

The Role of Intellectuals in Shaping Hegemony, Consent, and Political Emotion

Oliver A. Dueza

Polytechnic University of the Philippines

oadueza@pup.edu.ph

Gerlie C. Ogatis

Polytechnic University of the Philippines

gcogatis@pup.edu.ph

Anna Josa T. Ortiz

Philosophy Department Alumna

Polytechnic University of the Philippines

ajt.ortiz@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper aims to expose the underlying forces which shaped the hegemonic character of the Philippine civil society. The ideas of Gramsci written in his prison notebooks remained relevant even at present, especially in understanding the capitalists' control of social and political affairs. The state of the Filipino society today mirrors Gramsci's conception of capitalism and its influences on the political and social affairs. Despite Karl Marx's prediction of its death, the capitalist class managed to evolve, and it even survived with ethical measures involved. It is here where Gramsci believed that there is a need for the intellectuals to take a stand and form counter-hegemony against the capitalist control. One of the means to achieve a collective hegemony is by gaining consent from all levels of social strata. Doing so will demand an awareness of the political emotion that binds citizens together for them to feel that they belong to one hegemonic group. Thus, this paper tried to analyze in great deal, how capitalism maintains hegemonic control in our civil society and explain at the same time the necessary role of the Filipino intellectuals in forming contradiction in the given economic and political order.

Keywords: Capitalism, Civil Society, Consent, Hegemony, Political Emotion



INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on the role of intellectuals as explicated by Gramsci in his publication titled, *The Prison Notebooks* in carrying out the revolutionary causes of the working class. Since the time of Marx, there was a posited belief that capitalism will come to an end since he himself believed that it was laying grounds for its demise and creating its own grave diggers. It was proven wrong however, when Gramsci observed that capitalism went beyond this prediction and evolved into something productive, its legitimacy was further reiterated when it even provided an open and democratic economic space for citizens to become an active player within its sphere. Given this capability of capitalism to survive, Gramsci never gave up in his hope that in time, there will be contending groups to counter the force of capitalism. His intellectual contribution was best represented in his introduction of the concept of *hegemony*, which he defined as *force plus consent*, the main contention of this concept is the tendency to arrive at a potential representation of the *collective will*. Gramsci believed that what can be accounted for the failure of the capitalist's death was its manner of survival through hegemonic means. This in turn posed a challenging situation to the proletariats in lined with their intent to form a potential counter-hegemony. In realizing this goal, Gramsci sees the need for the intellectuals to take part in this endeavor; they must be willing actors and active articulators of ideologies if they truly want to effect change.

Who are the intellectuals and how are they going to influence the course of direction of a given revolutionary event? Gramsci in this aspect took an inspiration from the philosophical tradition that “all men are potentially intellectuals in the sense of having an intellect and using it, but not all are intellectuals by social function.”¹In this context, Gramsci theorized that intellectuals can fall into two groups: first, there are “traditional” professional intellectuals with their literary and scientific expertise and so on, second in the category are those organic intellectuals who are less distinguished by their function but perform an important function in directing the ideas and aspirations of the class to

¹ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Edited and Translated by Quintuin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, (International Publishers, New York), 3.

which they organically belong.² It is in this second category where he believed that the wide sense of the word, they will perform an essential mediating role in the struggle of the proletarian (working) group. The core of the problem, however, remains in the fact that intellectuals are not getting near success in gaining consent from the working class. As such, this paper oscillated its hypotheses based on the following assertions: a.) the intellectuals' failure of gaining consent and their attempt to form a counter-hegemonic bloc was because the workers remained tied to their economic needs as dictated by the everyday demand to earn a living, b.) the failure can also be accounted for their incapacity to formulate strong political articulation and get the workers support on their side, and c.) the failure of acquiring consent can be explained by something else, it can be connected to primitive narcissistic feelings that hinder the formation of hegemonic emotion. In this third claim, there is a very challenging role that must be explored and performed by the intellectuals to inspire cooperation and consent. A promising strategy in this part is the use of the artistic means of cultivating positive emotions that have potentials for the formation of hegemonic sense. This study also takes an inspiration from the philosophy of emotion conjectured by Martha Nussbaum as she envisioned a kind of society that is more inclusive and sympathetic to its citizen's needs. Furthermore, convergence and divergence in Nussbaum and Gramsci's thoughts has been given careful examination in order to arrive at a more holistic and critical means of analyzing the entire exposition.

