

2020

Gramsci in the Digital Age: YouTubers as New Organic Intellectuals

Follow this and additional works at: https://vc.bridgew.edu/grad_rev



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2020) Gramsci in the Digital Age: YouTubers as New Organic Intellectuals. *The Graduate Review*, 5, 34-45.

Available at: https://vc.bridgew.edu/grad_rev/vol5/iss1/8

This item is available as part of Virtual Commons, the open-access institutional repository of Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Copyright © 2020

Gramsci in the Digital Age: YouTubers as New Organic Intellectuals

KEITH LYDON

In 1926, from his prison cell, having been sentenced to twenty-years confinement by the fascist Italian government under Benito Mussolini, Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci struggled to reconcile his personal and political beliefs with the reality of his circumstances (Hoare and Smith, “General Introduction” 27). Not only had the proletariat not revolted against the bourgeoisie as had been predicted by Karl Marx decades before, but many workers in his own country supported Mussolini’s fascist regime, working directly against what Gramsci considered to be their own interests (Parker 227). Imprisoned and disillusioned, Gramsci dedicated the final 11 years of his life to understanding why a revolution that once seemed inevitable had not materialized, producing a series of essays that would come to be collectively

known as his “prison notebooks.” Nearly a century later, we find ourselves in the digital age, still beset by social injustice and economic inequality, but in the unique position, as I will argue, to harness the power of modern technology to bring Gramsci’s revolutionary aspirations to fruition.

In the prison notebooks, Gramsci claims the capitalist state maintains dominance, not merely through violence and economic coercion, but also by establishing and maintaining hegemony, or “ideological dominance by control of the major institutions of civil society” (*Ideology* 00:21:02). The capitalist state establishes hegemony through the indoctrination of the working class into capitalist ideology using institutions of civil society such as schools, churches, and the media. Through constant interaction with these institutions over the course of their lives, working-class individuals are conditioned to regard the social and political dominance of the capitalist state as “common sense,” or simply, the natural order of things. This is a simple yet effective strategy, as revolution is far less likely when the dominated consent to their domination; if, however, consent is withdrawn, the dominant class could always maintain order through coercion by use of military or police intervention (Parker 228).

Gramsci further asserts that traditional revolution by way of military insurrection, or “war of manoeuvre,” is all but impossible while the

capitalist state maintains hegemony. However, he thought it may be possible to take a page out of the enemy playbook, so to speak, and repurpose the institutions of civil society to articulate and disseminate a new ideology to rival that of the capitalist state. Designed for the proletariat by the proletariat, this new ideology would serve to disabuse the working class of the notion that their subservience to the capitalist state was simply “common sense” and convince them that the structure of society is not nearly as immutable as the ruling class would have them believe. Gramsci called this method of revolution, waged not on the battlefield but in the hearts and minds of people, a “war of position” (*Ideology* 00:23:33-00:24:0).

At the vanguard of this proposed war of position, Gramsci identifies the “organic intellectuals,” working-class individuals, who have taken up the mantle of cultural leadership within the proletariat. As members of the working class themselves, organic intellectuals have the capacity to draw upon personal experience to articulate an ideology that speaks to their socioeconomic peers with a level of intimate familiarity that the ruling class cannot hope to match; one that is reflective of the “feelings and experiences which the masses cannot express for themselves,” (*Ideology* 00:27:45-00:27:50). Through the articulation and dissemination of this new ideology, organic intellectuals organize the working class, providing it

with a unified identity, or as Gramsci puts it, “homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields” (Gramsci “The Intellectuals” 134).

The organic intellectuals stand in contrast to the “traditional intellectuals”, who according to Gramsci, are defined primarily by occupation and “conceive of themselves as having no basis in any social class and adhering to no particular class discourse or political discourse” (Ramos, Jr.). Traditional intellectuals are politicians, scholars, religious leaders, members of the media, etc., and they play an important role in maintaining the hegemony of the capitalist state. From within respected and influential institutions of civil society, the traditional intellectuals indoctrinate the masses into the ideology of the capitalist state by making, “...what is economically, politically, and historically variable and contingent appear timeless and natural...,” thereby discouraging the idea that a more equitable and socially progressive future may be possible (Torres). Traditional intellectuals are not, however, necessarily villainous pawns of the capitalist state. More probably, they are simply people who have been indoctrinated into capitalist ideology and who, having risen to positions of social and political influence, seek to instill in others what they believe to be objective truths about the world in which they live. As such, Gramsci believed that if organic intellectuals could “assim-

ilate” and “conquer ideologically” the traditional intellectuals, they would prove to be indispensably valuable allies in the war of position and hasten the toppling of the hegemonic capitalist state (Gramsci, “The Intellectuals” 134).

