologies; they are human historical productions that can be refuted and modified. However, in a society of subjects in asymmetric positions, the circulation of ideologies does not happen linearly and harmoniously but is the result of the social division of the world. On the contrary, it results from the social division established by the relations that underpin society's structural and superstructural organization and make a certain conception of the world become common sense and underpin the hegemony of a particular group.

Therefore, the importance attributed by Gramsci to the ideological framework is due to the delimitation of the role of the superstructures in the political struggle, inescapable to the relations of force, which determines the need for hegemonic apparatuses within the ideological dispute. Thus, in this process, the role of intellectuals takes on special relevance. As Gramsci stated that "a mass cannot be distinguished without organizing, and there is no organization without intellectuals" (2007, Q11, §12, p. 2362).

Gramsci understood that all subjects were intellectuals, but not everyone assumed this societal role. The author rejects the simplistic conception of an intellectual and expands the concept, not limiting himself to the current notion of the "great intellectual," an outstanding holder of superior knowledge and above the majority. It is not possible to deprive any human activity of an intellectual dimension. However, as he observes in Notebook 12:

it would be possible to say that all men are intellectuals, but not all men have the have in society the function of intellectuals (thus, the fact that someone can, at a given moment, fry two eggs or sew a tear in a jacket does not mean that all are cooks or tailors). Thus, historically, the specialized categories for exercising the intellectual function are formed, are formed in connection with all groups, but above all in connection with the most important social groups, and undergo broader and more complex elaborations in correlation with the dominant social group (GRAMSCI, 2007, §1, p. 1516-1517).

However, the extension of the intellectual character to all human beings did not imply that there were no distinctions in degrees and practical exercise of this intellectuality. Gramsci differentiates categories of intellectuals according to how they were constituted, their function, and the character of their intellectual activity: traditional, organic, cosmopolitan, and national-popular. All are translatable to our time.

Still, in this effort to understand the conceptual enlargement of the intellectual, Gramsci is concerned with the intellectual that he calls vulgar, superficial, and opportunistic. In this sense, he will elaborate on the concepts of Brescianism and Lorianism, formulations that have been little studied but have great importance in the organization of the social fabric. Moreover, in this historical moment in which we live, to better understand how, despite the inconsistency of thought and reflexive and critical concatenation with concrete reality, certain subjects came to power, it seems more than opportune to delve into this category of intellectuals. This manuscript will discuss the Gramscian conceptualization of intellectual and its different strains to embrace the breadth of this formulation and the place intellectuals take in political and social struggle inherent in the organization of human life.

The breadth of Gramscian conceptualization of intellectuals, centered fundamentally on the function of organizing influence on the social fabric, allows us to translate these categories to our time.

It is also important to recall the meaning and extent of the conceptualization of intellectuals in Antonio Gramsci's thought to establish another explanatory category that would help us shed more light on what made the rise of Bolshevism to power possible. This is a fundamental premise in the debate about how to think and build effective ways to overcome it.

## **INFLUENCES IN THE DELINEATION OF GRAMSCIAN INTELLECTUAL MEANING AND THE NEXUS WITH HEGEMONY**

Gramsci understands the importance of intellectuals as protagonists, as links of mediation between social groups, as key elements of the interchange between classes, of ideological, political, and practical intervention in the masses in forming a shared political will. Gramsci understood the importance of intellectuals as protagonists, as mediating links between social groups, key elements in the exchange between classes, of ideological, political, and practical intervention in the masses in forming a shared political will. They organize the organic link between the ideological and economic spheres that make up and organize the social fabric. For this reason, the theory of hegemony is closely related to Gramsci's theory of intellectuals. Not by chance, the author cites the term "intellectual" 1724 times throughout the 29 Prison Notebooks.

The ambitious project of studying the history of intellectuals announced by Gramsci already in the letter of March 19, 1927, sent to his sister-in-law Tatiana before he was even allowed to write in prison, became a pulsating vein of the Prison Notebooks. We can attribute a range of formulations, such as the development of the concept of the Integral State and the notebook on Americanism and Fordism, to the maturing of Gramscian reflections driven by this proposition. Expression of the extensive relevance that the organizational capacity of intellectuals imprints on society, and Gramsci skillfully grasped this during his analytical efforts while imprisoned in a fascist prison.

The entire historical context lived and clamorous at that moment, after Lenin's death, and the growing conflicts that harmed the alliance between workers and peasants and triggered the rupture in the Russian ruling group corroborated Gramsci's suspicions to grow concerning how the political game was being conducted in the USSR, jeopardizing the establishment of socialism (GRAMSCI, 1964; VACCA, 2008). The concrete historical situations of Western capitalist societies with their complex civil society demanded another struggle and political conduct.

However, it is impossible to say that Gramsci completely rejected the Jacobin idea and preached that hegemony comprised only the democratic political struggle. He only distinguished the strategies of power struggles in different social and historical times/circumstances while developing an enriched reading of Jacobinism, expanding the vision of strategic possibility with the same goal (FROSINI, 2014).

The organizational function in a given social group delineates the subject's role as an intellectual in that milieu. In line with the proposition of the 11th thesis on Feuerbach, "philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways; it is a matter of transforming it" (MARX; ENGELS, 2002, p. 103). Gramsci stated that intellectuals are more than interpreted; they are active agents of civil society, privileged terrain of circulation of ideologies and practices and, therefore, of relations that culminate in the hegemony of a particular conception, direction, and organization of society. In Gramscian understanding, the function of the intellectual is as complex as it is essential for social life.

In the excerpt from Notebook 12, Gramsci addressed the topic of intellectuals by indicating that the place occupied by them in modern society was defined by the historical development of the State and its enlargement:

The relation between intellectuals and the world of production is not immediate, as in the case of the fundamental social groups, but is mediated to varying degrees by the whole social fabric, by the whole of the superstructures, of which intellectuals are precisely the "employees." (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q12 §1, p. 1518–1519).