Concretization of the study was localized; the focus of investigation is the situation that historically shaped the Philippine intellectual and political movement. This attempt is relevant in pursuing a genuine discovery of how Gramsci's thoughts as an intellectual will fit in analyzing a very diverse and heterogeneous society like ours, not to mention a lot of social and political crises that our country went through as it was being colonized for a long period of time. Since the focus is on the plight of Filipino intellectuals in gaining consent, this paper included historical considerations of the major revolutionary movements to discover how they potentially shaped and influenced the political terrains in the place. This goes with the potential discovery of the different roles the Filipino intellectuals performed in carrying out the possibility of counter-hegemonic culture in the land. Who are the

² Ibid.

Filipino intellectuals and what are the factors that can be accounted to the failure of their hegemonic articulation? Why is it hard to convince the workers of realizing their revolutionary end? The formulation of these questions roots from the reality that being a third world country, majority of our workers suffered from all forms of injustices and inequalities. Despite the negative experiences and conditions that the workers went through, their passivity is quite puzzling to some degree. Hence, the researchers felt the need to perform thorough analysis of the situation to arrive at a better understanding of the entire situation in our land.

The Filipino Intellectuals, Are they Organic or Traditional?

Gramsci's conception of *organic intellectual* was not merely to describe the prophets of the European bourgeoisie and its industrial capitalism. The organic intellectual was above all, a name for those who, emerging from working class conditions, had the inclination and ability to express their vision of a society and organize it into action. Here, Gramsci envisioned not a savior swooping down from the elite, but thinkers sharing an experience of economic privatization that is translated into both an intellectual and social struggle.³ These are thinkers that are more directly involved in the process of production and sharing of common class experiences with the labor leaders.⁴

Tracing back the history of the formation of Filipino intellectuals, the parameters of revolutionary socialist change in the Philippines are clearly drawn by the legacy of its colonial history, first by Spain and then by the United States. This speaks of colonization by the theocratic Spain for more than 300 years and by the industrialized capitalist United States for nearly a century.⁵ In the case of America for

³ David Sessions, *The Rise of the Thought Leaders: How the Superrich have Funded a New Class of Intellectuals*, url: <https://newrepublic.com/article/143004/rise-thought-leader-how-superrich-funded-new-class-intellectual>

⁴ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Edited and Translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, (International Publishers, New York), 3.

⁵ Epifanio San Juan Jr., "Antonio Gramsci's Theory of the National-Popular and Socialist Revolution in the Philippines, url: https://www.academia.edu/1790366/ANTONIO_GRAMSCI_AND_NATIONAL-POPULAR_LIBERATION_STRUGGLE

instance, after forcibly subjugating the revolutionary forces of the first Philippine Republic, it used a transformist “passive revolution” to win the subaltern intelligentsia and thus incorporate the peasantry into a colonial order and eventually, a neocolonial set up;⁶ it suppressed the birth of a Filipino national-popular will. However, it was observed that the children of Chinese and Filipino creoles or mestizos succeeded in acquiring formal education in schools administered by the religious orders, others who went abroad to study were able to absorb liberal ideas that formed the basis for the nationalist movement which began in the 1870s and ripened in the 1898 revolution.⁷

The ones who were exposed to liberal ideas, the *Ilustrados*, were Filipino intellectuals who went to study in the European areas. Their failure however, which I would like to account as *unsuccessful hegemonic articulation* was due to their perception of what nationality means, its essence was mainly confined to artisans and professionals sharing their gentry class. Their nationalistic ideals were not shared by the peasantry, who in turn were mostly mobilized in terms of kinship or traditional loyalty to their village elders, or in terms of affiliation with millenary, chiliastic sects.⁸ It illustrated a clearer picture why hegemony failed; they overlooked the need to form a culture of inclusion supportive of considering the “collective will.” They remained tied to a narrow articulation of their own class interests.