In the last half century, the world has entered a digital age, and the internet has risen to pre-eminence over all other institutions of civil society. Many contemporary Marxist critics are wary of the internet, specifically social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter and YouTube due to their status as the property of corporations, and therefore, undeniably subject to capitalist market considerations. I would remind these critics of Antonio Gramsci and his proposed war of position. If one intends to repurpose the institutions of civil society to further ideological revolution and win the hearts and minds of the masses and traditional intellectuals alike, one would be wise to choose platforms by which a socially progressive ideology could be articulated and disseminated with unprecedented effectiveness and efficiency. I propose that a war of position is already being waged in the digital theatre, and the socially progressive content creators of YouTube are the new organic intellectuals, repurposing this popular institution of civil society to challenge the capitalist state and ultimately establish a socially progressive hegemony.

The concept of the war of position, and by extension the war of maneuver, is integral to my

overall argument and thus deserving of deeper exploration. In his essay, “Rethinking War of Maneuver/War of Position: Gramsci and the Military Metaphor,” Daniel Egan suggests that the differences between the two methods of revolution are exemplified by the political climate of Eastern and Western society in the twentieth century. Of Eastern society, Gramsci observed “...the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous,” while in the West, he asserts, “there was a proper relation between the State and civil society, and when the State trembled, a sturdy structure of civil society was at once revealed” (qtd. in Egan 522). The underdeveloped nature of Eastern civil society prevented the establishment of hegemony. As a result, the Russian state, unable to indoctrinate the working class into submission, was susceptible to a full-fledged military insurrection, a war of maneuver. The more robust civil society of the West allowed for the establishment of hegemony, and so its deposition would require a “war of position,” a revolutionary strategy Egan describes as a “slower, more protracted process of siege warfare, in which subordinate classes wear away the existing civil society and, through their self-organization, create a new one”(523). The capitalist state wields hegemonic dominance in the West to this day, and so it stands to reason that the war of position is still the most viable option available to those who wish to revolt against it.

In the digital war of position, the mantle of the organic intellectual has been collectively taken up by the socially progressive cultural and political commentators on YouTube. These new organic intellectuals, as I call them, are not professional politicians or members of the mainstream media; they are simply social progressives determined to challenge the dominance of capitalist ideology and savvy enough to recognize the amazing potential of YouTube to assist in accomplishing this goal. Early adopters of YouTube, the new organic intellectuals, successfully connect with millennial audiences in their formative years and influence their social perspectives and political affiliations more deeply than members of the mainstream media could ever hope to do. The depth of this influence is reflected in a 2015 study commissioned by Google that found, among other interesting statistics, that 70% of teenage YouTube subscribers relate more to YouTubers than they do to celebrities, and 70% of all YouTube subscribers thought that YouTubers change and shape culture (Geyser, “YouTube Stars”).

Admittedly, the new organic intellectual is not a member of the “working class” as Gramsci would have understood the term. In fact, both new organic intellectuals I will focus on for the remainder of this essay, hold college degrees and earn substantial incomes as YouTubers. I would argue, however, that the working class does not exist

today in the same way that it did in Gramsci’s lifetime. Indeed, I assert, that a clearer understanding of the American socioeconomic class system is achieved by thinking of the United States as comprised not of business owners and laborers but of the exorbitantly wealthy and everyone else. Those who find themselves skeptical of this admittedly frightening assertion need only look to the 2019 edition of *The Forbes 400*, an annual list of the 400 wealthiest Americans, to find that Bill Gates, Jeff Bezos and Warren Buffet alone hold more money between them than the bottom 50% of Americans (Inequality.org). For additional evidence, they may look to the National Bureau of Economic Research, which conducted a study into the fluctuation of wealth shares between 1962 and 2016, that reveals that the richest 5% of Americans own two-thirds of the entirety of American wealth (Inequality.org). In an America that seems to be drifting dangerously toward plutocracy, the new organic intellectual needs not be an indigent and unskilled laborer to articulate and disseminate an ideology reflective of the experience of the average American. Rather, they are defined by their socially progressive, political affiliations, independent from mainstream news organizations and history of social and political leadership and activism.