Intellectuals are key subjects in maintaining or fighting ideologies. In the excerpt taken from Notebook 4, Gramsci reinforced his interpretation of the position of intellectuals in civil society due to the relevance they have in achieving consensus and building hegemony:

Intellectuals have a function in the “hegemony” that the dominant group exercises throughout society and in the “domination” over it that is embodied in the State, and this function is precisely “organizing” or connective: intellectuals have the function of organizing the social hegemony of a group and its state domination, that is, the consensus given by the prestige of the function in the productive world and the apparatus of coercion for those groups that do not “consent” either actively or passively or for those moments of crisis of command and direction in which spontaneous consent undergoes a crisis. This analysis results in a very large extension of the concept of intellectuals, but only in this way does it seem possible to arrive at a concrete approximation of reality (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q4, §49, p. 476).

The author stresses the broadening that the conceptualization of intellectuals acquires in the study and from the analysis he undertakes. He also does so in correspondence to Tatiana, written in Turi on September 7, 1931:

My study on intellectuals is very broad as a scheme, and I don't think there are any books in Italy on this subject. There is, to be sure, much scholarly material, but scattered in an infinite number of journals and local historical archives. On the other hand, I greatly expand the notion of intellectual, not limiting myself to the current notion that refers to the great intellectuals. This study also leads to certain determinations of the concept of the State, which is commonly understood as a political Society (or dictatorship, or coercive apparatus to mold the popular mass to the type of production and economy of a given moment) and not as a balance of political society and civil society (or hegemony of a social group over the entire national society, exercised through so-called private organizations, such as the church, unions, schools etc.). It is precisely in civil society in particular that intellectuals operate (Benedetto Croce, for example, is a kind of lay pope and a very efficient instrument of hegemony, even if, from time to time, he is in disagreement with this or that government etc.) (GRAMSCI, 2013, p. 456-457).

The correlation between the deepening of the concept of the intellectual and the concept of the State can be observed. The perceptions of how power is conceived and how hegemony is achieved allow a better reflection on the configuration of the State and the influence of intellectuals in spreading or combating the conceptions of the world.

As Gramsci reiterates:

Critical self-awareness means, historically and politically, the creation of an elite of intellectuals: a human mass is not “distinguished” and does not become independent “for itself” without organizing (in a broad sense), and there is no organization without intellectuals, that is, without organizers and leaders, without the theoretical aspect of theory-practice nexus being concretely distinguished in a stratum of persons “specialized” in conceptual and philosophical elaboration (2007, Q11, §12, p. 1386).

Every social group is based on its intellectual corpus, which is ideological and practical, an indispensable condition for hegemonic support. Concerning the construction of the hegemony of the subordinate classes, a process in which the intellectual elevation of the masses is a prerequisite for the creation of a new consciousness, of a new society, the formation and performance of intellectuals for an effective intellectual and moral reform are of vital strategic relevance.

Awareness of the contradictions experienced in society is the first condition for social mobilization. This again reinforces the importance of the formative issue and the intellectual's role in confronting deep-rooted conceptions of the world. As questioners and mediators, the intellectuals in formative and organized action potentiate the necessary antagonism for an operative collective will.

Intellectuality is an intrinsically human capacity; what differs, therefore, is that not all human beings exercise this function of intellectuals in society. Not all assume this position, and not all have had

an education that would enable them to act in an influential and organized way. However, this does not prevent them from obtaining it in the future, which, again, highlights the educational and pedagogical role of every relation of hegemony.

This is why Gramsci advocated a mass intellectual progress; he thought the construction of new subjectivities and a new historical personality was fundamental. Hence, he gives education such an important place. He is concerned with the education of the masses, not with a formation for private life; he advocates a formation for collectivity, for public spirit, so that people can build collectively more organized and structured forms of struggle for human emancipation. Not surprisingly, Gramsci's maxim was the defense of a unitary school of general humanistic culture, full of historicity and concrete notions, which addressed notions of rights and duties from the most elementary education and explored the balance of the ability to work manually and intellectually, aiming at the integral formation of the subjects, making them capable of "thinking, studying, directing, or controlling who oversee [these schools]" (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q12, §2, p. 1457).

## DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF INTELLECTUALS

### Organic, traditional, national-popular, and cosmopolitan

Organic intellectuals are those who are truly linked to the class they represent, as they are active in theory and practice. Organic intellectuals can then be found in the ruling and working classes.

As Semeraro emphasizes:

Organic intellectuals are those who, besides being specialists in their profession, which binds them deeply to the mode of production of their time, elaborate an ethical-political conception that enables them to exercise cultural, educational, and organizational functions to ensure the social hegemony and state domination of the class they represent (SEMERARO, 2006, p. 377-378).

Gramsci points out that these intellectuals must:

Possess certain technical capacity, not only in the circumscribed sphere of their activity and initiative but also in other spheres, at least in those closer to economic production (they must be an organizer of masses of men, they must be an organizer of the "confidence" of those who invest in their enterprise, of the buyers of his goods, etc.). (2007, Q12, §1, p. 1513-1514).

As Gramsci mentioned in Notebook 4, § 49 and reiterated with more emphasis in Notebook 12, §1:

The most widespread methodological error seems to me to have sought this criterion of distinction in what is intrinsic to intellectual activities instead of seeking it in the set of the system of relations in which these activities (and, therefore, the groups that embody them) find themselves, in the general set of social relations (2007, Q12, §1, p. 1516).

We can say that the fundamental issue of intellectuals is political because their function is political, precisely because what makes them acquire this position is this ability to connect hearts and minds, to corroborate a certain way of seeing the world that, of course, is never restricted to this field, but leads to conducts; it is precisely the organizational character that determines the subject as an intellectual in society.

Traditional intellectuals, originating in a previous mode of production, persist in their space of influence and organization, despite the predominant change in production and political and social organization (such as the ecclesiastics, who were the organic intellectuals of the feudal system).

In his 1926 work "Some Themes of the Southern Question," Gramsci pointed out that in Southern Italy, traditional intellectuals predominated, with a strong religious, traditionalist imprint, rooted

with a monopolistic ideological conception, which linked the peasants to the large landowners. In the North, nevertheless, in that industrial condition, urban intellectuals predominated, who grew up with industry were linked to its fortunes and, in general, as is significantly the case with many urban intellectuals, were quite standardized (GRAMSCI, 2007).

