

AN UNEXPECTED COMPANION: HOPE AND ITS ROLE IN DYSTOPIAN LITERATURE

A Thesis

by

LUIS ALBERTO RAMIREZ

Submitted to Texas A&M International University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August 2018

Major Subject: English

An Unexpected Companion:  
Hope and its Role in Dystopian Literature

Copyright 2018 Luis Alberto Ramirez

AN UNEXPECTED COMPANION: HOPE AND ITS ROLE IN DYSTOPIAN LITERATURE

A Thesis

by

LUIS ALBERTO RAMIREZ

Submitted to Texas A&M International University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved as to style and content by:

Chair of Committee, Paul J. Niemeyer

Committee Members, Jonathan Murphy

Frances Rhodes

Angelique Blackburn

Chair of Department, Jonathan Murphy

August 2018

Major Subject: English

## ABSTRACT

An Unexpected Companion: Hope and its Role in Dystopian Literature (August 2018)

Luis Alberto Ramirez, B.A., Texas A&M International University

Chair of Committee: Dr. Paul J. Niemeyer

This thesis establishes a framework for analyzing the role of hope in young adult and adult dystopian novels. The first chapter establishes what hope is and what facets are focused on in establishing a framework for hope in a dystopian novel. This framework is based on figures such as Aquinas and Aristotle and uses Gravelle and Cartwright to establish a consensus on hope. Hope is an integral part of the human experience that comes in two states: pseudo-hope and true hope. True hope is a future desire for something good that is difficult to obtain but not impossible. It is something that is worked towards in everyday life and not merely an idea that lives in the future desires of a person. Hope is also courageous, but must not be confused with confidence; or one will fall into the pitfalls of pseudo-hope: overconfidence, extreme optimism, or ignorance. Moreover, this thesis establishes that hope may be used for manipulation via the three categories of hope that are not contingent on whether they are true or pseudo. In other words,, one can have a private hope that is pseudo and a public one that is true. The second chapter looks at George Orwell's *1984*'s manipulation of hope using the previously established framework. It contends that the Party is so successful because it masterfully manipulates its citizens by guiding them towards pseudo-hope and thus not allowing their true hope to flourish. Additionally, this chapter establishes the protagonist, Winston Smith, as an example of one who falls due to his venture in pseudo-hope. Lastly, the third chapter looks at Suzanne Collins' *The Hunger Games* and argues that it is the antithesis to *1984* because the ruling Capitol fails where

the Party succeeds: the manipulation of hope. Furthermore, this chapter establishes the protagonist, Katniss Everdeen, as a symbol of true hope via her personality and actions fitting the framework previously established. Lastly, this chapter looks at why *The Hunger Games* must be a positive example of hope due to its intended audience. This thesis concludes with an overview of the framework for hope and the examples of pseudo-hope and true-hope that were established.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Amber, whose unbridled support, understanding, and encouragement gave me the fortitude to keep going. From the moment we met, you have made me a better person.

To my baby girl, Allison, who is the light of my life, my source of inspiration, and motivation. You inspire me to be the father and man I can be. Thank you for always brightening my writing sessions by grabbing me by the hand and making me go play with you; a friendly reminder that life exists outside of my screen and it is wonderful. I love you.

To my wonderful sister, Elida, who has been my number one supporter as long as I can remember. Without your support, encouragement, and help with Allison, this thesis—and so many other things in my life—would have never been possible.

To my mother, for being the best role-model one could ask for: a perfect balance of love and strength. I strive to be half the person you are.

To my family, thank you for always being a great example to me.

To Mrs. Pamela Lerma, thank you for being the bar from which I measure all teachers—including myself—to, for fostering my love of literature and grand ideas, and encouraging my writing. You have affected my path in life more than you know. Thank you.

To my committee, thank you all for taking time out of your already busy schedules to accommodate my thesis work and I. I truly appreciate the support and confidence you gave me.

Finally, to my dogs, Cubbie and Shadow, thanks for staying up with me all those late nights. Sure, it was mostly in case I dropped some of my snacks, but a friendly paw was always welcome nonetheless.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II HOPE AND ITS IMPORTANCE DEFINED.....	12
What is Hope? .....	13
Dangers of Hope.....	22
Framework of Hope.....	27
III LEADING THE PUBLIC ASTRAY: THE PARTY’S WEAPONIZATION AND MANIPULATION OF HOPE IN ORWELL’S <i>1984</i> .....	31
Walking the Line: Hope vs. Pseudo-Hope.....	39
Symbols of Hope.....	65
IV AN INADEQUATE COPYCAT: HOPE IN COLLIN’S <i>THE HUNGER</i> <i>GAMES</i> .....	69
The Capitol’s Failed Manipulation.....	71
Katniss Everdeen: Symbol of True Hope.....	77
V CONCLUSION.....	90
WORKS CITED.....	95
VITA.....	97

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Hope as a concept is difficult to define; it is not an emotion, nor a construct, but it is something that is innate in the human experience. However, hope is often dismissed as a base emotion or afterthought when dealing with dystopian literature. Frequently, it is referenced when highlighting the lack of hope in a novel. Other times, it is a driving force for the characters that incites them to rebel and show defiance. Still, even in these circumstances, the word “hope” is mentioned only in passing; a watered-down definition of a concept that is immensely more complex than what is understood by its usage in the modern lexicon. Hope, as established by philosophers such as Aristotle and Saint Aquinas, is a focused, future desire which motivates the person into reasonable action. Hope is never ignorant, reliant on luck or experiences, nor is it inactive and passive or reliant on someone else. By taking hope and examining it via this lens, one can apply this to a dystopian work to explain the actions and success (or lack of) of their characters. For example, I argue that Winston Smith, the protagonist in George Orwell’s *1984*, has his hopes manipulated by the governing agency in his world and it is this manipulation that leads to a type of hope that is untrue; thus leading him to failure. Conversely, I argue that Katniss Everdeen, the protagonist in Suzanne Collins’ *The Hunger Games*, has her hopes manipulated by the ruling party in her world, as well. However, the manipulation fails to meet its end as the governing agency is not able to successfully manipulate her hopes but rather creates new ones that ultimately ends in the Capitol’s failure rather than Katniss’s demise. Through this comparative look at *1984* and *The Hunger Games*, I argue that the type of hope that inspires a character dictates the outcome of his/her actions.

---

This thesis follows the style of *Comparative Literature*.

Despite, the short shrift often given to hope in a genre which relies so heavily upon it, its history spans the millennia. For example, the classic Greek philosopher Aristotle distinguished between two types of hopes: pseudo-hope and true-hope. Pseudo-hope is a type of hope more akin to wishing and overconfidence. Aristotle believed that hope and courage were inextricably linked, one must be truly courageous to be truly hopeful. He warns of the three types of pseudo-hopes: experience, hopeful optimism (good fortune), and ignorance. Aristotle argues that if one has the "crutch" of experience one cannot experience true courage and thus your hopes are not needed. Secondly, he states that those who are hopeful due to "hopeful optimism" do not need nor experience true courage either as they are resigned to an arbitrary stroke of luck that is irrational to lay one's faith upon. Thirdly, he states that one cannot be courageous if one is ignorant of the seriousness of the situation one is in. Furthermore, Aristotle believed that if one is truly courageous, is rational in one's actions, and has their hopes placed in a good future goal: then one has "true-hope."

Similarly, Christian theologian Saint Thomas Aquinas echoes Aristotle's sentiments in *Summa Theologica*. Aquinas concurred with Aristotle in that good hope must be aimed at a future good. He also believed that hope works best when paired with the other two divine aspects of Christianity: faith and love. Therefore, one must have faith in God that one's worldly hopes will be fulfilled—and if they were not, one must have faith that it was for a divine reason. These hopes must also be paired with love and thus must not seek malicious or negative ends. Moreover, Aquinas believed that hope must entail some action as well; it cannot be simple wishful thinking but instead should dictate one's actions. Thus, to Aquinas, good hope must inspire action, be paired with faith and love, and it must aim at a future good.

Through the perspectives gathered from Aristotle and Aquinas, I establish a framework of what hope truly is. Though coined by Aristotle, I will borrow the terms “pseudo-hope” and “true hope” and extend their definition to include other ideas that are related to the overall idea that there is a duality of hopes: true and pseudo, good and bad.

The types of hope notwithstanding, Peter Drahos, author of “Trading in Public Hope”, establishes three distinct categories for hope: public, private, and collective. Public hope is that which is presented by public, often political, figures; it is the hope that a society makes public. Private hope is that which individuals have within themselves, and collective hope is that which a group, such as a society, holds. Public hope is the most dangerous of these as it can affect the other two, while the other two do not necessarily affect it. Furthermore, public hope can be used by what Drahos calls “political actors”—people who act in the public eye to expound political agendas—to influence the private and collective hopes of a populace. None of these categories of hope are contingent on hope being pseudo or true as either type of hope could reside in anyone of these categories.

Therefore, by deriving from Aristotle’s and Aquinas’ ideas, a framework of hope can be established. The framework establishes that there are two types of hope, pseudo hope and true hope, along two axes: public, political, and private. According to Aquinas, pseudo-hope is aimless or has no goal. Furthermore, Aristotle believed that pseudo-hope relies on pseudo-courage gained from experience, hopeful optimism, and ignorance. Conversely, both Aristotle and Aquinas believed that true hope aims toward a future good. Aquinas elaborates by stating that this goal must be reasonable. That is, it must be aimed at something that is difficult to attain but not impossible. Also, a man’s desire must not overtake his reason. Aquinas also believed that true hope must spur a man to action. Finally, true hope is self-reliant; it’s source should not

be another person. A person may help in hopeful endeavors or serve as a secondary object of hope.

In the following thesis, I will argue that this framework can be used to evaluate a work of dystopian literature. I also contend that hope has more integral and often sinister role in certain dystopian works—namely, George Orwell’s *1984* and Suzanne Collins’ *The Hunger Games*. Hope is a complicated, nuanced human concept that drives the actions of characters and can have a lasting impact on the outcomes of their lives. As such, it can be manipulated to steer characters towards a certain way of thinking and acting.

In 1949, George Orwell produced what has arguably become his most enduring and poignant work: *1984*. This novel delves into the author’s concern for the trend of authoritarianism after the Second World War; it is full of social and political commentary and is a novel that contains parallels that seem timeless. *1984* is the flagship of the dystopian genre—the father text if you will. That is not to say that it was the first—it can be argued that H.G. Wells’ *The Time Machine* published in 1895 was the prototype for future dystopian literature—nor was it the last. However, *1984* is the novel that has most deeply permeated the cultural fabric of the Anglophone; it has entered our culture so far that terms coined by Orwell have become part of the lexicon. For example, the phrases “doublethink” and “Big Brother” have become part of everyday discussions surrounding political issues including that of the overreaching of surveillance. The term “Big Brother” even spawned an eponymous television show where contestants are constantly watched by cameras and viewers alike—similar to Oceania’s citizens. Famously, the term Orwellian stands for a situation, idea, or condition that is destructive to the welfare of a free and open society. Everything from closed-circuit television (CCTV) to

presidential policy has been dubbed Orwellian, harkening back to the stern author of *1984* and *Animal Farm*.

*1984* stirs up a plethora of ideas when brought up in conversation: thought crime, doublespeak, despair, subjugation, Big Brother, conspiracy and dystopia to name a few. The genre of dystopia is “traditionally a bleak, depressing genre with no space for hope in the story, only outside the story: only by considering dystopia as a warning can we as readers hope to escape such a dark future” (Baccolini 520). In *1984*, both protagonists are destroyed and emotionally crushed by the totalitarian regime. They learn nothing. They do not escape. Though absent as it may seem, one key concept or idea that is central to the development and success of *1984* as a cautionary text is often left out of the conversation. This concept is “hope.” Hope is ever present in *1984*, not just outside of it. Hope is weaved in and out of every single event in the plot, and the characters’ adherence to such hope dictates the ultimate outcome.