Perhaps the best known and most divisive of the new organic intellectuals is Cenk Uygur. Uygur is the host of the popular YouTube news

program, “The Young Turks,” and chief executive officer of TYT news network, an independent alternative to major news networks and home to 30 other progressive news channels. The “About” section of TYT.com features the American Heritage Dictionary definition for the phrase Young Turk: 1. A young, progressive or insurgent member of an institution, movement or political party. 2. A young person who rebels against authority or societal expectation (“About,” *TYT Network*). This is an apt name for a news program hosted by a self-stylized, socially progressive revolutionary like Uygur, who combines a bombastic rhetorical style with a tendency to unapologetically interject his personal thoughts and feelings into his political commentary. Refusing to uncritically reinforce the dominant narrative attached to a social event or political development, Uygur’s aim is not just to deliver the news but to, in his words, “deliver the news in the way that I see it and I think is relatable to people” (Rudow). The uniquely candid nature of “The Young Turks” is perhaps best described by Uygur himself when he asserts, “If I’m amused by a story, I’ll tell you how amused I am by it. If I’m pissed about a story, I’ll tell you about how I’m pissed about it” (Rudow).

As a new organic intellectual, Uygur has an impressive history of organizing his followers towards revolutionary ends. In 2011, capitalizing on the public enthusiasm for the Occupy Wall

Street movement, Uygur founded Wolf PAC, a political action committee dedicated to amending the U.S. constitution to overturn the result of *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, a 2010 Supreme Court case that ruled it unconstitutional for Congress to limit the amount of money corporations could spend on political campaigns (Fischer). Uygur announced the creation of Wolf PAC on “The Young Turks” in typically dramatic fashion, filming himself in front of the Liberty Tower, just several hundred feet from ground zero of the September 11th terror attacks, asserting that the location also serves as “the ground zero for our fight to regain our democracy” (“Cenk Launches WolfPAC.com”). Showcasing his ability to fulfill what Gramsci called the “thinking and organizing” function of the organic intellectual, Uygur spends the majority of the video articulating his plan to harness the power of his audience to go over the heads of Congress by persuading two-thirds of states to force a constitutional convention (Gramsci “The Intellectuals” 131). Utilizing a tactic evocative of Gramsci himself, Uygur closes the video with a military metaphor, beseeching those of his followers with legal or technological expertise, who might be useful to the cause, to volunteer their services so that he might make them, as he puts it, “generals in our army” (“Cenk Launches WolfPAC”). As of 2019, five states have successfully passed resolutions applying for the conven-

tion, representing 15% of the two-thirds majority necessary to make it happen (“The Solution”).

More recently, in response to the election of Donald Trump, Uygur once again took to YouTube to announce the founding of a new wing of the Democratic Party called Justice Democrats. In a video entitled, “The Democratic Party Takeover HAS BEGUN,” Uygur explains that Justice Democrats are an answer to what he sees as a corrupt and ineffectual Democratic Party, more dedicated to representing the interests of corporate donors than representing the will of people. Uygur begins the video by asserting “the democrats used to represent something wonderful—voters, and goes on to describe how, the Democratic Party fell victim to a hostile takeover orchestrated by multinational corporations and exists today as a shadow of its former self (“The Democratic Party” 00:00:03). Uygur argues for the repurposing of time-tested corporate tactics to orchestrate a hostile takeover of our own, challenging incumbent congressional democrats by running “strong progressives” who pledge to refuse any and all corporate funding (“The Democratic Party” 00:05:20).

In founding Justice Democrats, Uygur not only serves as a model of the new organic intellectual but also empowers his supporters to take on the role of the new organic intellectual themselves by insisting that the candidates running in congressional races under the Justice Democrats banner be

nominated by fellow members of the organization. Uygur tasks his audience to “nominate someone else in your community who you think would be great at representing you and representing the entire community,” and specifically requests, “give me people who are not politicians but who actually care to do the job right” (“The Democratic Party” 00:09:35-00:09:41). The organization found success in 2019 when 29-year-old Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez defeated Republican challenger Anthony Pappas to become the youngest woman to ever be elected to Congress. A bartender before being endorsed by the Justice Democrats, the unabashedly progressive Congresswoman Ocasio-Cortez serves as an example of the real-world impact of the efforts of new organic intellectuals (Freedlander).