Regarding force, traditional intellectuals are subjects with strategic value in the struggle for hegemony. They should be disputed so that they could come to represent, allied to organic intellectuals, the same interests of the social group that disputes hegemony. For this reason, he states that

One of the most striking characteristics of every group that develops towards domination is its struggle for the assimilation and “ideological” conquest of traditional intellectuals, assimilation, and conquest that is all the more rapid and effective the more the group in question can simultaneously elaborate their own organic intellectuals (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q12, §1, p. 1517).

Here is why Gramsci deals with the

welding between organic intellectuals of a social group and traditional intellectuals, a function that it can fulfill in dependence on its fundamental function of raising the “economic” members of a social group to the quality of “political intellectuals,” that is, of organizers of all the functions inherent in the organic development of an integral society, civil, and political (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q4, §49, p. 478).

The ideological and practical organicity of a given social group is established through the actions of its intellectuals, executors of the political influx in the conduction of a project of society. Intellectuals are not, therefore, impartial or neutral subjects, also because of the impossibility of exemption from history and from the group in which they act on behalf of a world concept of which they are representatives and disseminators.

Another interpretative category is cosmopolitan intellectuals, who focus on universal issues rather than national demands and everyday problems. For Gramsci, historically, in the current sense of his intellectual activity, most Italian intellectuals had a cosmopolitan character. Cosmopolitanism was a constitutive element in line with the very late edification of Italy as a unified nation, with the “absence of the national character of culture” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q5, §123, p.651). In Notebook 3, the author points out this characteristic of Italian intellectuals:

Italian intellectuals and experts were cosmopolitan and not Italian, not national. Italian statesmen, captains, admirals, scientists, and navigators were not national but cosmopolitan in character (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q3, §80, p. 360).

Italy historically presented an intellectualist export, not constituting its intellectuals’ national tradition of action. Gramsci insists:

For Italy, the central fact is precisely the international or cosmopolitan function of its intellectuals that is both cause and effect of the State of disintegration in which the peninsula has remained since the fall of the Roman Empire until 1870 (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q4, §49, p. 479).

Gramsci further reiterates this point in Notebook 5:

Italy, because of its “cosmopolitan” function, during the period of the Roman Empire and the Middle Ages, suffered passively from international relations, that is, in the development of its history, international relations prevailed over national relations (2007, Q5, §55, p. 589).

Gramsci opposes Julien Benda’s vision of an impartial universalist intellectual for not conceiving alienation from history and non-partisanship; he believed that the mere defense of general principles of freedom and justice, disconnected from social struggles and national-popular issues, was empty, for not translating the demands of the masses, nor making political and social practices viable.

In turn, national-popular intellectuals would be those “who feel organically linked to a national-popular mass” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q14, §18, p. 1676), subjects capable of leaving the field of

ideas and universal ramblings and reaching the people by thinking and acting on the daily life and problems of their society. For Gramsci, “every intellectual movement becomes or becomes again national if there is a ‘going to the people’” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q8, §145, p. 1030). Therefore, he considers that:

The problem of creating a new intellectual class consists, therefore, in critically elaborating the intellectual activity that each one possesses at a certain degree of development, modifying its relation to muscular-nervous effort in the direction of a new equilibrium and making muscular-nervous effort itself, as an element of a general practical activity, which perpetually innovates the physical and social world, become the foundation of a new and integral conception of the world. [...] The mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer consist in eloquence, the exterior and momentary motor of the affections and passions, but in an active insertion in practical life, as a builder, organizer, “permanent persuader,” as not only a pure orator - but superior to the abstract mathematical spirit; from technique-work, he arrives at technique-science and the historical humanist conception, without which he remains a “specialist” and does not become a “ruling authority” (specialist + politician) (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q12, §3, p. 1551).

Since the distinction between subjects concerning intellectuality is due to “the nature of their role and their social function” (PAGGI, 1984, p. 320), it was fundamentally important the critical elaboration of this intellectuality, existing in some measure for the construction of a new conception of the world that would make possible in practice the real dispute for the translation of a new world structured under other social relations and production. It was fundamentally important to critically elaborate this existing intellectuality, to some extent, to construct a new conception of the world that would make possible in practice the real dispute for the translation of a new world structured under other social and production relations. Once understood that the role of intellectuals was to “determine and organize the moral and intellectual reform, that is, to adapt culture to the practical function” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q11, §16, p. 1407-1408), it became essential the formation and performance of intellectuals that allied the international dimension, not separating from the world and its outflows the national-popular issues.

Gramsci seems to recover Lenin’s propositions in “What to do?” by relating spontaneity to organized conscience. In this way, he understands that it is necessary to overcome the spontaneous by starting from the simple, the real, starting from common sense to reach organized consciousness, philosophy, another way of conceiving existing relations, and, mainly, the way they can be conducted.

The author highlights his position on the task of intellectuals by presenting Dostoiévski as a national-popular intellectual, simultaneously revealing criticism of Italian intellectuals historically distant from this question.

In Dostoiévski, there is the powerful national-popular feeling, that is, the consciousness of a “mission of the intellectuals” for the people who are perhaps “objectively” constituted as “humble” but must be liberated from this “humility,” transformed, regenerated. In the Italian intellectual, the expression of the “humble” indicates a relationship of paternalistic protection, the “arrogant” feeling of one’s undisputed superiority (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q9, §135, p. 1197).

The absence of Italian intellectuals connected to the masses reflected the lack of a national-popular character in literature and art, representing a “national and state weakness” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q14, §35, p. 1692-1693). Gramsci also addresses this aspect by pointing out the absence of this national-popular specificity in literature as well:

Lack of an identity of world conception between “writers” and “people,” i.e., popular feelings are not experienced as their own by writers, nor do writers perform a “national educating” function, i.e., they have not and do not set themselves the problem of elaborating popular feelings after having relived and appropriated them (2007, Q21, §5, p. 2114).

Literature in Italy “is separated from the real development of the Italian people, it is caste-based, it does not feel the drama of history, that is, it is not popular-national” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q6, §44, p. 720).

In this way, Gramsci differentiates “nationalism” from “national-popular.” The following passage shows this distinction: “countries where nationalism exists, but not a ‘national-popular’ situation, that is, where the great masses of the people are considered cattle” (2007, Q6, §135, p. 799).