In time, a new revolutionary group known as the *Propagandists* exerted effort in organizing reformist intellectuals-*Ilustrados* from the rich farmers, artisans, and petty traders with their ideals of enlightenment, rationalism, autonomy, and the recruitment of the petty landlords-merchants, a hegemonic social bloc of anti-colonialist emerged paving way to the formation of the Malolos Republic which was then led by then General Emilio Aguinaldo. This signaled the emergence of a Filipino national-popular intelligence and communal-oriented sensibility. What is evident in the chain of revolutionary historical events would be a realization that they almost carried with them the seeds of Marxism in their manner of unfolding. These intellectuals manifested Gramsci’s call of forming counter-hegemony against the ruling colonial power.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

In defining the role of intellectuals further, Gramsci said that they should diffuse philosophy to the working class. Lenin also posited the same, when he has seen that it is necessary to form a vanguard party that will carry out its role of infusing critical consciousness in the minds of the workers. Gramsci believed that the workers' minds can be characterized as already having the element of "common sense", although it is oftentimes composed of contradictory and fragmented thought-content. He then speaks of the need to develop a sense of *coherence* with help from the intellectuals, for only in coherent thought, a *critical consciousness* can be formed. In turn, a critically conscious mind will transform the "common sense" into "good sense," it is in the latter where the thought of resistance will be possibly realized. Whether the Filipino intellectuals failed in this particular aspect of converting the then oppressed society into revolting against an oppressor is not clear. What we know from history is that there is a failure from the part of the intellectuals to produce an organic leader. Many were part of the traditional or professional intellectuals who were given the chance to study abroad. It then created a clear division in terms of class formation, they failed in gaining consent from the working class. Following Lenin's idea, one possible way of strengthening the role of intellectuals in inspiring people is through a formation of political party. When realized, this party will serve as a bridge between the intellectuals (organic and traditional) and the workers that might in turn, form an intellectual moral bloc. It is through the party where the interests of the working class can be strongly represented.

The party representation was formed in the late 1920s, the Filipinos inculcated the spirit of Marxism into the local revolutionary tradition. The *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP)* formally established in 1930, grew out of *Congreso Obrero* and emanated from the *gremios* or *craft guilds* of the 19th century.⁹ The *gremios* were the first labor organizations in the Philippines who were either mutual aid groups or small cooperatives whose members helped each other in times of needs or guilds of skilled workers that sought to protect their jobs and

⁹ Franciso Nemenzo, *The Millenarian-Populist Aspects of Filipino Marxism*, url: <https://www.academia.edu/>

raise incomes.¹⁰ What is obvious in the nature of the *gremios* is its being economic, despite its role performed in the anti-Spanish revolution and American war.¹¹ On the other hand, the PKP deviated from the general pattern of party formation in the third world; it inherited the indigenous revolutionary tradition as it decided to merge with the *Socialist Party (SP)* of Pedro Abad Santos in 1938. The *Socialist Party* is peasant-based; this makes a promising hegemonic structure in the party itself. To understand its nature, it is imperative to analyze its major doctrines, namely: a) the role of superstition, employing amulets to bolster the morale of participants; b) emphasis on group solidarity as illustrated by the use of *tambuli*; and c) a distaste for book-learning and a penchant for direct action.¹² The *SP* was no doubt, revolutionary in orientation and Pedro Abad Santos was quite knowledgeable about Marxism. The *SPs* distaste for books, which Santos encouraged, found expression in their resistance to Marxist study circles.¹³ They believed that the formation of revolutionary consciousness is gained through direct involvement in the struggle; action, not learning, was the way to enlightenment.¹⁴ This resembles Gramsci's manner of interpretation of Marxism as not being an imposed doctrine, for it goes with the "spontaneous feeling of the masses"- it is attached to people's real experiences and beliefs. But to note, this anti-intellectual attitude runs counter with Gramsci's proposal of developing a better strategy in the war of position. Since hegemony can also be characterized as a war of ideology, the intellectuals must explore the open field as the best strategy of winning consent from the workers, which includes an extent of educating them at times. As noticed, this was the greatest handicap of the PKP, its commitment to Marxism-Leninism was overwhelmed by the indigenous pre-Marxian ideologies it had inherited from the *gremios* and more importantly, from the peasant millenarian world view. As a common tendency of any party inspired by the Marxist ideal, it too reflects a dogmatic way of executing its activities which can be accounted for the degeneration