Another of the new organic intellectuals is Kyle Kulinski, founder and host of YouTube’s “Secular Talk.” Kulinski created “Secular Talk” in 2008 while attending Iona College, where he majored in political science and minored in psychology. Kulinski produced “Secular Talk” as a passion project in his spare time between classes, and his ability to articulate his own unique brand of social and political commentary in an engaging manner soon attracted a loyal contingent of followers (“About,” *The Kyle Kulinski Show*). A description of the show displayed on the home page of the “Secular Talk” YouTube channel reads:

“Home of news & politics commentary from the libertarian-left; populist; social democratic; agnostic-atheist perspective” (“About” *Secular Talk*). The articulation of a new ideology necessitates the consideration of a wide range of topics from the social, to the political, to the economic, and Kulinski’s “Secular Talk” does not disappoint on this front, as demonstrated by his invitation to listeners to “tune in for unapologetic and stimulating talk focusing on politics, news, current events, pop culture, economics, science, philosophy and religion.” The casual and unpretentious feel of “Secular Talk” is exemplified by the tagline of the show: “nobody ever said intellectual discussion had to be boring” (“About” *The Kyle Kulinski Show*).

In an episode of “Secular Talk” simply titled “Self Marginalization Is Bad,” Kulinski speaks to the importance of engaging those with political beliefs not informed by socially progressive thought in open and honest discussion, even if we might find these beliefs objectionable. Kulinski opens the video with the frank assertion, “In the real world there are people that have odious beliefs, and to just excommunicate them to make yourself feel better is preposterous” (“Self Marginalization is Bad” 00:00:00). Kulinski goes on to provide an example of the negative consequences of becoming too insular and uncompromising with respect to propagating progressive ideology, stating, “...if you shame and condemn and excom-

municate, what you’re doing is saying you’re an irredeemable deplorable, like Hillary said about many Trump voters” (“Self Marginalization is Bad” 00:08:37-00:08:45). This is of course a reference to a 2016 comment made by then Democratic presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton, in which she claimed that half of those supporting her Republican opponent Donald Trump belonged in a “basket of deplorables,” and as such, are unworthy of any attempts at ideological conversion (Drobnic Holan).

In advocating against self-marginalization, Kulinski performs a core function of the organic intellectual, forging alliances between disparate factions of the working class to establish one ideologically cohesive unit, something Gramsci called a “historic bloc” (Parker 228). Representing the combined force of the proletariat, a historic bloc, once established, could be mobilized to great effect toward undermining capitalist hegemony. Kulinski is critical of Clinton’s remarks because they serve to hastily burn ideological bridges rather than build them, and they undercut attempts by new organic intellectuals to unify the working class under a common ideology and thus establish a historic bloc. As righteous as it might feel to dismiss those with political beliefs antithetical to revolution as lost causes, Kulinski asserts that these people are potentially valuable allies in the war of position, and engaging them in respectful de-

bate and debunking the factually incorrect facets of their argument can provide “a gateway ...out of right wing beliefs” (“Self Marginalization is Bad” 00:04:45-00:04:48). Kulinski evidences this claim by recounting the aftermath of his appearances on “The Joe Rogan Experience,” a podcast sometimes criticized for its popularity among the far-right. He claims to have received messages from people who self-reported as “going down a bad path” before being introduced to “Secular Talk” (“Self Marginalization is Bad” 00:05:54-00:05:56).

Admittedly, it seems counterintuitive that a company as subject to capitalist market considerations as YouTube could be an appropriate site for the articulation of a revolutionary progressive ideology. After all, the digital media platform has been a subsidiary of Google parent company, Alphabet, since its purchase in 2006 for 1.65 billion dollars, making it part of the third most valuable company on the planet (Jhonsa). In 2018, Colin Sebastian of R.W. Baird & Co., a financial services company, estimated that if Google released the statistics of the private company, they would show YouTube amassing around 15 billion dollars in annual profits, nearly all of which come from advertising (Jhonsa). Google pockets about 45% of these profits, and the average content creator can expect to earn about one to two dollars per 1000 views of their video, and that’s if they meet or exceed the minimum payment threshold of 100

dollars (Geyser “Money on YouTube”). The relationship between YouTube and content creators has been criticized by some, like Christian Fuchs, who asserts in his essay, “Labor in Informational Capitalism and on the Internet,” that the company exploits its users by capitalizing on the once social, common process of knowledge production. Following Fuchs’s logic, even if YouTubers want to be organic intellectuals engaged in the articulation and dissemination of a socially progressive ideology, using YouTube to do so would transform them into just another exploited class-producing content instead of traditional industrial labor (“Labor” 187).