Hope is a topic that is widely untouched by academics, especially in the context relating to Orwell and specifically to *1984*. Bloeser states that “western philosophical traditions [have] traditionally not paid the same attention to hope as it has to attitudes like belief and desire.” Philip Pettit, in his 2013 article “Hope and Its Place in Mind,” writes “hope does not bulk large. Indeed it scarcely bulks at all, among the topics that have engaged philosophers over the last half-century. [They] often ignore it completely and even moral philosophers have given it short shrift” (152). Historically hope has been looked upon primarily in a theological sense or in a superficial sense that seems like it does not deserve much attention. If at all mentioned, one often hears of the despair, or bleakness of *1984*. That is, the absence of hope; what shall be referred to as “hopelessness.” However, hope plays an integral role in the machinations at work in *1984*. This thesis contends that it is not simply enough to state that there is no hope in *1984*, but rather

that the appearance of no hope is something that has been artificially created by those in control, henceforth referred to as the Party.

After all, hope is something that is innate in humans; it is something that is wired into all of humanity and appears in even the bleakest situations. Lionel Tiger, a neurophysiologist, argues that “hope is a biological force located in the body and in human nature generally” (Halpin 398). Thus, one can contend that an external force cannot completely extinguish hope; especially when a mind has seen a life where hope is a real, palpable thing—that is a time a before the Party was in control. No, true hope and true hopelessness must come from within. If hope stems from an inner, innate source in man, then it stands to reason that it can only be extinguished from within, and it is for this reason that the governing parties in dystopian literature go to such lengths to manipulate hope.

To better understand how the Party manipulates and weaponizes hope to their nefarious advantage, this thesis will look at the history of hope as a literary and theological device. One must understand what hope truly is and dismiss the everyday notion of watered down hope. Furthermore, this thesis will look into various views of the concept of hope throughout the ages and will focus on Aristotle’s work as well as that of Saint Thomas Aquinas. I argue that hope is an innate human concept that has a dual-nature, pseudo and true, and that adhering to one or the other will lead to either failure or success.

Hope was once considered to be something eternal that sprung from the very heart of man (qtd. in Cartwright 167). By its very essence—in whichever school of thought it is looked upon by—hope is something that is future-oriented. That is, it is a concept that looks towards that which is yet to come with an optimistic outlook. Hope is a desire for a future goal (Cartwright 167). Aristotle believed that there were two types of hope: true hope and pseudo-

hope. He also believed that both versions of his hope were directly linked to courage and to experience. Aristotle claimed that there were three types of pseudo-hopes: experience, hopeful optimism, and ignorance. He believed that these types of hopes were not true as they had extraneous circumstances affecting the mind and heart. True hope is connected to true courage—courage that is not tainted by experience or ignorance. Similarly, St. Thomas Aquinas believed that hope was directed at a positive future outcome that was reasonable and not impossible to attain (188). He believed that it was best shown when clear thinking was involved. Thus, hope must be paired with rational thinking to be considered true.

Using the framework established in the second chapter, I will delve first into *1984* and then *The Hunger Games* by analyzing the actions of the protagonists of each novel. I chose *1984* as it a novel that has infiltrated the everyday lexicon of the English-speaking world. Furthermore, *1984* is the de facto guide for many young-adult dystopian novels. Thus, it will serve as the exemplar of how hope is used by a domineering power to maintain control over a subjugated population. This thesis will contend that hope is an ever-present and crucial concept in dystopian literature and that both novels show a version of hope. *1984* serves as a cautionary tale; not just in the political sense that Orwell intended, but as a cautionary tale about hope—if one follows pseudo or false hopes, as the protagonists do, one is sure to fail. Conversely, *The Hunger Games* provides an example of true hope via its protagonist, Katniss Everdeen, who unlike her adult male counterpart, does not fall into the pitfalls of pseudo hope.

While there are two types of hope, one type will prevail over the other. Either the character is a truly hopeful individual, or their hopes are misguided. Orwell's *1984* uses artificially created hope (pseudo-hope) to manipulate its protagonist and the characters living in the world of the novel. Winston Smith goes throughout the novel under the pretense of true

hope, but he falls prey to the three types of pseudo-hope that Aristotle addresses. That is, hope that is dependence on experience, false optimism, and ignorance. The methodical manipulation and creation of pseudo-hope via hopeful situations is how true hopelessness is engendered by the Party. The audience, like Winston, is left longing for a glimmer of hope; wanting refuge from the cold and desolate world of the Party's Oceania. The Party successfully weaponize hope by purposely and methodically arranging for hope to be present in an effort to entice its less-faithful citizens into exposing their treason. Thus, for the Party, hope is both an illusion they create and a weapon they use to, not only expose, but to manipulate and eventually break their problematic citizens.

For Winston, however, hope is something that is old and familiar, though he cannot quite seem to place it. He remembers a time when life was different, and the Party did not exist. For Winston, hope feels very real. Winston also becomes a symbol of hope. Through his defiant thoughts and actions, Winston becomes an everyman; a representative of what a person can be. This thesis will delve into the type of hope Winston experiences and analyze how Winston's foray into the entrapments that lead to pseudo-hope leads him to become a lost soul in the Party's plot; ultimately, establishing himself as a cautionary character for those who dare to hope.

In the final chapter, this thesis will look at the offspring of *1984*: young-adult dystopian literature. Specifically, it will focus on *The Hunger Games* trilogy by Suzanne Collins, not only because its world bears a strong resemblance to that of Orwell's *1984*, but also because the series' protagonist, Katniss Everdeen, is a stark contrast to Winston both as a character and as a symbol of hope. Primarily, I will take a comparative look at Everdeen's actions throughout the novel. I argue that, in contrast to Winston's would-be heroism, Everdeen exhibits all the traits of true-hope. She is reliant and reasonable and is never ignorant of the situations in which she is

placed. Everdeen never puts faith in others—almost to a fault—and she never lets her experience or good fortune dictate where she places her hopes. Furthermore, her hopes are geared toward a future good and while her hope spurs her to action, she does not believe that outcome of the events ahead of her will be positive, thus showing true courage. Everdeen is the antithesis of Winston. She is young, vibrant, confident, and unabashed in her beliefs and goals. This is in contrast to Winston’s frail, unsure, middle-aged self who is too afraid of the real consequences of his actions to fully commit to his own rebellion.

The ruling party in *The Hunger Games* employs hope-manipulation techniques to control the population much in the way that the Party does in *1984*. Unlike the Orwell’s *Party*, the ruling in *The Hunger Games*, the Capitol, does not meet the ends it tries to attain. The party uses many of the same Orwellian techniques to try to influence the private and collective hopes of their people. Citizens of the various districts are forced to watch public showings of propaganda like the titular Hunger Games—a competition where children must kill or be killed. The winners of the Hunger Games are proclaimed “victors” and live out the rest of their lives in their home districts in luxury. They are treated like celebrities because winning also gives their district benefits. The Capitol forces this event to be treated like a celebration and certain pomp and circumstance must be undertaken each year. This is a purposeful tradition meant to give those that live under squalor a glimmer of hope, and a falsely optimistic view that, despite hard times, life can get better. However, unlike the Party in *1984* who aims to organically, if cruelly, change the hopes of an individual, the Capitol tries to extinguish hopes. By doing so, they have set themselves up for failure as hope is more present when times are hard and when people are the most desperate. The conditions that the Capitol creates primes the populous for the inevitable revolt that starts with Katniss Everdeen.

Katniss thrust herself into the spotlight of the Capitol by volunteering to take her sister's place in the Hunger Games. This act is truly courageous as Katniss has no experience nor good fortune and she is well-aware of the situation that lays before her. Katniss has no illusions about her chances either. She does not expect to come out of this experience alive. For Katniss, hope has yet to manifest at this point in the plot. However, she is not in despair. Her hope is that she can win—something difficult but objectively attainable—in order to return to her sister. Yet, while her reason for hope is another person, she does not rely on said person, nor anyone else for that matter, to make her hopes come to fruition. Furthermore, her hope creates a drive in her and forces her into action. By doing so, she becomes the symbol of hope that everyone needs all while never trying to be that symbol. Katniss is focused and driven toward her future desire and is willing to do just about anything to get there while still remaining true to her values.

In doing so, she becomes an explicit figure of hope and not just an implicit one. Originally, her actions made her an implicit symbol of hope for the reader and the residents of District 12, but as she defies the Capitol, overcomes their chicanery, and changes the rules of the game, she launches herself from unwitting national sweetheart to complete object of the public's idolatry. Katniss has effectively manipulated the private and collective hopes of the audience watching the Hunger Games. By doing so, Katniss has turned hope into her greatest asset and weapon. Everdeen, unlike Winston, does not fall prey to her experience, ignorance, or hopeful optimism. Quite the opposite, Everdeen is a skeptic and is reluctant in her role as a symbol of hope. She never falls into the pitfalls of experience as she is always cautious in her moves; is never blindly optimistic nor ignorant as she knows the power of the Capitol. Thus, her hopefulness and that which she inspires in others stems from courage in the face of a dire situation with a hard to reach but possible outcome.

Hope is a concept that is as important as it is varied. From the two types of hope, pseudo and true, to the three categories of hope, private, public, and collective, hope is varied, and the outcome of a story can be dictated by whether its protagonist follows true or pseudo hope. Those that adhere to pseudo-hope tend to be unsuccessful, while those who are in possession of true hope are more likely to see their future desires come to fruition.

## CHAPTER II

### HOPE AND ITS IMPORTANCE DEFINED

Hope is a concept that is unique to the human experience. It is more than an emotional response and more than just a wistful desire based on an idle fancy. Hope is intrinsic to the survival and thriving of humanity. For hundreds of years, humans have tried to better understand hope. Classic Greek philosopher, Aristotle, believed that there were two types of hope: pseudo and true. He also believed that hope was contingent on one's fidelity to courage. In order to possess true courage, one must not rely on their positive experiences, good fortune, or ignorance. Furthermore, he believed that hope must be reasonable. Catholic philosopher and theologian, Saint Thomas Aquinas, believed that hope was aimed at a future good and needed to be paired with the other facets of Christianity: faith and love. Furthermore, he believed that hope must spur a man to action and must be reasonable. That is, it is aimed at something that is difficult to attain but not impossible. Furthermore, Aquinas believed that hope must be self-reliant. In other words, one's hopes cannot be primarily dependent on someone else. Both Aquinas and Aristotle represent two separate ideas of hope throughout the ages. The classical Aristotle represents a philosophical and secular view on hope that expounds courage, action, and reason above all. Aquinas pronounces a theological version that aims its desires towards a reasonable future good. Together, they show that hope is a dual thing: it exists in two different states; one which is impure and will lead to failure, and the other of which is true and will lead to success. Aristotle and Aquinas are particularly outstanding because of how well their ideas on hope complement each other. Both authors believe that hope is centered on some future thing that is difficult but not impossible to attain and both agree that hope must have action taken towards fulfilling it.

Furthermore, both agree that hope should not be placed in circumstances that are outside the realm of one's self .

Aristotle and Aquinas enable us to distinguish two different notions of hope, and to classify both types as being either true or false versions of hope. Peter Drahos, author of the article “Trading in Public Hope”, deals with the governmental influence on an individual, or populace's, hope. He elaborates on three separate categories of hope: public hope, as represented by the government, for example; private hope which pertains to individuals; and collective hope or hope that is held in common by a community or society. It should be noted that these categories of hope are not contingent on hope being true or pseudo. Drahos also establishes that hope has many dangers that go along with it, particularly when dealing with public hope. Public hope is particularly dangerous in that it allows “public actors”—persons acting in the role of figureheads—to manipulate the private and collective hopes of a people. Public hope can be used to present knowingly deceptive or insincere information, which may cause a shift in the hopes of a populace or a loss of faith in the institution that expounds such falsehoods. By combining the complementing notions of hope that Aristotle and Aquinas wrote about, I have synthesized an all-inclusive framework in establishing what true hope and pseudo hope. Furthermore, by including Drahos' ideas on public, private, and collective hope, a second level to the framework is established: one that looks at how governmental forces can use public hope to influence the private and collective hopes of the population.