¹⁰ Carmel V. Abao, *Growth without Labour Unions is not Change*, url: <http://ateneo.edu/news/research/growth-without-labor-unions-not-change-blueboard-carmel-v-abao>

¹¹ Franciso Nemenzo, "The Millenarian-Populist Aspects of Filipino Marxism," url: <https://www.academia.edu/>

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

of the party. Its hegemonic failure lies in the fact that it carried with it an overwhelming amount of traditional values, its chief weakness can be explained by its failure to transcend that tradition which is needed if the party was truly committed to the formation of a movement that is Marxist in character.

The Philippines is indeed a complex test for any revolutionary socialist politics removed from its European provenance. In such a highly differentiated political economy with divisions and fragmentation on every level, what is imperative is precisely an inventory of social-political forces. If one aspires for a revolutionary change, there must be a national popular movement in which the “masses will be led to think coherently” for them to be able to give their consent to the intellectual mobilizers. In turn, what the intellectuals need is the same as what everyone else needs: a society that prioritizes *human flourishing* over private profit and strong political networks that guard the public goods against the monsters of civilization. However difficult that society may be of achieving, one thing about the present moment gives us hope- we have *thinking individuals* who are willing to fight for the right of its fellow human beings. This will bring us to the central question of this paper: how do we account for the failure of winning hegemonic consent? In order to give a satisfactory answer to the question, this paper will use three contending hypotheses in bringing light to the argument of what factors truly account to the hegemonic failure: a) first, is the idea that the failure has something to do with the workers inherent interest in economism as they give their consent to the capitalist instead of waging counter-hegemony as a proposal from Adam Przeworski; b) second is the notion that the workers are not inherently determined by economic interest in their formation of beliefs, rather they are convinced by strong political articulation from the intellectuals as emphasized by Laclau and Mouffe; c) and third, the failure of gaining consent is not solely limited to economic or political interests, but goes beyond it with the inclusion of understanding the genesis of political emotion and its active role in shaping the public sphere as advanced by the philosophy of emotion by Martha Nussbaum. The third thesis will also highlight glaring similarities with Gramsci’s work on the *Prison Notebooks*, but at the same time the study will show the possible limits of Nussbaum’s account as well.

Hegemonic Consent and the Role of Aesthetics

Understanding the first proposition, Adam Przeworski theorized that the failure of the intellectuals in gaining consent can be associated with the workers as having no interest in forming revolt against the capitalist because they do not want to lose their jobs. Realistically speaking, workers do benefit from capitalism; others even manage to become better off in life. Consent in this case is not easily given to the intellectuals who are responsible to persuade them into becoming revolutionary, consent is extended to the capitalists who maintain the material survival of the workers through higher wages and concessions alike. There is a material basis to ideological hegemony in this aspect. As Przeworski puts it, “hegemony must be economic in the sense that it can be maintained only by a group that occupies a definite place within the system of production.”¹⁵ It implies that the interest of the workers is concretely coordinated with the interests of the capitalist: concrete coordination here means that the interests of the “subordinate” groups are to some extent realized.¹⁶ This idea is accounted from Gramsci’s view that capitalism survives economic crises as it becomes immune against the effects of exploitation and even possess the capacity to reduce conflicts of those being played by the rules of capitalism, it also enjoyed *active consent* from the exploited group.¹⁷ It is evident in this analysis that consent to capitalist relations is embedded through the gains workers get from the relations of production, revolt is far from reality in this respect because there is a material consent from the workers as to why they allow capitalism to perpetuate the system. As they experience beneficial ends in the economic aspect of their lives, workers in general will maintain extending their active consent to capitalism, the very reason too why they are trapped in economism.