A “national-popular” character implies the real consideration of the people as fundamental and constitutive members of the nation, culture, language, and customs and not as coadjutants of an imposed order.

It is in this sense that Gramsci points out:

These two fundamental points — formation of a national-popular collective will, of which the modern Prince is both the organizer and the active and operative expression, and intellectual and moral reform — should constitute the framework of the work (2007, Q13, §1, p. 1561).

Therefore, it states that:

A system of government is expansive when it facilitates and promotes development from below, raising the level of national-popular culture and thus making possible a selection of “intellectual excellences” in a wider area (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q6, §170, p. 821).

The link between intellectuals and hegemony is configured in the proposition of an indispensable strategic plan that links the cultural elevation of the people and the constitution of the collective will for another social order, no longer based on the inequality that imposes subalternity on the masses.

The national-popular intellectuals linked to the people would be able to pass “from knowing to understanding, to feeling, and vice versa, from feeling to understanding, to knowing” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q11, §67, p. 1505). And thus, with the political struggle and the educational and cultural work, breaking the silence of the solitary intellectual knowledge and the pain of everyday feeling, building new relations under a new common sense, and building a new hegemony.

It is thus evident that the intellectual’s way of existing is through politics in Gramscian conception. Consequently, the educational and cultural importance in the strategic conduction of political and social struggle is also clear. It is worth noting that to point out the educational role of the Gramscian conception is not to downgrade its revolutionary nature; on the contrary, it is to elevate it. Education and culture organize politics at the same time that they are the most pronounced expression of political exercise.

## **Party as collective intellectual**

For Gramsci, not only the intellectual as an individual has its weight in the process of building hegemony, but thus we could also understand the intellectual as an organism, which is the party, in a broad sense. On the importance of the party, he states:

The modern prince, the myth-prince, cannot be a real person, a concrete individual; he can only be an organism, a complex element of society which has already begun the concretization of a collective will recognized and affirmed partially in action. This organism is already given by historical development. It is the political party, the first cell in which germs of collective will are synthesized, that tends to become universal and total (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q13, §1, p. 1558).

The party assumes a preponderant character in the arrangement of social relations for the collective organization of subjects. Today, the party is associated with other forms of political action and collective struggles, such as innumerable social movements.

The desired party should be the locus of formation of organic intellectuals of the working class, acting without corporatism and clientelism. In order to acquire a truly democratic and hegemonic function in society, it was indispensable to exercise the party’s political power internally, as Gramsci points out:

The parties' hegemonic or political steering function can be assessed by developing the internal life of the parties themselves. If the State represents the coercive and punitive force of legal regulation of a country, the parties, representing the spontaneous adherence of an elite to such regulation, considered a type of collective coexistence for which the whole mass must be educated, must show in their private internal life to have assimilated, as principles of moral conduct, those rules which in the State are legal obligations. In parties, necessity has already become freedom, and from this arises the enormous political value (i.e., of political direction) of the internal discipline of a party, and hence the value of the criterion that such discipline has for assessing the power of expansion of the different parties. From this point of view, parties can be considered schools of state life. Elements of party life: character (resistance to the impulses of outdated cultures), honor (fearless will in upholding the new kind of culture and life), dignity (consciousness of operating for a higher purpose), etc. (2007, Q7, §90, p. 919-920).

Gramsci opposes the view of the party as a synthesis of interests represented by certain empowered subjects. He disagrees with the distinction between subjects in the formation of the party because he believes that this would cause a rupture with the working class, which would compromise its own role and disregard its formative function in the educational process of the masses. He considered that "only a strong cultural elevation of the militants could stop the phenomena of authoritarianism present in the life of the party" (PAGGI, 1984, p. 315).

Gramsci attributes a historical and political character to the process of the party's constitution and once again innovates by broadening its meaning. In response to Bordiga's position, he would later formulate the following considerations in prison:

That all political party members should be considered intellectuals is a statement that may lend itself to irony and caricature; yet, on reflection, nothing is more accurate. A distinction of degrees must be made; a party may have a greater or lesser composition of the highest or lowest degree, but this is not what matters: what matters is the function, which is directive and organizational, that is, educational, that is, intellectual (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q12, §1, p. 1523).

The party is not a simple opinion-forming agent; it has the mission to undertake a theoretical-practical body that designates a way of thinking, being, and acting "to manufacture the maker" (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q19, §24, p. 2018). To do so, it acquires the fundamental task of occupying a position in people's lives that was previously filled by religion, which "must mobilize individual and collective wills," "organize them, give them homogeneity and meaning" (DIAS, 1996, p.11). After all, "only in an organized terrain can the conditions of political success be determined" (PAGGI, 1984, p. 336).

However, it should be noted that although the party has a pedagogical attribution, it is an organizational form historically constructed by and for the subjects in the desire to respond to their concrete struggles. Not only must it provide paths and answers, but it must also be ready to gather them from society. The party not only "teaches but also "learns." It is not only a "teacher," but it is itself a "student," in the measure in which, linked to the circumstances and the struggle of the subaltern classes, it must re-signify its strategies, its locus of action, resizing its weight in each form of struggle.

As a "collective thinker," the party must guide daily political practice. The concrete situations and contradictions in the disputed terrain of civil society are not monolithic and demand that the "educator also be educated." An organizer of the masses in favor of hegemonic construction, the political party must always be ready to question its practices and reinvent itself, learning from social movements and the masses' pains to continue representing and expressing a collective will.

## **Lorianism and Brescianism: intellectuals in hiding**

Still concerning the categorization of intellectuals, Gramsci states that every society develops an intellectual body that uses knowledge lightly, propagandistically, and ideologically in favor of their class interests because they feel their privileges threatened and contribute to impregnating in the collective mentality of a caricatured image of reality. He understands it to be almost a "general law of human

development,” as he states in the article “*La compagnia di Gesù*” in *Avanti*, published on October 9, 1920 (GRAMSCI, 1987, p. 707).

The essay conducted by Francesco De Sanctis on the work “*L’Ebreo di Verona*” by Antonio Bresciani was the fundamental inspiration for the development of the Gramscian conceptualization of ‘Brescianism,’ which would acquire, together with ‘Lorianism,’ a character as an analytical category of intellectuals in Gramscian thought.