### What is Hope?

In order to fully grasp the complexity of the relationship that humans have with hope, there needs to be a deep understanding of hope and how it has evolved as “an element in a structure of intellectual or theological understanding“(Cartwright 166). Author John Cartwright

succinctly and cogently sums up a history of hope in his 2004 article, “From Aquinas to Zwelthamba: A Brief History of Hope.” Cartwright expounds on many philosophers’ thoughts on hope including Saint Thomas Aquinas. Similarly, in his 2000 article, “Aristotle on Hope,” G. Scott Gravlee expounds on Aristotle’s definitions and beliefs on hope. This thesis will borrow heavily from Cartwright and Gravlee’s expert understanding and analysis of hope through the ages to create the base for a framework of what hope is and what it is not. Cartwright’s “A Brief History of Hope” gives a concise and succinct summary of hope through the ages. He begins by establishing that hope is an idea that, like Alexander Pope once stated, “springs eternal in the human breast,” and is permanently in the human consciousness. He further states that as an idea in everyday use, it has been muddled in the everyday language (167). Cartwright states, “It is helpful to regard hope as a constantly reemerging force in the human psyche, which has from time to time been explicitly” recognized and elaborated upon (167). At its very essence, hope is something that is future oriented; it is a thought or a desire that is focused on a future goal.

Hope is not merely a theological construct; it is a force in human actions and choices (Cartwright 172). While much had been made about hope as a Christian value or a theological virtue, Aristotle examines hope in a secular way. Aristotle addresses hope in many ways that are relevant to the discussion of *1984*, but his most notable contributions are his discussions on courage (Gravlee 461). In Greek, the term that is typically translated as “hope” is the word “elpis”: implying “good hope” or “hope for good things.” Aristotle uses this term in a more neutral way. He uses this word as a general term as in “expects,” “anticipates” or “hopes for,” which are all phrases without a positive or negative connotation. After all, one can hope for negative outcomes, and that would not coincide with either Aquinas’s or Aristotle’s views of hope. Instead, Aristotle uses the more specific terms “elpizeinagathon” or “euelpis” to indicate

hope for good things (Gravlee 462). For Aristotle, courage is linked with hope. There are also two types of courage: pseudo-courage and true-courage. The source of one's courage determines which type of courage an individual is experiencing. He believed that one cannot experience true hope unless one is experiencing true courage. One must be in the appropriate situation to be able to hope truly.

Aristotle's two kinds of courage—true and pseudo—are directly related to hope. Gravlee writes, "Aristotle sets up several contrasts between those who are *euelpis* and those who exhibit the virtue of courage" (463). In order to be truly hopeful, one must be courageous. They are inextricably linked. Thus, for the purpose of this thesis, the terms will be fused, and they will be henceforward referred to as "pseudo-hope" and "true-hope." This concept of duality in hope exists across the spectrum of those who analyze hope. Godfrey distinguishes between "absolute" and "ultimate" hope. Philip Pettit distinguishes between "superficial" and "substantial" hope. Even Aquinas distinguishes between the way people hope. There are certain distinguishing features in the disparate terminology employed by the authors, but at its basis the same duality of hope exists for all. In one sense, hope is insignificant and not true, whereas in the other hope is substantial and true. One form of hope is an ill-advised venture, whilst the other form of hope is a positive force that is wholly good and beneficial to the human experience.

Aristotle elaborates on this duality by addressing the concept of courage. Aristotle believed that courage, like hope, exists in duality. There is false courage and true courage. To be truly courageous in the face of adversity is a requisite for true hope. Aristotle uses soldiers to elaborate on his point, explaining how an experienced soldier experiences what he calls pseudo-courage because he knows the probability of living and dying and the many "false alarms" that come with battle. Those who are confident in their abilities and skills forged through experience

will act confidently but not courageously. He argues that there is, in fact, no need for them to be courageous as they are confident their skills can overcome the task. Aristotle states that courage is “displayed precisely where there are fears to face (i.e., where there is no confidence in a positive outcome)” (Gravlee 463). Aristotle notes that once there are truly fears to face, “and when they are inferior in men and equipment, professional soldiers turn cowards: they are the first to run away” (Gravlee 463). Thus, confidence does not equal courage. Aristotle writes, “A courageous man is also fearless at sea and in illness, though not in the same way as sailors are. Because of their experience, the sailors are optimistic, while the courageous man has given up hope of saving his life—he has turned away from the judgment that he will be saved” (qtd. in Gravlee 463). Thus, the hope and courage that these sailors are experiencing is not true, because they are relying on their prior experience. Though they may have their trepidations, the soldiers have gone through adversity in the past and overcome it. This taints the soldiers’ courage as now the soldier has a basis from which to be confident about. Aristotle elaborates on his point, “For they have the best insight into the many false alarms which war seems to [bring with it]. They give the impression of being courageous because the others do not know what is happening. Moreover, their experience enables them to be efficient in attack in defense... Therefore; they fight with the advantage.... trained athletes [have] over amateurs” (Gravlee 463). Thus, they are, at least to some extent, confident that they will escape their current adversity. This is not true courage. True courage requires one’s resignation to the probability of a negative outcome and the persistence to meet the problem head-on anyway. Only then is one truly courageous and only then is one truly hopeful. Thus, confidence does not equal courage.

The second type of pseudo-courage Aristotle mentions he calls “euelpis.” Gravlee refers to this as “hopeful or optimistic from good fortune” (463). Aristotle does not believe that those

who are optimistic due to good fortune are courageous either. Aristotle writes, “Nor are optimists [*hoi euelpides*] courageous, for they gain their confidence in danger from having won many victories over many people. They resemble courageous men in that both are confident...however...the confidence of optimists is based upon their belief that they are the strongest and will suffer no harm” (qtd. in Gravlee 463). He believes that their constant wins over people have led them to be confident—what one would refer to as over-confident or cocky—and as previously stated, confidence does not equate courage and without courage there can be no true hope. The source of their confidence is similar to the first in that it cannot count as hope. Furthermore, their beliefs that they are “the strongest” is ill-founded as it is not based on anything empirical, but rather it is assumed due to the good fortune they have had in grave situations, regardless of their actual skill or experience (Gravlee 464). Thus, courage cannot come from one’s confidence in good fortune.

The third type of pseudo-courage is ignorance of the danger at hand. In alignment with “early Greek thought, hope is often seen as an attitude of those who have insufficient knowledge or are easily swayed by wishful thinking” (Bloeser and Stahl 2017). Aristotle writes, “in fact, they are not far removed from the optimists, but they are inferior in that they have none of the self-reliance which enables the optimists to hold their ground for some time” (qtd. in Gravlee 464). These type of people are not truly confident, but rather are optimistic in the face of circumstances they face because they are ignorant of them. They do not know the danger and are thus confident in their continued success. Gravlee writes, “an agent with the confidence of ignorance has not faced dangers and come out safely, but rather she has not knowingly faced dangers at all” (464). Thucydides similarly notes that “those who hope, typically have a poor understanding of their situation, fail to come up with good plans, and things go badly from them”

(qtd. in Bloeser and Stahl 2017). In this sense, ignorant optimism leads to confidence but not to true courage or true hope.

In summary, Aristotle believed that there are three types of pseudo-courage; that which comes from experience, from having good fortune in bad situations, and from ignorance. These three types of courage are linked to the idea of pseudo-hope vs. true hope. A man cannot experience true hope if his courage is not true. True hope comes from being courageous in the midst of uncertain circumstances and while experiencing fear. Moreover, true hope comes from having the courage to fight on and hope for a positive outcome despite the probability of a negative one.

Saint Thomas Aquinas weighed in on the matter of hope in his 1485 book *Summa Theologica*, a text that he composed to explain the intricate plan of divine creation. Aquinas states, “hope is directed to a future good which is hard but not impossible to attain” (qtd. in Gravlee 188). That is to say, if a goal is easy to attain, then it does not require hope. If it would be impossible to be attained, then there is no point in having hope. Cartwright further elaborates, “[h]ope as an operative capacity is therefore at its most effective if it is associated with clear thinking and the realistic assessment of options and possibilities. The consistent linking of hope to human rationality and the power of judgment is therefore clear...Consequently; also, hope has active meaning only when at least some degree of free will, practical thinking, and individual or collective choice is assumed” (170). Hope must be reasonable and use clear-thought. One cannot let the hope delude the mind or cloud one’s judgement with good fortune via experience. Also, in order for hope to be meaningful, hope must be undertaken via one’s own volition. One cannot be forced into hope.

St. Aquinas believed the function of hope was to be placed in the hands of God and the aim of hope was some divine and good thing. Part of the medieval view on hope stated that humans live in a unique condition where they have both a “soul and reason.” This makes the human existence a complex one. Reason is a special human talent that is used to understand the nature of the world in ways that reflect the nature of heaven (Cartwright 168). Thus, it was believed that there needed to be a hierarchy of hoping and reason. An oft used analogy was that of the body. Cartwright states, “reason, understanding, and memory, seated in the head, should control the lesser organs of, say, digestion and sexuality; if they do not, the result may be likened to a rebellion. Conversely if the laboring classes (whose special role is to provide food for everyone) turn against the monarch (the head of state), this is as unnatural as an individual’s desire for money or for sex becoming immoderate and overruling his or her reason. ... [like] a horse controlling its rider, rather than the other way around” (168). Accordingly, hope cannot usurp the place of reason. Thus, hope only has significance when one exerts one’s freewill or practical thinking.

Aquinas believed that hope is only fully effective when complemented by its sisters: faith and love. All these virtues are “intimately tied to theologically defined notions of salvation and transcendence” (Cartwright 172). It is useful to define these virtues outside of the notion of religious salvation while maintaining their potency and significance to Aquinas’ ideas.

Cartwright states:

1. *Love* is a heartfelt wish for the well-being of another (or others), not dependent on a desire for personal gain.
2. *Faith* is an intuitive sense of possibility of certain desired outcomes.

3. *Hope* is a force that “is directed to a future aim that is hard but not impossible to attain. (170)

He goes on to write that “*Hope* without *Faith* has little staying power; *Hope* without *Love* is short-sighted and ignorant of its true long-term interests” (170). Thus, according to Aquinas, to be hopeful requires an exercise in reason while maintaining a notion of future goodwill towards others that is not contingent on personal gain.

Aquinas also points out that “there is no hope to be found in the blessed or the damned; it exists only in those who are still en route (*viatoribus*)” (192). He contended that hope does not exist in those that cannot be saved, nor does it exist in those that have already obtained the grace of heaven. Hope is only truly available for those that are en route to salvation. In Christianity, an individual is often referred to as a traveler (*viator*) or a pilgrim (*peregrinus*) (Cartwright 171). The traveler is constantly confronted by “crossroads, bad weather, smooth-tongued fellow-travelers and conmen, and other discouragements, seductions, and choices. On this path, a traveler may also find secondary objects of hope” (170). The concept of life as a journey was “deeply ingrained in medieval thought” (171). Thus, a person who is going through life as a traveler is the only viable candidate for hope. Throughout life, they will experience hardships, but they need not travel alone. It is acceptable for a traveler to find secondary objects of hope, so long as they are not the primary objects and so long as they are still aimed toward “the ultimate divine objective” (171). To put this in secular terms, one may use secondary objects of hope to guide or aid one towards their ultimate hope, but they cannot be the main source of one’s hope.

While Aquinas does not directly deal with the corruption or misuse of hope, he “warns that one should not put one’s hope in other people, except as ‘secondary or instrumental sources of help in attaining the means of beatitude’ (qtd. in Cartwright 170). Thus, a person who relies

solely on others as their source for hope is already at a disadvantage. One must be self-reliant and have faith to achieve hope and help in attaining beatitude—or by extension, the object of one's future desire. A person can help you along the way and you can rely on that person as an object of hope, but they cannot be the sole source or object of your hope for this may lead to negative outcomes.

David Halpin, author of “The Nature of Hope and Its Significance to Education” from 2001, argues that hope is a supernatural thing “insofar that [it] raise[s] our minds to things that are above nature” (394). Furthermore, Aquinas believed that “hope is a special case ... its object is twofold: first the future good that one desires and, second, the help by which one expects to attain it” (394). Hope, he believed, is ultimately only realizable through divine means, and it requires some humility from those who chose to practice it. He also believed that one has already faltered when one chooses to not believe in a higher power and relies only on one's self. Hope, he believes, is divine (Halpin 394). Parts of Aquinas' theistic interpretations of hope do, however, lend themselves to secular interpretation. Hope, as Aquinas defines it, requires anticipation of future happiness and “trusting in present help to come to it” (Halpin 394). Thus, a hopeful person must anticipate their own happiness and trust the process by which they are going to go about obtaining said happiness. In summary, for Aquinas, hope requires an aim, faith in something greater, and reliance on something good and not solely on one's self. Moreover, all hope, he believed, is directed towards happiness.