The second proposition veered in the opposite direction of economism, theorized by Laclau and Mouffe, they viewed the workers as having no objective interests in their economic life experiences. “Class interests are not given to politics and ideology by the economy. They arise within the political practices, and they are determined as an effect

¹⁵ Adam Przeworski, *Capitalism and Social Democracy*, (Cambridge University Press, 1985), 135.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

of definite modes of political practices.”¹⁸ Central to this theory is the role of political articulation in gaining consent. As defined, *articulation* means any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified because of the articulatory practice, and the structured reality resulting from it is called *discourse*.¹⁹ Hegemonic articulation exists in a vast field of democratic space, and it has the power to further shape people’s identities through discourse. And because for them, workers have no objective interests in socialism, it is through hegemonic articulation that people’s interests are shaped by strongly articulated ideologies. What the discourse of ‘historical interests’ does is to *hegemonize* certain demands.²⁰ And this can be nurtured in a democratic space, because defining a practice as hegemonic means that it is happening in a vast area of floating camps,²¹ there are always many competing hegemonic articulation, as the authors Laclau and Mouffe theorized it, the social is open and unsutured.

However, the workers’ economism and their possible yielding to strong articulations were not enough reasons in understanding why hegemonic consent of the workers is not easily attained by the intellectuals. These beliefs stand true to some extent, but there remains a hidden force that serves as detriment to consent, and this is where Nussbaum’s philosophy of emotion is helpful. Dubbed as the philosopher of feeling, what is essential in her project is determining the role of emotions in the political field. Similar to the aspirations set by liberal democracy, she supported this cause by examining what factors are needed in building a just society that pursues the goals of each person, considering that *each person is an end*, and none a mere means to the goals or ends of others.²² In parallel, with the hegemonic goal of giving due consideration to the “collective will”, Nussbaum too, aimed to construct a better road towards the realization of what she termed as the “*politics of inclusion*” through the proper stirring of positive emotions that will support our aspirational aim of having a just

¹⁸ Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (London: Verso, 1985), 120.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 105.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 136.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Martha C. Nussbaum, *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2013), 119.

and decent society for everyone. Borrowing her analysis, what accounts for the failure of getting consent from people is not only due to their (workers) confinement to the economic needs nor their tendency to be persuaded and shaped by strong political and ideological articulations. Although the two are equally important factors in understanding the failure, she said there is something more to it, and it went as far as analyzing human psychology and the need for proper cultivation of positive emotions.

She discovered in many of her studies that we come into the world unfortunately as rather narrow and selfish creatures in our scope of concern. In real cases, we always end up loving the ones that we are close to and become unmindful of the plight of the ones that are far away. In this regard, getting consent must also address the question: how do we get people to care about the ones that they do not know in a way that requires sacrificing their personal interests i.e. financial and material ones? What emotions might work well in the political field in order to establish hegemony, a kind of emotion that truly binds citizens together? Nussbaum's answer to these questions is the positive emotion of *compassion*. However, before digging deeper in the potential composition of *compassion* that might render hegemonic consent possible, let us analyze first its enemies i.e. *projective disgust* and *fear*.