The political soap opera “*L’Ebreo di Verona*” was inspired by serial narratives, was anti-republican, and inflamed people’s feelings of terror and hatred. It played an essential role in the battles between the clergy and liberals. This criticism of Father Bresciani extended to the Society of Jesus, which, with its production and performance, inculcated a hatred of the liberal à liberal revolution in the middle classes. So much so that in Notebook 3, paragraph 13, Gramsci uses “Jesuitism” and will use it as a synonym for Brescianism. The exploitation of faith in favor of a conception of the world that deflated political prejudices and misrepresented reality was arduously mobilized in these productions.

If at first, the deontian criticism of Bresciani’s work raises a Gramscian denunciation about the falsification of history, later, with the development of the reflections he will undertake, he will acquire greater attention to the literary mechanisms of mystification and their reach, as narrative constructions that delineated the socialist and communist leaders as unscrupulous subjects, as greater attention to the literary mechanisms of mystification construction and their reach, as narrative constructions that delineated the socialist and communist leaders as unscrupulous subjects, thirsty for power, wealth, and manipulators of the people.

In a letter of April 7, 1930, addressed to his sister-in-law Tatiana, Gramsci states that in Italian literature, “there is an essentially sectarian tradition” and makes direct reference to Bresciani, pointing out that for him, “all the patriots were scoundrels, rogues, murderers etc., while the defenders of the throne and the altar, as they were then called, were all little angels who came to earth to work miracles” (2013, p. 332).

Other authors besides Bresciani, such as Mario Puccini (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q3, §64, p. 345), Luigi Capuana (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q3, 73, p. 349), Ugo Ojetti (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q5, §101, p. 630), Angello Gatti (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q6, 2, p. 685), Enrico Corradini (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q7, 82, p. 914), Giovanni Papini (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q8, 105, p. 1002), among others, presented works with stereotypical characterizations and ironic tones, which ended up creating a false idea of Italian political life. The literary production of the time contributed to a hypocritical deformation of the national historical picture, as occurred during the period of the greatest effervescence of the workers’ struggle, the so-called Biennium Rosso. Gramsci called these authors, who presented a superficial and sectarian representation of social and political reality and its struggles, contributed to the spread of antidemocratic ideas “the offspring of Father Bresciani.”

Gramsci, in his vigilant sagacity and perspicacity, extends attention to these literary productions and denounces the lack of historical characterization, the mechanical representations, the stereotyped clichés, the elementary language full of mistakes, and the use of vulgar and cartoonish terms that characterize them and that could make them underestimated because they are considered to be of poor quality. Nevertheless, these factors result in a profound mystification of reality, especially of the popular world and of the phenomena that built its history, given the adherence they achieve. In this way, he reflects on the social function of literature, showing that it is not “innocent” and neutral. On the contrary, showing how it constitutes a weapon at play. We could extend this function to the other forms of languages prevalent today, especially with the internet and social networks.

For Gramsci, Brescianism is “anti-state and anti-national” (2017, Q9, §42, p. 1122), an expression of the demonstrated inability of Italian intellectuals to understand and represent the people, the life and struggle of the popular classes. This aspect is considered by him of utmost importance, so much so that he dedicated a special notebook to the subject of the subalterns, Notebook 25. Gramsci questioned the markedly cosmopolitan character of Italian intellectuals in their perceived inability to effectively take up the popular national question to connect with the people. Just as he criticizes, he also

criticizes the folkloric sense attributed to those intellectuals who seek to focus on the people, or, as he puts it, the “simple ones.” Moreover, the Italian literary tradition, ever since Manzoni, bears this mark.

Gramsci, in Notebook 1, paragraph 24, sketches the outlines of a wide range of contemporary literary works that, despite different narratives, converge on superficial approaches that disregard the problems of reality and social dialectics. These contradictions beset us with the mechanisms and phenomena that structure inequalities, reducing them to simplistic formulations and the caricature of the subjects, sometimes dehumanizing and bestializing them. In general, they present a Manichaean vision of class struggles: on the one hand, the bourgeois as holders of values to be cultivated, of morals, of the family, of the family; on the other, the proletarians, troublemakers, amoral, rioters of the social order.

Gramsci denounces “ideological partiality and myopia,” as Musitelli (2004) rightly points out, the constitutive presumption and hypocrisy. Throughout his reflections in prison, he points to misrepresentation, “the demagogic use of terms like revolution (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q9, §10, p. 1102), the exclusively aesthetic consideration of politics and morality (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q9, §11, p. 1103), and polemics as an end in itself and insurmountable moral dilettantism” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q9, §24, p. 1926).

Gramsci’s ability to pay attention to the reactionary tendency of contemporary literary production and the risk that this represents, above all, to the most vulnerable in the organization of the social fabric, through the validation of a *modus operandi* that weakens them enormously.

Another term forged by Gramsci in this sense is the concept of Lorianism, so called about its main exponent, the positivist economist, and sociologist Achille Loria, to designate an emblematic category of opportunistic intellectuals, alienated from rigorous scientific development, quite influential in the formation of national culture, as he himself describes it:

Loria is not an individual teratological case: on the contrary, he is the most complete and finished exemplar of a series of representatives of a certain intellectual layer of a certain historical period, in general, of that layer of positivist intellectuals who occupied themselves with the workers’ question and who were more or less convinced of having deepened, revised and surpassed the philosophy of praxis. (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q28, §1, p. 2325).

Gramsci vehemently pointed out his opposition to Loria’s nonsensical ideas from his journalistic work and militancy period. He even pointed to him as “a brain incapable of thinking” in an article published in *Il Grido del Popolo* on January 9, 1918, entitled “Achille Loria.” It also satirized his theory that hunger could be combated by putting mistletoe on the wings of airplanes, which would make it easier to hunt birds. Another example of Loria’s illogical theory, referred to by Gramsci in Notebook 28, paragraph 1, is the connection between “mysticism and syphilis,” mysticism is understood as any non-positivist or vulgar materialist attitude.