Halpin states that, according to Aquinas, “hope is interpreted not so much as a matter of positively looking forward—though that is a significant part of it— as a way of living prospectively in and engaging purposefully with the present” (395). Thus, hope is not just a positive outlook into the future or a desire that is based solely on what has yet to come. Hope

encompasses the way in which a hopeful person might live in the present. One must have a plan in place for prospective happenings that one must actively engage in to accomplish one's desired ends. As the proverb states, "faith without works is dead," so too is hope (*New Kings James Bible, James 2, 14-26*). Being hopeful also means living prospectively by having a plan, and engaging purposefully by actively bringing said plan to fruition.

### Dangers of Hope

Hope is not without its faults. One can hope for negative outcomes or bad things. One can hope without reason or purpose and lead oneself or others to disappointment. More significantly though, hope has a uniquely dangerous quality in that it can be manipulated to fit an agenda or philosophy. When the agenda is aimed at good, then there is no danger, but when the agenda is aimed at something negative, it can have grave consequences. Manipulation of hope is done by targeting one of three categories of hope that Peter Drahos elaborates on in his 2004 article, "Trading in Public Hope." He focuses on the three categories of hope: private, collective, and public. These categories are separate from the two types of hope previously established: pseudo-hope and true hope. Private hopes are those which an individual citizen holds and believes. Collective hopes are those which a large group or society holds and believes. Public hopes are those that are articulated by a public entity such as the government (Drahos 31). These categories of hope are intertwined and, at times, influenced by the others. This is where the danger stems from. As one category of hope changes, it has the potential to influence the other categories of hope. This happens naturally, but if this is done by means of purposeful manipulation, then it becomes problematic.

Drahos argues that public hope is the most dangerous kind. According to him, "public hope is hope that is articulated by political actors in the context of the exchange of relationships

of various kinds. All three have dangers, but public hope is potentially the most dangerous because it allows political actors to harness emotionally” charged issues and collective thoughts and manipulate the audience who may be ignorant on the subject (Drahos 18). By controlling and manipulating the public hopes of people, political actors can exert their agenda upon the public. This, in turn, would influence the collective and private hopes of people and change the landscape of the society. Therefore, public hope is the most dangerous category.

Drahos uses the modern world trade as a backdrop for his analysis of hope. His focus on public hope is in the context of political institutions in a society. He states that in those places where poverty, sickness, and starvation are rampant, there is a need, or a demand, for hope. He believes that “hope is a psychological event or process that is distinct from services and products to which it may be linked” (19). Drahos states that hope can be marketed. According to him, “the private hopes of individuals have complicated public dimensions. Commercial actors understand that if they can link their products to the private hopes of individuals, they will sell more of those products and gain customer loyalty” (20). He further states that politicians and other public figures are “actors” and “traders” of hope. They use hope as part of an exchange in which hope is traded for votes, favors, privileges, and so on. (Drahos 20). When the political actors or the institutions they represent are trustworthy and have the best interest of the public in mind, then this exchange is fine. However, this exchange can be problematic as it can be easily abused by either the individual political actor, by the institution they represent, or by the government as a whole. When self-interest is at the heart of the public hope being expounded instead of the good of the masses, then public hope can be a very dangerous thing.

The seven conditions that constitute what Drahos calls “collective hope” include the need that it be experienced by the whole of society, that the beliefs that trigger the emotion are widely

shared, that the cultural products of the society express the emotion and the beliefs to which it is connected, and that the emotion and beliefs are part of collective memory. Drahos states that public hope is that which is “articulated or held by actors acting politically in relation to societal goals. Public hope need not be collective hope, and in fact, only a few may be aware that it is operating” (20). Some examples of public, collective, and private may overlap and be all three at once. Collective hope, however, cannot be a public hope if it does not have political representation. If no one of significance is an “actor” or proponent of this collective hope, then no matter how many people hold this hope privately and as a collective, it will never be public, at least as classified by Drahos, and widespread.

Furthermore, Drahos contends that outside threats affect the needs and wants for peace and security. Interestingly enough, these threats lead to an increase in levels of private and collective hope. Why there are increased levels of hope versus increased levels of wishful thinking (a fanciful, less concrete desire) is unclear, but what is clear is that “hope is the more important psychological mechanism in times of serious threat or adversity” (Drahos 21). Wishing is a simpler process; it requires no mental exercise nor any rationality or reason. Hope requires the “mental act of creating a sense of expectation or anticipation about the future that seems to make hope an important psychological resource for dealing with a future made uncertain by a threat of some kind ... Hope is a forward-looking emotion in a way that wishing is not” (Drahos 21). In short, it seems that hope can help an individual “combat what seems, at least inductively, a certain and depressing fate” (22).

The dangers of the manipulation of public hope must be checked by what Drahos calls “cold analysis”; a harkening back to Aristotle and Aquinas’s reason. He states, “hope can trigger in individuals an instrumental rationality that leads them to a desired goal. It helps individuals to

solve problems and, at times, to overcome the seemingly impossible odds dealt by the forces of nature or by the forces of men. But hope has its hazards. Intense hope carries with it the danger of intense disappointment” (30). Thus, while stating that hope can be an operative force that drives the individual and the masses forward, it can also act as an enabler of irrationality and a perpetuator of disappointment. The imagining or creation in the mind of a hopeful endeavor can be dangerous if left unchecked. If it goes “unchecked by reason and evidence, [it] can lead the individual into fantasy thinking, irrational action, and finally, failure rather than success” (Drahos 31). Furthermore, Drahos argues an individual’s ability to avoid the pitfalls of personal hope depends on their ability to “create an inner dialectic in which reason checks and assesses the possibilities for the future” (31).

Part of the dangers of public hope is its influence on personal hope. Social institutions are key in influencing individual’s private hopes. The government or medical industry are examples of said institutions. If they communicate certain information, say the surplus in the budget or the positive survival rates of cancer patients, then they are fostering hope. But, if social institutions have broken down, then those institutions, such as health or education, will no longer be seen as sources of hope. People will no longer plan their futures based on these institutions, and their hopes turn elsewhere, or despair replaces hope (Drahos 31).

Private hopes are dependent on the confidence that people have in the public institutions. When hope and social institutions are “fully-integrated,” then the possibility of a tyrannical government is largely removed. Drahos states that “private hope also depends on having basic freedoms in order to be meaningful...at the same time, it encourages those freedoms” (32). Therefore, when the public institutions effectively convey hope to the public, and the public reciprocates that action with confidence in that institution, then the outcome is generally a

positive one. Conversely, if hope and social institutions are purposefully segregated—that is if there is no hope to be gained from the public institution, or no confidence in the hope that they are expounding—that opens the doors for a negative outcome such as a tyrannical government. If the individuals no longer have confidence in their institutions of public hope, then they are forced to rely on an emotional and perhaps irrational private hope. As stated before, any hope that stems from irrationality is a false hope and will eventually lead to a person’s profound disappointment.

Just as public hopes influence private hopes, private hopes can become public hopes. Drahos reasons, “individual hopes for each when shared by many become the basis of mass movements and social politics that may eventually become represented as public hopes within the political system” (32). Furthermore, public hopes in the political system may exist and even influence and exert changes in policy without the general public being aware of it. Again, this is part of the pitfalls of public hope. When so-called public hopes, hopes that are geared toward a general population, are kept a mystery, they are not exposed to scrutiny and can lead to negative outcomes (32). While private hope encourages an individual to action, the responsibility of public hope does not lie within the many citizens that have been moved by it, but rather with the executive arm of the government (33). There is a sizeable risk involved in this type of hope as it puts the responsibility into the hands of someone else. Doing so is ill-advised as it may make progress difficult to measure and can potentially allow the hopeful to lose sight of the realism and rationality of one’s hopes. Drahos states, “a danger of public hope is that it becomes a tool of manipulation, an emotional opiate that political actors use to dull critical treatments of decisions and policies that serve private rather than social interests” (33). Often, the language used with public hope is geared toward “obtaining emotional assent to a set of policies that then run

unchallenged” (33). The ambiguity of public hope makes it particularly dangerous in the way that it can influence by manipulation of the language and the confidence of the public. Both versions of public hope—the one that affects key policymakers and the one openly invoked to move the public—can lead to adverse outcomes.

There are ways to check public hope to ensure that it does not go awry. There are four principles to ensure that hope is checked. First, public hope must be judged by the truth. Secondly, a clear connection must be made between public hope and the available evidence that relates to the probability of the hoped-for goal (Drahos 34). Thirdly, as public hope must be judged by truth, then it must also be the subject of cross-examination by those who oppose it. Lastly, Drahos writes, “those who are capable must be encouraged and provided with resources to turn the private hope to public hope” (34). In general, public hope is created by those who lead and by those who inspire a widespread private hope. If public hope is to be good, then it is contingent on it being checked.

### Framework of Hope

By examining hope, one can get an insight into the machinations of the human condition. Hope is something that is an innate part of the human condition. To hope is to be human. By looking at different notions of hope from the secular, religious, and political realms, one can put together a framework from which one can gain a deeper understanding of what hope is and how it can be used as an operative force. Figures like Aristotle and Aquinas agree that there are different ways to hope. Aristotle connects hope with the virtue of courage and believes that there are two types of hope.

Furthermore, Aristotle believed that there were two types of courage: pseudo-courage and true-courage. I use the terms “pseudo-hope” and “true hope” to differentiate between the two

types of hope established by Aristotle, but also to expand on the definition. He further contends that in order for one to be truly hopeful, one must be truly courageous. Aristotle cites that those who have undergone hardships and come out of them in a positive light by the merit of their skill are not truly courageous when faced with similar hardships. These hardship experiences have given them a sense of confidence that their skill and experience will lead them to a good outcome. These people are not truly courageous because they believe that the outcome will be positive and then strive forward. Confidence does not equal courage, so this is not true hope. Secondly, Aristotle states that those who have confidence due to good fortune in their outcomes and not because of their skill, are also not truly hopeful. They are relying on luck without the merit of having the skill and actual experience to support their confidence. This also is not true hope. Thirdly, he reasons that those that are ignorant of the dangers that lie in front of them cannot be truly courageous. After all, how can one be truly courageous if one does not know the extent of their situation? Those that are confident due to their ignorance are also not truly hopeful. To Aristotle, confidence does not equal courage, and without courage, one cannot experience true hope. True hope is attained when an individual is fully cognizant of their situation and maintains true courage despite the probability of failure.

St. Thomas Aquinas would later write about hope in his work *Summa Theologica*. In it, he describes hope as being something that is aimed towards a future good that is hard to attain but is not impossible. Aquinas believed that if something is impossible to attain, then there is no need for hope. He elaborates on this by comparing a hopeful person to a traveler. True hope is available only to those that are in transition. Those that are damned do not possess hope for something divine is impossible for them, nor do those that are blessed for they have no need of hope. The human experience is like a journey then the individual traveler is the perfect candidate

for being truly hopeful. However, this hope must be paired with rationality and reason for true hope cannot come without an exercise in one's reason. Lastly, Aquinas states that one must be reliant on one's self and the object of one's hope must be divine. To extend this to secular terms, the divine object of one's hope is the positive good one strives for. Thus, hoping for malicious things is not true hope, nor is hoping without reason. Furthermore, while one may find secondary objects (other people) of hope to help in the journey, they may not become the primary object of your hope. These secondary objects can help along the way but must never be the sole object of your hope unless one wants a negative outcome.

Peter Drahos adds to the secular and theistic notions of hope by providing three distinct categories of hope in the political or social realm. Drahos reasons that there are three categories of hope that are distinct from pseudo-hope and true hope. These categories are not contingent on being true or pseudo in order to exist properly. They are private hopes, collective hopes, and public hopes. Drahos states that private hopes are those held by individuals, collective hopes are those held by the population, and public hopes are those presented by political actors or those in power. Each one of these categories could be pseudo-hope or true hope. Of particular danger is public hope. Public hope can be dangerous in that it can be used to manipulate private and collective hopes if it goes unchecked.