The exploitation of content creators is not the only criticism that could be leveled against the idea of YouTube as a platform on which new organic intellectuals can wage a war of position in the modern day. In 2013, CIA agent turned whistleblower and fugitive, Edward Snowden, released to the public classified documents naming Google, and by extension, YouTube, as one component of what Fuchs calls “a global communication surveillance system that secret services use to monitor and analyze communication flows in real time” (Fuchs “Digital Objects” 58). YouTube’s participation in this clandestine government surveillance initiative is symptomatic of the rise of what Fuchs calls “big data capitalism,” a new form of capitalism for the digital age in which corporations col-

lect, buy, sell and otherwise commodify the massive amount of personal data generated by internet users during day-to-day online activity. Once collected by corporations, this tremendous cache of data inevitably attracts the attention of secret services and law enforcement agencies that prize it for its amazing potential to revolutionize the detection and prevention of crime. The collection of private information by YouTube, and subsequent sharing of that information with law enforcement, leads Fuchs to conclude that when one uses digital media platforms like YouTube, one runs the risk of being at once considered a commodity and a potential criminal (“Digital Objects” 57-59).

These criticisms of YouTube are well founded, and to dedicate any portion of this essay to their direct refutation would be wasted effort. That said, the validity of my assertions does not rely on the company itself to be free of capitalist considerations or sympathetic to the plight of the working-class people that make up its user base. For the purposes of my argument, YouTube needs only to be an effective tool with which YouTubers, as new organic intellectuals, may reach out to the working-class masses, and through a combination of entertainment and education, challenge the notion that the ideological tenets of the capitalist state are simply common sense. I entreat all those who value the dignity and prosperity of people over the advancement of capitalist interests to refrain

from dismissing YouTube as a means of resistance because it falls short of perfection. I call on not just the working class, but all Americans who find themselves outside and at the mercy of the ever more exclusive club of the rich and influential, to come to terms with their status as members of what Gramsci referred to as the “subaltern” classes, inherently subordinate to the hegemony of the capitalist state, and thus, at a disadvantage whenever they attempt to engage in resistance against its oppressive power (Hoare and Smith “General Introduction” 20). Before the revolution can begin in earnest, it is imperative that the people at the mercy of hegemony accept that their unfavorable position necessitates the use of strategies of resistance, based not on how well they align with their moral and political convictions, but how effective they are in challenging the hegemony of the capitalist state.

Cenk Uygur, Kyle Kulinski and the other new organic intellectuals of YouTube have the attention of hundreds of thousands of people every time they upload a video. For years, they have been using YouTube as a platform by which to articulate and disseminate a socially progressive ideology specific to the working class, and in opposition to the ideology of the capitalist state. They were persistent enough to recognize the amazing potential of the digital media platform to allow them to influence the worldview of a new generation of the

working class without having to toe the ideological line of mainstream news organizations. With the rise to power of the millennial generation, some of whom were first introduced to politics by the new organic intellectuals in the mid- to late-2000s, the prospect of the American ideological revolution is perhaps more real now than any time since the 1960s. I would request the reader of this essay to visit the YouTube channel of a new organic intellectual today, and if after some searching, they cannot find one who speaks to their sensibilities, I would suggest they consider starting a channel of their own. In the digital war of position, there is always room for one more organic intellectual.