Projective disgust and *fear* serve as impediments to the formation of compassionate relationship among individuals in the civic sphere. First, *disgust* originated from what Nussbaum referred as *childhood narcissism*, a time when the infant experienced itself as a diffuse center of experience, impinged upon by various external forces making his or her world originally solipsistic.²³ Nussbaum realized that from this early situation of *narcissism* grows a tendency to think of other people as mere extension of the self, other people are seen as slaves (and not full people with needs and interests on their own).²⁴ If not properly overcome, this account for a failure in realizing hegemony due to *projective disgust* will go on exercising a pernicious impact in human lives, as people turn a blind eye in their greedy nature (tied to economism) and focus most of their energies in protecting their own interests and satisfaction.

²³ Martha C. Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 167.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 168.

Fear on the other hand resembles a narcissistic element as well, for its main emphasis is the survival of the self alone. All it requires is some rudimentary orientation toward survival and well-being, and an ability to become aroused by what threatens them.²⁵

Going back as to why *compassion* is a potential force in gaining hegemonic consent, one of its most important components is the judgment of *similar possibilities*. In this account, people all together imagine the possibility of their own fate, making them potential victims of a life that is not designed to be fair and equal.”²⁶ It opens up a view that the misfortunes to which *compassion* commonly responds to i.e. deaths, wounds, poverty, hunger, losses of loved ones- are real and general because they really are the common lot of all human beings.²⁷ Here Nussbaum talked of the need for inclusion, if one imagines a good design for a decent life, he too must imagine involving others as well in his idea of human flourishing- also known as *eudaimonistic living*.²⁸ *Eudaimonia* includes “mutual relations of civic and or personal love and friendship, the objects here are loved and benefited for their own sake for they are constituents of a life that is my life and not someone else’s.”²⁹ Rousseau is right after all, when he theorized that “society does need sentiments of solidarity that make people feel they are fellows of one another.”³⁰ This for me calls for a necessity for the intellectuals to develop aesthetics in their manner of performing their noble job as articulators of hegemonic ideas, a creative reach towards something that strive for decency and justice, and striking the right balance between aspiration and acceptance is one of the most difficult and delicate tasks of the political life, as of the personal.

When Gramsci posited that hegemony is always a work in progress, part of the challenge is for the intellectuals to discover what

²⁵ Martha C. Nussbaum, *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2012), 25.

²⁶ Martha C. Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 324

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 350.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 42.

³⁰ Martha Nussbaum, “Political Emotions”, url: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=87hwtoLfd6I&t=4290s>.

accounts for the failure of getting consent from the workers. Reiterating Nussbaum's belief, she said that more than the economic interest and the tendency to be persuaded, there is a part explained by psychology that people are naturally selfish as they were trapped in childhood narcissism. And a potential way to move out from that trap is to start cultivating civic emotions of *sympathy* and *compassion*, extend it to a wider group and learn to discover the emotions that bind citizens together through our manner of truly understanding what matters to them. The necessity to work for the inclusion of the interests of the collective is needed as a support for the political sphere to remain stable. People must learn to help each other; partly due to the fact also, that they come into this world needy and vulnerable. An added support is expected as well from institutions and groups in the civic sphere at large.

As for Gramsci, the vulnerability of people is likewise accounted in his conception of hegemony. For instance, he is also concerned about the ability of the subaltern groups to take part in social debate, and they should maintain that for their voices to pose a real challenge to the prevailing hegemony.³¹ The strategies of gaining consent and the mechanisms for maintaining it are important and crucial in Gramsci's thought. Both Gramsci and Nussbaum believed in the role played by educational institutions as they facilitate the provision of consent to the voices of the subalterns or vulnerable groups. Going against Althusser in believing that the school is an ideological state apparatus, Nussbaum sees it as a space for democratization of dissent and creativity. The main difference however, in Nussbaum's project, she was very particular that her goal works better in a liberal society, when on the other hand, Gramsci seems to be open in the kind of political system where hegemony might develop as he sees it dynamic and changing in its manner of pursuit. However, both took the serious task of bringing philosophy in the field of humanity as they give due considerations on the politics of inclusion and the hegemonic phase where the "collective will" is deliberated as an important element of moving out from one's narrow concern. In my analysis, Nussbaum has provided a hopeful idea of using aesthetics and form artistic articulation in order for the