In summation, hope exists in duality: pseudo-hope and true hope. In order to be truly hopeful, one must be truly courageous in the face of adversity. Thus, one cannot rely on their past experiences, on their prior good fortune, nor be ignorant of the situation at hand. Furthermore, hope is something that is aimed at a future good that is difficult but not impossible to attain. It must employ an act of reason and free will and must not rely on secondary sources of hope except as auxiliary parts. Moreover, there are three categories of hope: private, collective,

and public. Each of these has the potential to influence the other, but public is the most dangerous as it can be used to manipulate the other two for the personal gain of a political actor or entity.

### CHAPTER III

#### LEADING THE PUBLIC ASTRAY: THE PARTY'S WEAPONIZATION AND MANIPULATION OF HOPE IN ORWELL'S *1984*

Hope and Orwell's *1984* are inextricable. Often discussed in relation to its absence, hope plays an integral role in the plot of *1984* as it is weaponized and used as a method of manipulation and deceit. I have previously established that there are two kinds of hope, pseudo-hope and true hope, and established a framework from which to determine which is prominent. In this chapter, I argue that the antagonistic force of *1984*, the Party, manipulates the lives of its citizens, namely Winston Smith, to steer them in a path where they would be apt to possess pseudo-hope which in turn leads them to make choices that would ultimately lead to their demise. I argue this point by using the protagonist Winston as the exemplar. Winston is the would-be hero of *1984* who commits many hopeful acts but never possesses true hope. Through his actions, he constantly falls into the pitfall of pseudo-hope by placing his hope in others, by being unreasonable in his hopes and choices, by being aimless in his hopes, by being confident and not courageous, and being ignorant to the task at hand. I contend that the Party uses methods such as allowing Winston to purchase and write in a notebook, planting a fake dissenter in Winston's workplace in the form of O'Brien or building his confidence via Mr. Charrington, allowing Winston and Julia's affair to continue, and even providing a place for them to have their trysts in the form of Charrington's shop to guide Winston towards the path of pseudo-hope that they need in order to entrap and psychologically reprogram him to eventually love their agenda. Winston's story is a cautionary tale of what happens when a man allows himself to hope impurely; he will ultimately meet undesirable ends.

It has been established that hope is something intrinsic in man. It is a concept or a facet of humanity that arguably has many definitions and cannot be shaken. As a literary or philosophical concept, it is something that is directly connected to confidence and to experience. Furthermore, it is of significance because those that are truly hopeful are reasonable and do not either deceive themselves or aim towards a future good. Being such an important concept, one can see how “hope” can have a role in just about any genre of literature.

However, the presence and significance of hope in dystopian literature is one that bears examination. Dystopian literature, by design, deals with characters and societies that are in a state of despair. The very name of the genre indicates the opposite of a utopia—a place that is essentially perfect, though many would argue that all utopias are dystopias as well. Thus, the concept of hope as a literary construct is often dismissed or glanced over by the readers. Over-generalizations such as “the situation is hopeless” or “The protagonist gives people hope” are often about as deep as the analysis of hope in this genre goes.

Upon further review, however, it is evident that hope plays a much larger role than one might anticipate from a dystopian text. In fact, despair is necessary for there to be hope. Halpin writes, “hope needs despair as its opposite (for at the root of...hope is the consciousness of a state of affairs which invites us to despair’), despair itself is the enemy of progress because in the final analysis, it lacks faith in the future” (396). Thus, hope and despair have an intertwined relationship, not a mutually exclusive one. To be truly in despair means that one has no hope, and while one may argue that much dystopian literature leaves a reader with such a feeling, that is not to say that dystopian literature is void of all hope. Hope plays a vital and inextricable role in most stories classified as dystopian literature. That role, however, is as nefarious and Orwellian as the images conjured up when dystopian literature comes to mind. Hope is both a

driving force for the characters—in either pseudo or true form. Their foray into either pseudo or true hope is what determines a character's success in achieving the future outcome for which they set out to achieve. Furthermore, hope is weaponized by the ruling parties in some dystopian novels. These ruling parties use the concepts of public hope to manipulate the private hopes of their citizens. By doing so, they are able to misguide them towards venturing to pseudo-hope which inevitably leads them to in manifesting any sort of meaningful hope and planning. By doing so, the ruling parties are able to successfully sedate their citizens—as some hope is needed in order to function, but too much could lead to rebellion. Hope is effectively weaponized as a tool to lead citizens towards pseudo-hope, failure, and eventual subjugation.

I will focus on George Orwell's *1984* as the exemplar of dystopian literature to illustrate the point. It is arguably the most widely known of its genre and has permeated the culture of the English-speaking world more than any of its contemporaries. Thus, this chapter argues that hope as a concept is systematically weaponized and manipulated to lure would-be defectors and quell them before they lash out.

This process of manipulation is done by placing those who are not orthodox thinkers in precarious situations that would steer them towards disobedience of the party. The Party carefully manipulates would-be dissenters, like Winston, away from obtaining true hope as described above. The manipulation of their hopes creates pseudo-hope which leads them down a path of ill-advised ventures that ultimately ends with profound disappointment. This creates the type of unreasonable and impossible hope that constitutes pseudo-hope. Once this type of hope has overtaken an individual, then it is easy to manipulate that person's actions.

The Party employs methods that have been used by political entities throughout history. The Party taps into the three types of social hopes: private, collective, and public. These are

types of hopes that a society has at any given point in time. Private hope is that held by individuals, collective is that held by a community though not necessarily in an organized fashion, and public are the hopes put out by “political actors” as the official hopes of a society (Drahos 19). Public hope has been said to be the most dangerous. The Party is ambitious in its attempt to seek to control of all three facets of hope via misinformation and manipulation. They control the public hope with Big Brother; they control the public hope with acts of subterfuge and entrapments. All paths lead to pseudo-hope and in doing so, control by the Party. If they can control your hope, they can control you. It manipulates the public hope flawlessly.

Private hope is based on being able to imagine a fulfillment of a goal for either one’s self or for others. Often, private hopes are influenced by public institutions—such as governments. The idea is that the institutions to which one belongs to is are reliable sources of information, and thus their influence on an individual would be righteous. However, the danger falls when institutions have broken down (Drahos 31). That is to say that the confidence in such an institution has broken down, not that the institution itself has stopped functioning. In fact, quite the opposite happens in *1984*. The institutions from a utilitarian perspective are impeccable. For example, by having rallies such as “Two Minutes of Hate” where a “noise that set one’s teeth on edge and bristled the hair at the back of one’s neck” denotes that “The hate had started” (Orwell 11). During this time the face of a purported public enemy, Emanuel Goldstein, is shown on the screens. People proceed to hiss and yell. The Party also sends out reports of the daily effects of war—all fabricated, it is presumed. Even the entertainment is geared towards the manipulation of the public and collective hopes. Winston writes, “Last night [I went to] the flicks. All war films. One very good one of a ship full of refugees being bombed somewhere in the Mediterranean. Audience much amused by shots of a great huge fat man trying to swim away with a helicopter

after him” (Orwell 8). The Party employs propaganda techniques to ensure that the hopes and loyalties of the citizens are where they want them to be: hatred and anger directed at Goldstein or at some other enemy of the state. By organizing rallies, the Party promotes groupthink where even the sight of Goldstein “produced fear and anger automatically. He was an object of hatred more so than” the enemies they fought at war (Orwell 13). The war-films, the newsreels, and the rallies all promote groupthink where the public and collective hopes of the citizens become one: down with the enemies of Big Brother. The party facilitates the direction of their hopes via the institutions that the people are a party of (Drahos 21).

The majority of the public take their cues on hope and hate from these institutions—sometimes switching aim from one minute to the next. Total confidence and state-conditioned self-delusion are at work. However, because the information the Party disseminates is false and because the aims of the people are not good, this too is pseudo-hope. It is through these methods that the Party takes on the more ambitious undertaking of manipulating the private hopes of individuals as well. Why else would a ruling party spend so much time and effort on two low ranking citizens of the outer Party? That is unless they had to.

The Party must focus on individuals because public and collective hopes only constitute part of the hope in a person’s mind. It addresses the outward hope, but the Party wants to control all types of hope. Thus, it must create scenarios where citizens would be vulnerable emotionally and mentally. Furthermore, there are people like Winston who recall a time when institutions were not completely broken—in a moral sense. To Winston, these institutions have failed him. Winston and people like him “will no longer plan their futures based on these institutions and their hopes turn elsewhere, or despair replaces hope” (Drahos 31). The Party, Winston knows, is no longer a source of hope. Though he willingly participates in the day-to-day machinations of

his role in the party, Winston knows that there is something wrong with his situation. How can he simply make up people and erase people? How can this simply be accepted as fact? His trepidations about this work and the Party lead him to look for hope elsewhere.

The entirety of the charade that Winston is encased in is an exercise in manipulating hope; a notion that most citizens believed was their only escape. For example, Winston's co-worker and superior, O'Brien, is set up like the proverbial bait. When Winston sees O'Brien at the Two Minutes of Hate Winston thinks:

The other person was a man named O'Brien...In spite of his formidable appearance, he had a certain charm of manner. He had a trick of resettling his spectacles on his nose which was curiously disarming—in some indefinable way, curiously civilized...He felt deeply drawn to him...because of a secretly held belief—or perhaps not even a belief, merely a hope—that O'Brien's political orthodoxy was not perfect. Something in his face suggested it irresistibly. (11)

O'Brien's mannerisms are not coincidental. They are not personality quirks but rather are purposely aimed at catching the attention of one who would be unorthodox. He is meant to portray a type of intelligence that no completely orthodox person could have. At least, that's the message O'Brien's character portrays. It is revealed later that all of it was a play and O'Brien is, amongst other things, a skilled actor. This is the first attempt towards manipulation of the private hopes of an individual. By placing a character in the lives of those who might be unorthodox, they are guiding their private hopes towards an individual who might share those unorthodox views. Once there, they are then able to manipulate and control the person even further.

Once the Party has initiated its protocols via its institutions to influence the private hope of the individuals, most Party members are convinced; perfectly indoctrinated by the pomp and circumstance of the perennial "us vs. them" argument. Still, few remain unconvinced—at least, not convinced to the point of complete and utter orthodoxy as the party would like. There are the

proles, who by all accounts are complacent with their lives and are kept in check by simple means. Then there are the discontent members of the outer-party—the middle class of Oceania to which Winston belongs. Unlike the proles who have relative personal freedom, the Outer Party is closely under surveillance at all times, and their quality of life is quite low. This could be the worst of the three social classes. This is the class that brings about the most trouble for the party for this is the class that does most of the actual work and gets none of the benefits. This is the class where despair and hope are most apt to rise.

Someone from the Outer Party with unorthodox thinking is the individual that the Party needs to manipulate the most for he is the most dangerous to their system. The Party begins this process by starting with a flawed individual. Winston Smith, who is by all accounts an unremarkable man, cannot be a true symbol of hope nor does he ever really possess true hope. This is because Winston Smith is ignorant of the issues around him, puts all his faith in others, and relies on the crutch of experience when facing the odds. Winston, then, is a character whose flaws and actions lead him down a successive path of hope that is impure. Its foundation and its application toward a future goal are not in alignment with the tenants discussed in the chapter before, and because they are not, then Winston's hope is superficial.

As previously argued, the Party succeeds in manipulating Winston's hope by exploiting the different facets of false hope. By using the institutions available to them, they are able to manipulate Winston's private hope and lead him to make choices that will take him down a path of pseudo-hope that will lead him to despair and eventually to complacency. This is fundamental to the operation of the Party as governing entity. It cannot have a member of the Party simply live in fear, nor can they have them live in ignorance like the proles—the outer party has roles after all. Quite contrarily, the Party cannot have their members living in despair because a person who

is in a state of despair is not productive. Moreover, a person who is in despair might pass on their despairing thoughts to others. Despair could become a collective hope and from despair comes true hope, and from true hope, action. No, the party cannot allow this to be the case. So, it goes through elaborate means of manipulation of a person's private hopes in order to entrap them. By doing so, they shatter the optimistic illusions of any sort of freedom from the Party and perpetuate the "Big Brother is Watching" ideal. Furthermore, by removing all hope and nullifying any hopeful actions undertaken, they plunge the individual into despair. Once there, however, they psychologically annihilate the individual, until eventually the person "loves Big Brother" too.

