

García, J. C. (2016). *The FARC-EP's counter-hegemonic struggle (1998-2002)*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

To propose how the counter-hegemony of the subalterns can become varied and diverse, especially when it contains an ideology that is defended with weapons, as in the case of the guerrilla group studied, FARC-EP.

It analyzes the subordinate classes in the organic crisis of the Colombian state; politics as a continuation of the war; the belligerence of the army; Bill Clinton's Plan Colombia; the new hegemonic fraction of the dominant bloc; the discourse of democratic security; and the crisis of the organic intellectuality in the FARC-EP.

Politics is not only the struggle for power, but also the intellectual and moral direction of civil society and political society, the autonomous creation of a world of possibilities and the explicit recognition that subalternity, as the social materiality of living labour, is a historical condition of the contemporary capitalist regime and its organic crises. The analytical scheme of situations is none other than the relation of forces in an established juncture, which proves the human condition of collective, social and common action. In this area the FARC-EP moves with uncertainty between socialism, nationalism, justicialism and peasant populism.

The military power of the insurgency does not mean per se a counter-hegemonic reality, because in the FARC-EP the reading of force prevailed over political-ideological direction; and the reading from the political-military struggle of political society rather than from the struggle for the direction of civil society. During the four years or so that the demilitarized zone lasted, the insurgents did not criticize the weapons or the power economy.

The way that privileged the agrarian insurgency was the conformation of a popular army, without any reference to the war of democratic positions, in key of Gramsci. Therefore, civil society as a problem of the counter-hegemonic struggle is not present in the discourses of the FARC-EP, where the Gramscian Marxist side and its later developments are unknown.

The political responsibility in the relation of forces has to do fundamentally with the ideological-political discourse of the subalterns within the FARC-EP, since they did not manage to do so in the common sense of civil society, stopping or disintegrating the dominant hegemonic bloc and the irregular war. In Colombia, the armed confrontation is defined in the speeches of the actors, where the guerrilla has privileged coercion and armed rhetoric, despite the fact that it has carried out ideological trials for demands such as the Bolivarian Movement.