³¹ Tiina Kontinen, *The Rocky Road of Growing into Contemporary Citizenship: Dewey, Gramsci, and the Method of Democracy*, https://www.academia.edu/24483887/The_Rocky_Road_of_Growing_into_Contemporary_Citizenship_Dewey_Gramsci_and_the_Method_of_Democracy

intellectuals to inspire the imaginative spirit of the workers. This is the main concern of *compassion*, in its inclusion of *similar possibilities* and *eudaimonistic thought*. It requires an imaginative spirit to feel the need to extend concern to others, and one of its manifests is giving one's consent in a revolutionary cause that is promotional of the "collective will." As regards how this must be done, the intellectuals themselves must play an active role in performing a "creative reach" to the majority members of the many sectors of civil society. Gramsci already laid down the ground leading to the formulation of this artistic hegemonic articulation. Since in his philosophy, he is calling for the intellectuals to confront the oppressive situation and be aggressive in the war of position (in the ideological realm), these intellectuals must be creative in their formulation of strategies in order to win in the battle of competing hegemonic articulations. If done in an active and persisting way, only then a counter hegemony will be possibly realized.

So, where are the Filipino intellectuals now? Why do they remain resolute in performing their duties as the instigator of counter hegemonic ideologies? Concluding this paper will bring us to discovering the present plight of the Filipino intellectuals. And we are confident that they do not stop in their attempt to win in the war of ideologies. We can imagine them as active educators in the classroom providing enough space for the democratization of dissent. We can also find them carrying the critical task of revolutionary artists who wrote songs about preserving human dignity, artists who paint the beauty of humanity and poems reflecting the spirit of solidarity. Gramsci would agree that these imaginative means of reaching out to others will create an impact in the diffusion of common sense; these cultural and artistic practices of the intellectuals will eventually form a force of disarticulating the hegemony of the oppressive ruling order.

The Filipino intellectuals at present might not be well-represented in a political party but diffused maybe as they are- they do their fair share of articulating. Since the war of position has its new platform in the social media, they can be seen active in educating the mass about the present terror that the public is experiencing in the hands of leaders who are trying to kill and suppress our democratic space. What is missing however, is a realization that more than the articulating that they are doing in social media, in conferences, symposia and the like, they need to perform an immersion. Articulation is best

won if these intellectuals will learn the value of personal encounters, listening to the emotional pleas of the working class, teaching and inspiring them to form enough courage so that they can move out from their narrow emotions of disgust and fear. What is truly needed in the current situation is the widening of the field of artistic articulations, and the intellectuals must learn effective ways of building connection with the ones they were trying to win the consent of- the workers. As such, despite the organic crisis our country is experiencing right now, we must remain hopeful in our pursuit of discovering a decent and just way of survival.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Edited and Translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, International Publishers, New York.

Laclau, Ernesto and Mouffe, Chantal, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, London: Verso, 1985.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*. USA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*. USA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012.

Przeworski, Adam, *Capitalism and Social Democracy*, Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Online Sources

Abao, Carmel V., *Growth without Labour Unions is not Change*, url: <http://ateneo.edu/news/research/growth-without-labor-unions-not-change-blueboard-carmel-v-abao>

Nemenzo, Francisco, *The Millenarian-Populist Aspects of Filipino Marxism*, url: <https://www.academia.edu/>

Nussbaum, Martha, *Political Emotions: A Workshop Session at London Global Univeristy*, url: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=anK8IPxnwK0>

San Juan Jr., Epifanio, *Antonio Gramsci's Theory of the National-Popular and Socialist Revolution in the Philippines*, url: https://www.academia.edu/1790366/ANTONIO_GRAMSCi_AND_NATIONAL-POPULAR_LIBERATION_STRUGGLE

Sessions, David, *The Rise of the Thought Leaders: How the Superrich have Funded a New Class of Intellectuals*, url: <https://newrepublic.com/article/143004/rise-thought-leader-how-superrich-funded-new-class-intellectual>