Of course, by truly loving Big Brother the person has fully and truly integrated the values, beliefs, and hopes of Big Brother into their own—public and private. Thus, the Party makes sure to provide instances where a person verging into unorthodoxy could see a glimmer of positivity and mistake it for hope. However, the party ensures that whatever this becomes is aimless and thus cannot lead to true hope. The Party makes sure that everything done is kept in secret, thus ensuring the complete ignorance of the individual as he pursues action. Additionally, the party manipulates the interpersonal relationships of its populous as it purposefully places spies amongst the populace. These spies are there to both inform on potential "thought-criminals" but more importantly they encourage thought-criminals to action by giving subtle clues. By doing this, the Party manipulates the dissenter, Winston, to put his faith in people. As previously stated, hope can never rely on someone else. Thus this again leads to pseudo-hope. Lastly, the Party creates situations that lull the dissenter into a false sense of security. They allow small trespasses to occur repeatedly in order to allow a false sense of security to overtake the individual, thus setting them up for entrapment.

This leads the protagonist to two other pseudo-hopes: experience and cheerful optimism. This is crucial in that while those members that dissent have a glimmer hope, it must be quelled. It has been established that one must have hope in order to have despair, but too much hope will be problematic. However, one cannot simply remove hope. It must be learned or given away. It is the aim of the Party to take that sliver of hope that shines within the human breast and add tinder to it to make it rise into a flame. Then, when the fire of hope is ablaze in the heart of a person, the Party snuffs it out and completes the person's descent into despair. Once the person is in despair, then the reshaping can take place, and the individual is taught to love Big Brother and accept the hopes and aspirations of the Party, public, collective, and private. This is the Party's ultimate goal.

Thus, it is my contention that *1984*'s antagonistic force "The Party" uses techniques that guide a would-be hero and symbol of true hope down the path of pseudo-hopes in an attempt to purge the essence of humanity from him and reshape it to fit their needs before ultimately erasing him from existence. This path leads Winston to encounter various symbols of hope and consequently put faith in said symbols to commit a folly from which he can never recover. Through the complex machinations of the Party, they aim to strip what is left of individuality, free thought, and hope and make him a compliant member of the Party. However, it is not enough for the Party to simply receive a confession or a plea of guilt or even an oath to service; the Party requires that the person lose all hope in their hearts and resign themselves to the Party's control willingly. Thus, as if verifying Aristotle's notions, *1984* shows the reader how someone who deals only with pseudo-hope can never attain glory, redemption, or salvation.

#### Walking the Line: Hope vs. Pseudo-Hope

When Winston is introduced in the novel, he is a character who is defiantly-obedient.

He's an orthodox member with just a flicker of something that makes him different from most of the population. Orwell writes, "this, he thought with a sort of vague distaste—this was London, the chief city of Airstrip One...he tried to squeeze out some childhood memory that should tell him whether London had always been quite like this" (Orwell 3). Winston is described as a working member of the Party, yet he has a "vague distaste" for the city that he lives in, or rather for the condition of the city that he lives in. Being a person who was alive before The Party took control, he holds in his mind memories of how it used to be. Unlike Winston, the population—that is, the majority of the Outer Party and the proles—are content in their day-to-day lives placing their hope in (an almost abstract) figure of Big Brother. To them, Big Brother is the ultimate goal and source of hope. They look to the state and to this figure for the comfort they require in their lives in times of perpetual war. The entire population is engaged in pseudo-hope and is willfully ignorant of their position. Winston, however, sticks out because he vaguely remembers a time before Big Brother was the ultimate source of one's hope. To Winston, a character who is born of a different world, the innate tinder of hope that lies in his breast rejects the idea of life. Still, he can't seem to bring it to the forefront. Orwell writes, "it was no use., he could not remember: nothing remained of his childhood except a series of bright-lit tableaux, occurring against no background and mostly unintelligible" (Orwell 3). While Winston cannot explicitly remember his childhood, there is a sense in him that things must have been different. For a brief moment in the novel, Winston is truly hopeful and courageous; his hope is illuminating the present and highlighting his own dissatisfaction with it. After all, when the reader is introduced to Winston he is "sitting in the alcove [of his flat], and keeping well back, Winston was able to remain outside the range of the telescreen [surveillance device]" (Orwell 6). Winston proceeds to open the book he bought under questionable circumstances in a shop. The

act of possessing the book is not illegal since there are technically no laws, but he is fairly certain that his actions if discovered will lead to death (Orwell 6). He is already committing a dangerous act that could be construed as treason. He further exacerbates his situation, “his pen had slid voluptuously over the smooth paper, printing in large, neat capitals—DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER...over and over again, filling half the page” (Orwell 18). Winston writes this absentmindedly while ruminating on the day’s events. These words come from his subconscious as do his memories of a world different from his. How could he not be? He lived in a time before the Party took control. A time before terms such as double-think was a fact of life. For a few shining moments, Winston seems like a defiantly hopeful individual, one who will defy the Party and become the hero the audience longs for. One might even be convinced for a brief while that Winston is indeed a truly hopeful person. Yet, Winston falls victim to all the facets of pseudo-hope. First, Winston’s foray into pseudo-hope will be discussed via an analysis of the key moments in the plot. Then, the role of the Party in perpetrating Winston’s fall will be discussed.

Winston’s individuality from a time prior to the Party’s existence is still evident in him. Unlike most, he still hangs on to a bit of the past. He yearns for a time when life was different; he courageously defies the Party and hopes for a better future. He still holds in himself a semblance of a human being that was not totally converted by the Party. When he visits the normal shop on the free market, he is inclined to purchase a diary that may be incriminatory, partly because “the rule was not strictly kept” (Orwell 6). This diary represents that part of him that feels uneasy in the current state of things. It’s a connection to the past and a conduit to the future. It is in this instance that Winston, through his actions, perpetrates what the reader may mistake for true hope.

The early chapters of the novel show the audience Winston Smith engaging in what

might be considered in a taboo act: writing in a diary outside of the gazing and prying eyes of Big Brother. This is definitely an act of defiance and rebellion. It has been stated that when the institutions that one confides in fail the individual, then the individual looks towards other sources of hope. It is also true that external threats “lead to higher levels of hope” (Drahos 21). Winston has grown to distrust the government for which he works. He recounts the time that he found photographic proof of the Party’s lies. Orwell writes,

He came on a fragment of paper which had evidently been slipped in among the others and then forgotten. It was a half-page torn out of the *Times* of about ten years earlier—the top half of the page so that it included the date—and it contained a photograph of the delegates at some party function in New York. Prominent in the middle were Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford [confessed traitors] ... The point was that at both [of their] trials all three men had confessed that on that date they had been on Eurasian soil... they had betrayed important military secrets... There was only one possible conclusion: the confessions were lies. (78)

This is not a new discovery to Winston. The population knows that most confessions given by traitors are false, but this is “concrete evidence; it was a fragment of the abolished past, like a fossil bone which turns up in the wrong stratum and destroys a geological theory. It was enough to blow the Party to atoms if in some way it could have been published to the world and its significance made known” (Orwell 78). Winston realizes the importance of such a paper, but he also knows the risk. He proceeds to destroy it, as is his job, but the distrust is still there.

Winston also does not have faith in the public and collective hopes of his nation. Winston famously writes, “If there is hope...it lies in the proles” (Orwell 69). The proles are the largest population in Oceania, yet Winston has no faith that they will ever amount to anything. Winston ruminates, until they become conscious, they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious” (Orwell 69). Winston knows that the proles have the power to overthrow the government but also realizes that they are not apt to do so. They are ignorant of the extent of their plight. He knows that he is isolated in his hopes and in a situation that is

dangerous to his well-being. He knows that one minor slip in judgment and he will be erased from existence or worse. Winston feels the threat of his own orthodoxy, and due to this, he is spurred into that extra mental process that creates a sense of expectation and anticipation (Drahos 21). He is anticipating the act he is to commit though he does not have a plan where it will go. Halpin writes that “hope is interpreted not so much as a matter of positively looking forward—though that is a significant part of it—but a way of living prospectively in and engaging purposefully with the present” (395). So, while Winston’s outlook towards the future might not be instantly interpreted as one that is hopeful, he shows that he is indeed a hopeful individual due to the way that he engages with the present—by committing a small act of defiance that reaches simultaneously to a better past and a better future. Still, hope “has its hazards. Intense hope carries with it the dangers of intense disappointment” (Drahos 30).

One can assume that Winston has never previously rebelled against the Party. It is this first instance when he is about to open a diary and write that shows a strong innate presence in him. By making a choice to buy and write in this diary, Winston has briefly shown courage and a glimmer of what may become hope. This simple act of defiance allows one to hypothesize what is to come: a treaty exposing the truth? A scathing article rebelling against Big Brother? A plan geared toward an uprising? Before he writes down his words and expounds on his thoughts, the acts may become courage should he implicitly follow certain tenants of what constitutes true hope.

Orwell writes, “The thing that he was about to do was to open a diary. This was not illegal (nothing was illegal since there were no longer any laws), but if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced-labor camp” (6). Yet, despite the consequences, Winston is still compelled to follow

through with his actions. Winston proceeds to “[dip] the pen into the ink and then faltered for just a second. A tremor had gone through his bowels. To mark the paper was the decisive act” (Orwell 7). At a cursory glance, one could see how Winston at this moment is courageous and hopeful. Gravlee writes, “courage is displayed precisely where there are fears to face (i.e., where there is no confidence in a positive outcome)” (463). Undoubtedly, Winston displays courage for a split-second. Winston is definitely scared as he ruminates about the certainty that “it would be punished by death, or at least twenty-five years in a forced-labor camp” and how he didn’t think “anything would be needed but courage” (Orwell 6-7). He starts showing physical symptoms of his fear and begins “writing in sheer panic,” lost in a blur of his own incohesive thoughts (Orwell 6). Winston has no qualms that this will end badly, but he trudges on regardless. Winston shows bravery, courage, and even defiance. He is at the peak of his sympathetic descriptions at the beginning of the plot: the hero of the story, defiant and courageous.

The reader is quick to find out, however, that Winston, from the get-go, has fallen victim to the one pitfalls of pseudo-hope: aimlessness and despair. Though he truly shows courage for the brief moment that he begins to write, it is misplaced as it has no aim, and furthermore, he expects nothing positive to come out of it. As Winston reveals his thoughts, he shows that his hope is ill-conceived for it is aimless despite how brave and risky it may have been. It may be appealing to some that the act of rebellion simply occurs and that alone may constitute a radical and romantic act of defiance but following the framework of hope that has already been established, Winston’s act of defiance is folly. Orwell writes, “A sense of complete helplessness had descended upon him...for whom, it suddenly occurred to him to wonder, was he writing this diary? For the future, for the unborn. His mind hovered for a moment...how could you communicate with the future? It was of its nature impossible. Either the future would resemble

the present, in which case it would not listen to him, or it would be different from it, and his predicament would be meaningless” (7). Winston realizes the predicament that he is in. Though his intentions are good, he has no aim, no plan. As stated before, hope is a “focused enterprise in which people are willing to stand aside from the beliefs that come most naturally to them and to order their mental and active lives around more galvanizing assumption: around a cognitive plan” (Pettit 159). Furthermore, Thucydides believes that “those who hope [poorly] have a poor understanding of their situation [and] fail to come up with good plans” (Bloeser & Stahl). It is evident that Winston’s small act of defiance is neither focused nor a plan. Furthermore, it becomes evident later that Winston is ignorant of the true complexity of the situation. Therefore, a scene that introduces the protagonist and gives the reader a glimpse into what might be—a possible figurehead in a rebellion to come, perhaps—is quickly disproven as one sees the true nature of Winston. He is a flawed man, living in even more flawed times. He is limited in his actions and a pawn in the political game for power the Party controls. This is evident given the incident with the picture. Winston has a moment where he holds a concrete piece of evidence that the world he lives in is falsified; the crimes many were accused of a ruse. Yet, despite realizing its significance, Winston proceeds to burn the photo. Winston sees the gravity of the situation: “[He returned] straight to work. As soon as he saw what the photograph was, and what it meant, he covered it up with another sheet of paper. Luckily, when he unrolled it, it had been upside-down from the point of view of the telescreen... [he was] tormented by the fear that some accident...would betray him. Then, without uncovering it again, he dropped the photograph into the memory hole...within another minute, perhaps, it would have crumbled into ashes” (Orwell 79). Winston’s potential for heroism and his lack of fortitude to reach for it are evident in this

episode. Winston fantasizes about what could be but does not want to partake in actions that may actually lead those fantasies to fruition for he feels it will be futile.