Loria was also harshly criticized by Engels in the “Preface” and “Supplementary Considerations” to the third book of “Capital” by Antonio Labriola, considered to be the precursor of Marxism in Italy, in his work “In Memory of the Manifesto of the Communists, of 1895; and even by Benedetto Croce in his work “The Historical Theories of Professor Loria” of 1896.

In its eighteen paragraphs, Notebook 28, a special section on the theme of Lorianism, is dedicated to these figures, pointing out their works and incongruities in a way closer to the polemics that Gramsci had in his journalistic expositions during his militancy. This way, it is closer to Gramsci’s polemics in his journalistic expositions during his militancy.

Initially thought to designate a layer of Italian intellectuals through the accurate reading of his time, Gramsci understands that “every period has its more or less complete and perfect Lorianism, and that every country has its own” (2007, Q28, §1, p. 2325); a group of intellectuals who develop arguments and productions anchored in simplistic musings, easy to adhere to the masses because they are clothed in an apparent logic, although that covers up the complexity and contradictions of the social order, of easy adherence to the masses, because they have an apparent logic that, however, hides the complexity and contradictions of social order, e that cannot be exposed with weak and inconsistent formulations. Prossegue:

Hitlerism revealed that Germany nurtured, under the apparent domination of a serious intellectual group, a monstrous Lorianism, which broke through the official crest and spread as the scientific conception and method of a new “officialdom” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q28, §1, p. 2325).

What Gramsci considers emblematic and emphasized as an aspect that we cannot ignore is:

That Loria could exist, write, elucidate, and publish books and booklets on his own is nothing strange. There are always the discoverers of the perpetual moto and the parish priests who publish continuations of Jerusalem Liberated. Nevertheless, that he has become a pillar of culture, a ‘master’, and that he has ‘spontaneously’ found an immense public is something that leads us to reflect on the weakness, even in normal times, of the critical resistance that nevertheless existed: one must wonder how, in abnormal times, of unleashed passions, it is easy for Loria, supported by interested forces, to overcome all obstacles and infect for decades an environment of intellectual civilization that is still weak and fragile (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q28, §1, p. 2325).

Understand as — despite the “lack of organicity, absence of systematic critical spirit, negligence in the development of scientific activity, absence of cultural centralization, laxity and ethical indulgence in the field of scientific-cultural activity” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q28, §1, p. 2321) — the Lorians achieve wide diffusion in society is fundamental to understand the fragility of cultural organization and the crisis of modern civilization.

## **GRAMSCIAN CONCEPTION OF INTELLECTUAL AS A PRISM TO THINK ABOUT BOLSONARISM**

The presentation of the Gramscian concept of intellectual developed so far, with its broad spectrum and modes of action (which can be translated to our time, especially the wide dissemination of the internet and social networks), but with a fundamental influential and organizational impact, shows itself as a relevant resource in understanding the current order of the Brazilian social political fabric, which enabled the rise of Jair Bolsonaro to power and, despite all the crisis experienced, still sustains a significant percentage of supporters. The importance of creating new analytical models to understand this political scenario is highlighted by Avelar:

Bolsonaro’s rise represents, above all, the complete breakdown of the model by which a discipline, political science, tried to understand Brazilian reality from a concept of coalition presidentialism. It is consistent with its history that Brazilian political science predicted and expected that the political field would recompose itself in 2018 and the second round would be contested again by two coalitions led by PT and PSDB, or at least by two coalitions situated between the center-left and the center-right. The Brazilian election of 2018 is the story of the spectacular failure of this expectation. Having directed its attention for two decades to the parliamentary-executive game of negotiations and bloc formations, crystallized in the concept of coalition presidentialism, political science found itself ill-equipped to understand the Bolsonarist earthquake.(AVELAR, 2021, p. 231).

Bolsonaro’s rise to power results from the convergence between forces constituting the right and extreme right in Brazil, as highlighted by Araújo and Carvalho:

Strictly speaking, Bolsonarism is beyond the figure of Jair Bolsonaro. However, this grotesque and bizarre figure has sociopolitical meanings, bringing up historical marks of the Brazilian social formation and our own political culture, materialized in conservatism, machismo, racism, misogyny, and discrimination of multiple natures. Bolsonaro seems to embody the colonialist perspective of submission, elitism, and violence, traversing the country’s history and

reintroducing itself into the political-cultural reactionary agenda of present-day Brazil. (ARAÚJO; CARVALHO, 2021, p. 151).

In this sense, even taking into account authoritarian periods present in the history of Brazil, such as the Estado Novo of Getúlio Vargas (1937–1945) and the Military Dictatorship (1984–1985), the authoritarianism present in Bolsonarism presents new configurations that must be considered and which are highlighted by Chauí:

We are used to identifying fascism with the presence of the mass leader as an autocrat. It is true that today, although the rulers do not reach the figure of the autocrat, they operate with one of the characteristic instruments of the fascist leader, that is, the direct relationship with “the people,” without institutional mediations and even against them. Also, today, other elements proper of fascism are present: the discourse of hatred of the other — racism, homophobia, misogyny; the use of information technologies that take to unthinkable levels the practices of surveillance, control, and censorship; and cynicism or the refusal of the distinction between truth and lies as a canonical form of the art of governing. (CHAUÍ, 2019, p. 1).

In perspective presented by the author, the rulers, who begin to have their performance approaching the manager present in private companies, create the image of being the legitimate representatives of the real people, with whom they maintain a direct relationship through social networks, without the need for institutional mediation, and casting doubt on the legitimacy of the institutions linked to the legislative and judicial branches.

Nevertheless, one caveat is relevant: specific concrete circumstances made the fascist regime successful in Italy. It “was the neuralgic point of the postwar crisis of European civilization, and it was, therefore, no accident that fascism was born there” (FRESU, 2019, p. 18). Moreover, to not fall into the mistake of simply transposing the designation of fascism to other reactionary and authoritarian regimes, it is necessary to differentiate it as a conception of the world and a regime of government.