Works Cited

- “About” *The Kyle Kulinski Show*, Secular Talk Radio Network, Dec. 2017, web.archive.org/web/20171220032415/http://seculartalkradio.com:80/about/. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- “About” *Secular Talk*, www.youtube.com/user/SecularTalk/about. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- “About.” *TYT Network*, www.tyt.com/about. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- “Cenk Launches Wolf-PAC.com.” *YouTube*, uploaded by The Young Turks, 19 October 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=hg0O3OyWi-5Y&t=3s.
- Drobnic Holan, Angie. “In Context: Hillary Clinton and the ‘basket of deplorables.’” *Politifact*, www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2016/sep/11/context-hillary-clinton-basket-deplorables/. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Egan, Daniel. “Rethinking War of Maneuver/ War of Position: Gramsci and the Military Metaphor.” *Critical Sociology*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2014, pp. 521-538. *Sage Journals Online*, doi: 10.1177/0896920513480222.
- Fischer, Brendan. “At OWS, Cenk Uygur Announces Effort to Amend Constitution, Get Money Out of Politics.” *The Center for Media and Democracy’s PR Watch*, www.prwatch.org/news/2011/10/11096/ows-cenk-uygur-announces-effort-amend-constitution-get-money-out-politics. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Freedlander, David. “‘There Is Going to Be a War Within the Party. We Are Going to Lean Into it.’ The Justice Democrats helped get Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez elected. Who are they after next?” *Politico Magazine*, www.politico.com/magazine/story/2019/02/04/the-insurgents-behind-alexandria-ocasio-cortez-224542. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Fuchs, Christian. “Labor in Informational Capitalism and on the Internet.” *The Information Society*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2010, pp. 179-196. *Taylor and Francis Online*, doi: 10.1080/01972241003712215.
- Fuchs, Christian. “Karl Marx in the Age of Big Data Capitalism.” *Digital Objects, Digital Sub-*

- jects: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Capitalism, Labour and Politics in the Age of Big Data*, edited by David Chandler and Christian Fuchs, London: U of W P, 2019, pp. 53-71.
- Geyser, Werner. "How to Make Money on YouTube: 9 Ways Influencers Monetize Their YouTube Channels." *Influencer Marketing Hub*, www.influencermarketinghub.com/how-to-make-money-on-youtube/. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Geyser, Werner. "Why YouTube Stars are More Influential than Traditional Celebrities." *Influencer Marketing Hub*, www.influencermarketinghub.com/youtube-stars-influential-traditional-celebrities/. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Gramsci, Antonio. "The Intellectuals." *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, edited by Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, Electric Book Company, 1999, pp.130-147.
- Hoare, Quentin, and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. "General Introduction." *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, Electric Book Company, 1999, pp. 22-27.
- Hoare, Quentin, and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. "Terminology." *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, Electric Book Company, 1999, pp. 19-20.
- Ideology: Marx, Althusser, and Gramsci*. Films Media Group, 2015, fod.infobase.com/Portals/1/Playlists.aspx?wID=103198&xtid=145538. Accessed 4 Apr. 2019.
- Jhonsa, Eric. "How Much Could Google's YouTube Be Worth? Try More Than 100 Billion." *The Street*, www.thestreet.com/investing/youtube-might-be-worth-over-100-billion-14586599. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Parker, Robert Dale. *How to Interpret Literature: Critical Theory for Literary and Cultural Studies*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Ramos, Jr., Valeriano. "The Concepts of Ideology, Hegemony, and Organic Intellectuals in Gramsci's Marxism." *Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism Online*, no. 30, 1982, <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/periodicals/theoretical-review/1982301.htm>. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- Rudow, Bryce. "Cenk Uygur Finally Opens Up About Keith Olbermann: 'He's Clearly Got Clinical Issues,'" *The Daily Banter*, <https://the-dailybanter.com/2014/01/10-questions-with-cenk-uygur/>. Accessed 25 April 2019.
- "Self Marginalization is Bad." *YouTube*, uploaded by Secular Talk, 26 March 2019, www.youtube.com/watch?v=zqia3pQIAzg.
- "The Democratic Party Takeover HAS BEGUN." *YouTube*, uploaded by The Young Turks, 23 January 2017, www.youtube.com/watch?v=lOTsKWGNAC&t=633s.
- "The Solution." *Wolf-Pac*, www.wolf-pac.com/

the_solution. Accessed 25 April 2019.

Torres, Anthony. "Organic Intellectuals and Counter Hegemonic Theoretical Discourse." *As It Ought to Be Magazine*, 1 Sept. 2009, asitoughttobe.wordpress.com/2009/09/01/critical-theory/. Accessed 25 March 2019.

"Wealth Inequality in the United States." *Inequality.org*, <https://inequality.org/facts/wealth-inequality/>. Accessed 29 September 2019.

About the Author

Keith Lydon is pursuing his Master of Arts in English. His essay was completed in the fall 2019 under the mentorship of Dr. Kimberly Davis. He plans to pursue his Master of Science in Library and Information Science in the fall of 2020.