This is Winston's first critical mistake: he has no plan for his hopeful rebellious act. Hope and hopeful acts have to be "focused on a future goal" (Cartwright 167). Winston's only goal and desire here is to write in the book. There is no object—neither human nor divine. His hope is "superficial." This type of hope is argued as "the lowest common denominator of analysis" (Carwright 167). Winston's actions, though careful, show that he is not focused on a future goal, but rather is just living in the moment, hoping—or rather wishing—that he doesn't get caught. He does not have a goal when he meets a person whom he believes to be a fellow dissenter: O'Brien. During the Two Minutes of Hate, a moment passes, and Winston and O'Brien's eyes meet. Winston is convinced that O'Brien is on his side. Orwell writes, "such incidents never had any sequel. All that they did was to keep alive in him the belief, or hope, that others besides himself were the enemies of the Party" (17). Winston tries to hide his emotions but can't fully do it. In this lapse, he makes eye contact with someone he thinks is with him and almost immediately he puts his faith in him. Still, once this happens, despite the welling of emotions and optimism in Winston's spirit, he does not have a follow-up action. It is true that these events have no follow-up. In fact, they could not without risking exposure and execution. So again, we find Winston in a situation with the potential to redeem him as a hopeful man and where he commits a hopeful action, but he does not have the conviction or means to follow with a plan of action. He holds hope in his heart but not in his mind.

Winston also allows himself to be sucked into Julia's world of defiance. Julia does not care for full-on rebellion or big ideas; she enjoys rebellion against the Party. While she may be committing hopeful acts, she is not a hopeful person. She is largely ignorant of the severity of the

Party's reach. Orwell writes, "she would not accept it as a law of nature that the individual is always defeated...part of her...believed that it was somehow possible to construct a secret world in which you could live as you chose. All you needed was luck and cunning and boldness. She did not understand that there was no such thing as happiness, that the only victory lay in the far future" (Orwell 135). Julia is naïve and ignorant about the complexities of life and the Party. She has no aim in which she points her rebellious acts; she merely does them to ameliorate the life that she already hates.

Winston is wiser to the world. He knows that people are vaporized for lesser offenses than they have committed. Yet, the excitement and novelty of their relationship allows Winston to turn a blind eye to reason. He chooses to follow in her ignorance: a dangerous combination of being unreasonable and willfully ignorant. When Winston mentions their inevitable deaths at the hands of the Party, the following exchange takes place; "We're not dead yet," said Julia prosaically. "Not physically. Six months, a year—five years, conceivably. I am afraid of death. You are young, so presumably you're more afraid of it than I am. Obviously we shall put it off as long as we can. But it makes very little difference. So long as human beings stay human, death and life are the same things" [said Winston]. "Oh, rubbish...stop talking about dying" (Orwell 136). Julia proceeds to plan the next time they will meet. Telling him that he must go a different route in order to avoid suspicion. Winston complacently watches as Julia draws out a map in the dust. It's evident that Winston realizes the dangers of their tryst, but he decides that he shall continue with their affair and remain unreasonably ignorant.

Furthermore, Winston falls prey to ignorance outside of Juliet's influence and by design of the Party. He is ignorant of the true extent of the dangers around him and ignorant of the intentions of the people he deals with. For example, he is ignorant of O'Brien's true intentions.

When O'Brien reveals himself, Winston exclaims, "'they've got you too!'... 'They got me a long time ago' said O'Brien with a mild, almost regretful irony" (Orwell 238). Even after being caught, Winston holds on to the idea that O'Brien is on his side. He is still ignorant that O'Brien was part of the ruse the whole time. Moreover, Winston is ignorant of Mr. Charrington's involvement and that they're being surveilled in the shop. It's revealed when Winston and Julia are speaking, and a robotic voice responds to Winston's words, "'You are the dead,' said an iron voice behind them... '[the surveillance device] was behind the picture,' breathed Julia" (Orwell 220). The revelation of the device reveals that they have been ignorant of the machinations of the Party, of being surveilled, and of the danger they were in. Hope and Stafford refer to those who hope as Winston does to have "insufficient knowledge or are easily swayed by wishful thinking" (Bloeser and Stahl 2017); and Aristotle states that those who are ignorant are inferior even to those who have confidence of optimistic experience—for those who are ignorant of the dangers at hand do not have the self-reliance that the confident do, but rather they confide in their situation. A person who has the confidence of ignorance—as Winston has—has not faced dangers and come out safely, but rather has not knowingly faced dangers at all (Gravlee 464).

Winston becomes a cautionary tale for the danger of hope satiating a desire for something good; an example for hope corrupting rather than helping. Winston's hope for future acts of rebellion, for playing his role in upsetting the status quo—but at a safe distance—and his hope for a better world are like Novocain to his senses. Previously, his instincts had been sharp and kept him on his toes and away from the prying eyes of Big Brother, but the further he descends into his own machinations, the further into pseudo-hope he goes. Winston is duped into ignorance and is also complacently and willfully ignorant. A sharper Winston, not placated by his feelings towards Julia and his notions of rebellion, might have picked up on cues that told

him he was being watched the whole time; that the Party had in fact orchestrated every minute detail.

The Party is there the whole time; spying on him; keeping an eye on a possible thought criminal, cancer in the Party's perfect system. This can be inferred for instance at the moment when Winston and Julia first realize that they have been found out. There in their "love nest," the two contemplate the freeness of birds who sing for themselves and not for the Party and not for anyone else. They contemplate how "the birds sang, the proles sang, [and how] the Party did not sing" (Orwell 221). They ruminate on how all around the world there is suffering and indignation and how all around the world there is this ubiquitous figure that imposes backbreaking labor from birth until death—and yet, still remains there singing. Singing like the proles and the birds did. Unrequited; unforced. The birds and the proles alike sing as if something more is compelling them to. They sing as if in defiance of the very misery that they live in. "If there was any hope," Winston had previously thought "it lay in the proles" (Orwell 69).

It is at this precise moment, after months of furtive meetings and building of pseudo-hope that the Party decides to strike. It's at the very moment when the two members have finished the unorthodox action of furtively making love in and outside of marriage begin to realize that there is something that is indomitable in nature in the form of music—hope. It's at this very precise moment that the Party reveals itself. Orwell writes:

"We are the dead," [Winston] said.

"We are the dead," echoed Julia dutifully.

"You are the dead," said an iron voice behind them.

They sprang apart. Winston's entrails seemed to have turned into ice. He could see the white all-round the irises of Julia's eyes. Her face had turned a milky yellow. The smear of rouge that was still on each cheekbone stood out sharply, almost as though unconnected with the skin beneath.

“You are the dead,” repeated the iron voice.

“It was behind the picture,” breathed Julia.

“It was behind the picture,” said the voice. “Remain exactly where you are. Make no movement until you are ordered.”

It was starting; it was starting at last! They could do nothing except stand gazing into one another’s eyes. (221)

This chilling description of a couple’s hopes being systematically shattered is unnerving. It’s a dramatic and blood-curling revelation that makes the reader realize that the hopeful actions of both Winston and Julia are all for naught. Even still, the Party’s methodical breakdown of this couple’s psyche and spirit is just beginning.

As the story progresses, Winston’s ignorance is further elaborated on when he is in the Ministry of Love—an ironic name, given the actions that take place. It’s interesting to note that the ministry is named after love, one of the virtues of faith according to Aquinas. Aquinas argues that hope is most effective when paired with the two virtues, faith and love. In an ironic twist, the breakdown of hope is most effective when the pseudo-hopes of Winston and the Ministry of Love are joined to break down Winston. O’Brien reveals himself to Winston as a member of the Outer Party who has been part of the chicanery. After merciless beatings and mental abuse, O’Brien speaks to Winston, “‘Don’t worry, Winston; you are in my keeping. For seven years I have watched over you. Now the turning point has come. I shall save you; I shall make you perfect.’ He was not sure whether it was O’Brien’s voice; but it was the same voice that had said to him, ‘We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness,’ in that other dream, seven years ago” (Orwell 244). O’Brien confirms that they have been monitoring Winston for some time. They even know that Winston’s worst fear is rats, something that was revealed the first time that Julia and Winston visited the room (Orwell 144). O’Brien states that he personally has been “‘watching over” Winston for the past seven years. However, he proceeds to ask Winston about a photograph that was in Winston’s possession “some years ago.” Winston recalls that this is the

photograph that proved the Party's lies; it was palpable evidence. The photo depicted three traitors to the state, Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford in New York. This disproved the official story that they were on enemy soil betraying military secrets (Orwell 78). He recalls that it was "eleven years ago" (Orwell 247). It was immediately destroyed. This is meant to unnerve Winston and show him just how long he has been watched, just how far the reach of the Party goes.

Due to the Party being involved in Winston's life the whole time, Winston's act of defiance has been corrupted. The hope that he holds in his heart and his acts of rebellion are no longer a shining beacon of light in an otherwise dark landscape, but rather a black hole in a seemingly endless sea of gray. His hopeful act to put a dent in the Party's armor was calculated and orchestrated by those whom he tried to defy. He was ignorant of the matter, and thus, due to his ignorance, he is experiencing pseudo hopes. Aristotle states that a person cannot be confident or truly courageous when faced with consequences that he or she does not fully understand. So is the case of Winston Smith. He cannot show true virtue or courage when he does not know the true extent of the Party's reach.

Winston also falls into a second habit that leads to pseudo-hope: placing one's faith in others. Aquinas "warns that one should not put one's hope in other people, except as secondary or instrumental sources of help" (Cartwright 79). This requires one to use one's sense of reason and sensibility—something that Winston neglects as events start to unfold. First, he puts his hope blindly in O'Brien. He lays his hopes not so much on the real man, but on the fictionalized version of this man that he created in his head. He also blindly and unreasonably puts his hopes on Julia—a woman with whom he has no future. Finally, he also puts his hopes on Mr.

Charrington and the proles. To Winston, they are part of a version of the world which no longer exists. They serve as a positive reminder of what once was and what could be again.

The first time that his faith and hope are proven to be unmerited happens at Mr. Charrington's shop. After one of their encounters, a voice reveals that they have been watched the whole time. The first emotional blow is intentionally from someone familiar. Orwell writes, "and then another quite different voice, a thin, cultivated voice which Winston had the impression of having heard before, struck in: 'and by the way, while we are on the subject, *Here comes a candle to light you to bed, here comes a chopper to chop off your head!*'"(222 emphasis Orwell's). Winston proceeds to wonder about Mr. Charrington. His questions are soon answered. Orwell writes:

Mr. Charrington came into the room...Something had also changed in Mr. Charrington's appearance...The cockney accent had disappeared; Winston suddenly realized whose voice it was that he had heard a few moments ago on the telescreen. Mr. Charrington was still wearing his old velvet jacket, but his hair, which had been almost white, had turned black. Also, he was not wearing his spectacles. He gave Winston a single sharp glance...it occurred to Winston that for the first time in his life he was looking, with knowledge, at a member of the Thought Police. (224)

These two acts of the Thought Police are deliberate ways of breaking down any hope that Winston has. The dramatic fashion in which Charrington reveals himself is a form of psychological warfare intended to hurt the individual; to show that placing your hopes on the wrong person will lead to betrayal and failure. The only person in whom you should place hopes in is Big Brother.

Then there is Julia—the woman that Winston loves. From the onset of the story, much like he does with O'Brien, Winston creates a fictionalized version of Julia in his mind. He originally believes that she is an orthodox member of the Party. He initially hates her and admits it to her. Winston also believes that she is an amateur spy, zealous for the Party who had taken it upon herself to listen for any in discrepancies or an actual member of the Thought Police.