The root that makes fascism viable is the same strand that created irrational race theories, dividing humanity into biologically based superior and inferior races. I have assumed here, therefore, the use of the term fascism no longer as a social-political phenomenon circumscribed to its strict form of government but as a possible category of analysis of human contradictions — while its concrete realization is also the politically organized expression of racial hatred, through the perception of the different as an adversary to be eliminated. In this way, the perception of the different as an adversary to be eliminated enables one to capture the sense of politics as violence, conjugated, therefore, in a fundamental ferment for the diffusion of fascism in the social terrain.

In this context, Chauí (2019) points out that the forms and expressions of critical thought become the target of persecution since a division of society is forged between “the good people,” who support them, and “the diabolical,” who contest them. The present discourse is one of hatred of the different represented in minority groups such as immigrants, migrants, refugees, LGBTQIA+, and others. Political opponents are referred to as “the corrupt,” even if corruption is the primary practice adopted within the government. The justification is always based on a communist conspiracy theory led by leftist intellectuals and artists.

Given this exercise of a general characterization of Bolsonarism, the conception of intellectual developed by Gramsci is elucidative to the understanding of this political configuration present in Brazil. The first example is related to the abyssal distinction between an alleged nationalism, preached by the current Bolsonaro government and its supporters, and what would be a national-popular character, which would effectively consider the history, the problems, the needs, and the desires of the people.

The concepts of “Brescianism” and “Lorianism” developed by Gramsci are present in the construction of the discourse and the logic of Bolsonarism. The creation of a caricatured image of reality is associated with a discourse of change, in which measures present in the ideology of neoliberalism are adopted as a solution to the economic crisis, along with a narrative based on religious fundamentalism

of neopentecostal churches, committed to combating a supposed communist threat, which defends values contrary to the preservation of the “traditional family” and their respective moral values.

The simplistic Brescian and Lorian arguments adhere to and become sedimented in common sense, shaping convictions and operating on practical life. In the Gramscian sense, ideas and conceptions are lived in the masses as conviction, as it is well shown: “in the masses as such, philosophy cannot but be lived as a faith” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q11, §12, p. 1390). Therefore, the conviction that guides conduct constitutes a political, material, and social force. Hence, popular belief is a social and political force expressing expresses the historical effectiveness of a conception of the world. In this way, the Brescians and Lorians, with their superficial approaches, contribute to the passivity of the masses, hindering critical readings of reality that address the complexity and contradictions surrounding the social fabric. Thus, they confuse and brake the organization of the subalterns, corroborating and feeding reactionary responses to crises.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

The extension that the concept of intellectual acquires in Gramscian thought corresponds to its importance in the social fabric, correlating to the deepening of the concept of the State. In Gramscian conception, all human beings are intellectuals because no human activity can do without some intellectual dimension. The differentiation that Gramsci establishes among intellectuals according to the genesis, function, and character of their activity (organic, traditional, cosmopolitan, national-popular, Brescian, and Lorian) clarifies the scope of his conceptualization of intellectuals and the weight that intellectuals carry for any political and social order. Moreover, these categories can be translated to the present time, above all, insofar as they express the organizational and connective, therefore political, function that the influence of how certain subjects think and act exerts on society. The essentiality of the organicity between the intellectuals and the subaltern classes for realizing an emancipatory revolutionary project is thus ratified in the delineation of his action strategy.

Intellectuals play an essential role in the political struggle because they are the foremost interpreters of civil society, the connective elements between the ideological and the economic fields, disseminators of ideologies, active agents of the combat or the maintenance of a particular conception of the world and, precisely for this reason, promoters of the collective will, of the functional performance of the masses and the consensus necessary for the hegemony of a social group. For this reason, they are fundamental, both for the group that is in power to obtain consensus and for subordinate groups that need to unify e to assume a coherent and critical conception of the world that can be socially disseminated in the postulation of the hegemonic position.

Because of his historicist position, Gramsci cannot agree with the vision of an impartial universalist intellectual. In his view, a nonpartisan intellectual performance is inconceivable because he does not understand the possibility of neutrality and non-partisanship in any human sphere. For this reason, he defends the formation of intellectuals who understand and act on the needs of the masses without segregating themselves from the world. Organic and national-popular intellectuals who are committed to the struggle of the subalterns for having felt it as they feel it and for having translated it into the necessary elaboration to idealize a conception of the world to be disseminated. There is an indispensable link between the action of intellectuals (and, therefore, of education and culture) and the Gramscian proposition of political struggle.

The importance of intellectuals justifies the party’s role in its widest sense. The collective intellectual is the theoretical and practical agent in structuring a hegemonic path since it is the first core of the collective will, the engine of the praxis of the masses. It has a clear political formative role in fostering consciousness and organizing individual and collective impulses. However, it must not place itself as superior to the class it represents. It is crucial that the party be part of the class and not an authoritarian governing body. After all, as an organism created by the subjects to help them confront problems in the search for answers and actions for other social relations capable of creating new

possibilities of political and social arrangement, it must also learn from their experience and feelings. The party must act as “master” and “pupil” within society.

Gramsci points out the importance of the spontaneous movements of the subalterns but stresses that they should not be left to spontaneity. In order for them to acquire cohesion and strength to assert themselves and enter in order for them to acquire the cohesion and strength to assert themselves and to be in a position to win in the political game, they need conscious direction, which reiterates the role of intellectuals and educational, cultural, and political organizations. Cultural emancipation is the first step on the path to a new hegemony capable of overcoming the subalternity of the masses.

The place of intellectuals is irremediably circumscribed in the active human role in constructing the entire social, political, and economic fabric. Consciously or not, every conception of the world influences social practices, which, when ordered and congregated, gain political and driving force for organizing propositions in the social arena.

The distinction between intellectuals is not in nature, but in degree and field of action, in the extent of reflection, action, and influence on real issues or limited to more abstract elements, detached from national-popular problems.

It is not for nothing that the project of intellectual and moral reform is Gramscian’s greatest proposition. Furthermore, this is the arduous and indispensable task of building an intellectual and moral reform for an activist translation that mobilizes the masses and, consequently, makes a revolutionary human emancipatory project feasible.

The conceptualizations of “Brescianism and Lorianism” developed by Gramsci, more than an instrument of historical-literary classification, elevated to the status of an interpretative category, reach a substantial relevance for the development of more convincing readings and analyses of decisive phenomena for the weaving of our current political and social moment, e consequent reflections and critical actions that are indispensable for the collective construction of answers that contrast in content, but are similar in mass diffusion.

In our country, the disorganization of culture led to a mass movement that made Bolsonarism possible. Suppose we cannot attribute the responsibility for our current national political picture solely to the influence of mediocre subjects who assume the function of intellectuals in social organization. In that case, they certainly have a decisive weight in this composition. In this sense, the categories of Brescianism and Lorianism are very important for understanding our current historical bloc and, consequently, for the reflections we must undertake in the search for its overcoming.

We live in a time of increasing expansion of Lorians and Brescians. Let us think of the scope of the discourse of “Marxist cultural dictatorship,” the systematic attack on education à the sciences as a whole, the attacks on democracy and national à national sovereignty. It makes perfect sense to think, as Gramsci points out, that “the intellectual groups that expressed Lorian questions, in reality, despised not only logic, but national life, politics, and everything else” (GRAMSCI, 2007, Q28, §17, p. 2335).

Our value judgment on the intellectuality of certain subjects does not change the scope they acquire politically, nor the function they assume if they can communicate and combine that connection of heart and mind across broad strata.

Thinking about the moment in which we are living, under the regency of a government that we can also consider as the result of a new drapery of “Brescianism and Lorianism” in this digital age, with the transmutation of these fallacious formulations into memes of immediate mass reach, allied to widespread harassment of the school organization and culture. The challenge of building an intellectual and moral reform becomes urgent in the same measure of its complexity. It imposes this historical task on all who disagree with these absurdities and do not forge humanity, despite the monstrosities experienced daily.

What remains, in general terms, is that intellectuality matters the more it inevitably organizes, even the intellectuality. This is a nod to the unavoidable challenge of the collective struggle for mass education policies, for the right to education and culture, as a permanent track of political and social construction of hegemonic dispute and permanent struggle.

## REFERENCES

ARAÚJO, Maria do S. S.; CARVALHO, Alba. M. P. Autoritarismo no Brasil do presente: bolsonarismo nos circuitos do ultraliberalismo, militarismo e reacionarismo. **Revista Katálysis.**, Florianópolis, v. 24, n. 1, p. 146-156, jan./abr. 2021. <<http://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0259.2021.e75280>>.

AVELAR, Idelber. **Eles em nós: Retórica e antagonismo político no Brasil do século XXI**. Rio de Janeiro, Record, 2021.

CHAUÍ, Marilena. Neoliberalismo: a nova forma do totalitarismo. *In: A Terra é redonda*, 6 out. 2019. Disponível em: <https://aterraeredonda.com.br/neoliberalismo-a-nova-forma-do-totalitarismo/>. Acesso em: 15 de fevereiro de 2021.

COSPITO, Giuseppe. **Il ritmo del pensiero. Per una lettura diacronica dei “Quaderni del carcere” di Gramsci**. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 2011.

DIAS, Edmundo. *et al.* **O outro Gramsci**. 2ª edição. São Paulo: Xamã, 1996.

FRESU, Gianni. Gramsci e o Fascismo. **Revista Práxis e Hegemonia Popular**, ano 4, n. 4, jan./jul., 2019, p. 9-20. <<http://doi.org/10.36311/2526-1843.2019.v4n4.p9-20>>.

FROSINI, Fabio. Nota sul programma di lavoro sugli "intellettuali italiani" alla luce della nuova edizione critica. **Studi Storici**. Anno 52, n.º 4. L'Edizione Nazionale e Gli Studi Gramsciani (ottobre-dicembre 2011) Fondazione Istituto Gramsci. pp.905-924.

\_\_\_\_\_. Egemonia prima e dopo Gramsci. **Testo presentato al Seminario Egemonia dopo Gramsci: una riconsiderazione (1)**, Urbino, 20-21 ottobre 2014.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **2000 pagine di Gramsci. I Nel tempo della lotta (1914-1926)**. Volume primo. A cura di Giansiro Ferrata e Niccolò Gallo. Milano: Casa editrice Il Saggiatore, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Per la verità. Scritti 1913-1926**. A cura di Renzo Martinelli. Roma: Editori Riuniti, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_. **L'Ordine Nuovo. 1919-1920**. A cura di Valentino Gerratana e Antonio A. Santucci. Torino: Einaudi editore, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Quaderni del carcere**. Edizione critica di Valentino Gerratana. 3ª edizione. Torino: Einaudi, 2007, 4 volumi.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Lettere dal carcere 1926-1937**. A cura de Antonio A. Santucci. 2ª edizione. Palermo: Sellerio, 2013.

LENIN, Vladimir.I. **Que fazer: problemas candentes de nosso movimento**. 1ª edição. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2010.

MARX, Karl; ENGELS, Friedrich. **A ideologia alemã**. Tradução: Luis Claudio de Castro e Costa. 3ª edição. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002.

MUSTELLI, Marina P. Brescianismo. In: FROSINI, Fabio; LIGUORI, Guido (Org.). **Le parole di Gramsci: per un lessico dei Quaderni del carcere**. Roma: Carocci, 2004.

PAGGI, Leonardo. **Le strategie del potere in Gramsci. Tra fascismo e socialismo in un solo paese 1923-1926**. Roma: Riuniti, 1984.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. Gramsci e a educação no Brasil: para uma teoria gramsciana da educação e da escola. In: SCHLESENER, Anita H. *et al.* **Filosofia, política e educação: leituras de Antonio Gramsci**. Curitiba: UTP, 2014, p.137-164.

SEMERARO, Giovanni. Intelectuais “orgânicos” em tempos de pós-modernidade. **Caderno Cedes**, Campinas, vol. 26, n. 70, p. 373-391, set./dez. 2006. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ccedes/v26n70/a06v2670.pdf>>. Acesso em 18.mar.2022.

VACCA, Giuseppe. Dall’“egemonia del proletariato” alla “egemonia civile”. Il concetto di egemonia negli scritti di Gramsci fra il 1926 e il 1935. In: D’ORSI, Angelo. **Egemonie**. Napoli: Dante &Descartes, 2008, pp.77-122.

**Submitted on:** 28/04/2021

**Approved on:** 07/07/2022

#### **DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest with this article.