Orwell writes, “Why was she watching him? Why did she keep following him around?...probably she was not actually a member of the Thought Police, but then again it was precisely the amateur spy who was the greatest danger of all” (62). Furthermore, Winston later tells her, “If you really want to know, I imagined that you had something to do with the Thought Police” (121). She laughs at the idea and proceeds to talk to Winston about her hatred of the Party and Big Brother. She also goes on to mention that she has had sex “scores of times,” something that is looked upon with contempt in the Party. Orwell writes of Winston, “Anything that hinted at corruption always filled him with a wild hope. Who knew? Perhaps the Party was rotten under the surface, its cult of strenuousness and self-denial simply a sham concealing iniquity” (125). Immediately when Julia speaks of committing an act of rebellion against the Party Winston is impassioned. His feelings towards her are exacerbated by the feelings he has against the Party; Winston exclaims, “Listen. The more men you’ve had, the more I love you” (125). Her unorthodoxy excites Winston, but it is this same quality that leads Winston towards pseudo-hope and failure.

The biggest misplacement of hope for Winston, however, is in O’Brien who is a member of the Inner Party and has an important position. When Winston sees O’Brien he “felt deeply drawn to him...because of a secretly held belief—or perhaps not even a belief, merely a hope—that O’Brien’s political orthodoxy was not perfect. Something in his face suggested it irresistibly. And again, perhaps it was not even unorthodoxy that was written in his face, but simply intelligence” (Orwell 11). Winston believes here that O’Brien is a person he can talk to, someone who might share his beliefs. Winston, like so many people in dire situations, is looking for someone to share in his struggle; to join him. Winston further exacerbates his hope for a comrade in arms when

momentarily he caught O'Brien's eye...there was a fraction of a second when their eyes met, and for as long as it took to happen Winston knew---yes, he *knew!*—that O'Brien was thinking the same thing as himself. An unmistakable message had passed. It was as though their two minds had opened and the thoughts were flowing from one into the other through their eyes. 'I am with you,' O'Brien seemed to be saying. 'I know precisely what you are feelings. I know all about your contempt, your hatred, your disgust. But don't worry; I am on your side!' (Orwell 17; emphasis Orwell's)

Winston knows however that whatever exchange they had could never be reciprocated, nor could it be repeated. Doing so could cause serious harm to them both. This is also where Winston begins to slip from being a man who is possessing true hope to someone who accumulates false hope. He unreasonably puts his hopes on someone whom he's never had a conversation with. O'Brien becomes a symbol to Winston, something that shows that there are others like him around the world. His faith in humanity is placed squarely on O'Brien's shoulders. Winston has lost sight of his true hope and places his pseudo-hope and faith squarely in O'Brien; an action that may—and does—lead to profound disappointment. Winston's hope is proved to be invalid once he is captured. The Party deliberately used someone to garner sympathy and fish out someone like Winston for this purpose. While in his cell, Winston fantasizes about O'Brien. He imagines O'Brien as a savior. The sympathetic glance he had exchanged with him must have meant something. Orwell writes, "sometimes with a fading hope he thought of O'Brien and the razor blade [that he would send to Winston to kill himself in the event of a capture]. It was thinkable that the razor blade might arrive concealed in his food if he were ever fed" (Orwell 238). As Aquinas states, hope cannot be placed primarily on people. One's faith and hope must be directed at a greater good, and people may serve only as secondary sources towards that good.

As Winston sat in his cell in the Ministry of love, O'Brien walks in. He is so taken aback by pure excitement and emotion that "for the first time in many years he forgot the presence of the telescreen" (Orwell 238). He ignorantly asks, "They've got you too!" to which O'Brien responds to with a "mild, almost regretful irony." O'Brien elaborates: "They got me a long time

ago... You knew this, Winston... Don't deceive yourself. You did know it—you have always known it" (Orwell 238-239). By using O'Brien to deliver a blow to Winston's ego—and to instruct the guards to deliver an actual physical blow to Winston, the Party continues to tinker and toy with Winston's emotions. For a moment, Winston allows himself to believe that there may be help in the form of the Brotherhood and O'Brien, but in the midst of his pain, under the gaze of a man whom he entrusted, Winston realizes that "[i]n the face of pain there are no heroes, no heroes, he thought over and over as he writhed on the floor, clutching uselessly at his disabled left arm" (239).

O'Brien continues to be an instrumental piece in the torture that is applied to Winston. More than just being a figure of hope for Winston, O'Brien has become the person who controls Winston's fate now. It is this thought that fills Winston's head and one of the key elements into the breakdown of Winston. Winston

had the feeling that O'Brien was at his elbow, just out of sight. It was O'Brien who was directing everything. It was he who set the guards onto Winston and who prevented them from killing him. It was he who decided when Winston should scream with pain, when he should have a respite, when he should be fed, when he should sleep, when the drugs should be pumped into his arm. It was he who asked the questions and suggested the answers. He was the tormentor; he was the protector, he was the inquisitor, he was the friend. (Orwell 244)

O'Brien, who had been the beacon of hope for Winston, now becomes everything to him. This isn't merely a coincidence, but rather this is something that the Party has deliberately orchestrated. From the very moment that Winston heard the words "We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness," in his dream, it has been O'Brien who has been the orchestrator of Winston's life (25). Thus, it must be O'Brien who breaks him.

O'Brien is adept to doing this because Winston places his hope so wholeheartedly in him. So much so, that earlier in the novel, Winston unwittingly confesses to his crimes before even really committing an act—a detail that, in a world where thought crime is a punishable offense,

is moot. When Julia and Winston meet with O'Brien in his office, he is ready to accept O'Brien as a savior and companion. O'Brien begins with a series of routine-sounding questions that Winston gives an affirmative response to: "are you prepared to give your lives? Prepared to murder? To commit acts of sabotage? To betray your country to foreign powers? You are prepared to heat, to forge, to blackmail, to corrupt the minds of children, to distribute habit-forming drugs, to encourage prostitution, to disseminate venereal diseases—to do anything which is likely to cause demoralization and weaken the power of the Party?" Winston replies, "Yes" (Orwell 172). Then, when O'Brien asks if Julia and Winston are willing to betray each other, Julia immediately responds "no" and after some hesitation, Winston replies "no", as well. They have effectively and unwittingly confessed their treachery to the Party and revealed their weakness: each other.

To Winston, O'Brien is a symbol of hope. He is a symbol that is opposite of Big Brother. O'Brien represents that there is still some hope in the world. This has all been a lie. O'Brien confesses his involvement: "Don't worry, Winston; you are in my keeping. For seven years I have watched over you. Now the turning point has come. I shall save you; I shall make you perfect." He elaborates his decision to torture Winston; his need to make him perfect. O'Brien states, "I am taking trouble with you, Winston,'... 'because you are worth trouble.'"(Orwell 245). He then proceeds to explain to Winston that Winston is, in fact, mentally ill and O'Brien plans to fix him via reprehensible means. O'Brien explains that people are not brought to the Ministry of Love merely to confess or to be punished. O'Brien outlines the purpose of the ordeal, "[it is] to cure you! To make you sane...The Party is not interested in the overt act: the thought is all we care about. We do not merely destroy our enemies; we change them" (Orwell 253). Thus, it is made clear the purpose of the elaborate ruse. It is not enough to simply kill or eliminate The

Party's enemies or even make them belt out false confessions like the Soviets used to do, but rather the enemies need to be converted. Truly converted.

There are to be no martyrdoms in this process either. O'Brien proceeds to detail where purges from history like the Spanish Inquisition and the Crusades failed: they fought corruption by becoming corrupted. O'Brien elaborates

“You have read of the religious persecutions of the past... They set out to eliminate heresy and ended up perpetuating it. For every heretic that was burned at the stake, thousands of others rose up. Why was that? Because the Inquisition killed its enemies in the open, and killed them while they were still unrepentant; in fact, it killed them because they were unrepentant. Men were dying because they would not abandon their true beliefs. Naturally, all the glory belonged to the victim and all the shame to the Inquisitor who burned them.” (Orwell 253)

He assures Winston that the Party would not make the same mistake that neither the Inquisition nor the Nazis had. The Nazis, O'Brien says, at least got the idea of not having martyrs right, yet the execution of their plan, with their obviously forced confessions, led to the same result. He says, “The dead men had become martyrs and their degradation was forgotten” (Orwell 254). This is routine for the Party. They must not only destroy their enemies. They must convince them. They must win.

Another fault of Winston's falls perfectly in line with Aristotle's first pseudo-hope: confidence. Aristotle believes that one “possible way of finding value in hopefulness would be to find some connection between the hopefulness and some intrinsically valued virtue.... [he] does suggest in places there are connections to be made between the two via the concept of confidence” (Gravlee 265). Aristotle believes that a person who is a coward is pessimistic because he fears everything. However, a courageous man is confident because there is an implied hopefulness (Gravlee 465). Thus, a courageous man is hopeful.

While Winston is neither outright confident nor courageous at a cursory glance, one can appreciate the courage in the small acts in his rebellion when analyzing the despotic totalitarian

world that he is a part of. Gravlee explains, “[T]his sets up a close relationship among the three concepts of confidence, courage, and hopefulness...as Aristotle claims here, the courageous person is hopeful; it is not simply the case that the hopeful person is courageous. One’s hopefulness, and one’s confidence can be derived from non-courageous sources; some types of hopefulness and confidence are not constitutive of courage” (465). Thus, hope and courage can be corrupted by the presence of confidence or over-confidence.

Winston’s courage and hope originally derive from a pure source: a rebellious act against the Party. But as he continues to go further down the path of defiance, Winston’s true hope becomes corrupted by his experience. From the onset, the first time that Winston and Julia rendezvous at a grassy knoll, there is an inherent ignorance to their actions—ignorance is another of the pseudo-hopes that I have discussed. Winston is ignorant while Julia is confident. Winston is concerned with the safety of the location and Julia promptly assures him that “[she’d] been here before” (Orwell 119). Thus, her hope stems from her prior experiences there, the confidence that there have been no alarms, and that “there’s nothing big enough to hide a mike in” (Orwell 119). Of course, Winston is reassured by this information and his questions are quelled for the time being. There is a confidence that is building within him that swells with each arranged meeting and successful escapade with Julia. Even as early as their first meeting, Julia states that “[they] can come here again...it’s generally safe to use any hide-out twice...but not for another month or two of course” (Orwell 126).

Then there’s Mr. Charrington’s shop where Winston visited and bought contraband and remained unscathed. He also had placed some of his faith and hope in Mr. Charrington, so he decides that it is a safe place to frequent. Furthermore, the Party is trying to convey that is that there is no escaping the Party and that every waking moment of their rebellion had been carefully

orchestrated—they reveal that one of the other two people that Winston had trusted, Mr. Charrington, had, in fact, been a member of the Thought Police. Winston held Charrington and the song “Bells of St. Clemens” in the same regard that he had held that paperweight in the room he and Julia used; he believed that Charrington, like song and the paper weight, had existed outside of the Party’s influence. The cockney accent was a clear indicator that he was, in fact, one of the proles, one of the people that held the key to a revolution, to a better future. Winston believes in Mr. Charrington to the extent that he allows himself to trust him despite his best logical oppositions. He trusts him and conversely, Charrington entrusts his songs and stories of his times to Winston. Orwell writes, “the room was a world, a pocket of the past where extinct animals could walk. Mr. Charrington, thought Winston, was another extinct animal” (Orwell 15). Winston has complete confidence in Charrington. The thought that he may be a member of the Inner Party or even that he might betray him never crosses Winston’s mind. To him, they are on the same side: members of a minority of people who do not accept the world as it is and remember some good of the world that was.

However, this is all an elaborate ruse meant to spike the feeling of confidence in Winston and Julia. It is meant to lead them down the path that many athletes and warriors have gone before. It allows them to experience the pseudo-hope of experience and confidence and it is because of this that this plot is so effective. Winston ruminates on what he’s done the first time he rents the room out for his tryst: “Folly, folly, his heart kept saying: conscious, gratuitous, suicidal folly! Of all the crimes a Party member could commit, this one was the least possible to conceal,” and he knows that it is also “folly” to visit a place more than once for such an illicit event (Orwell 137). Winston knows that what he is doing is ill-advised—though, initially he believes it to be so because adultery is hard to conceal. Furthermore, he knows that “what was

happening [then] could not last long. There were times when “the fact of impending death seemed as palpable as the bed they lay on, and they would cling together with a sort of despairing sensuality, like a damn soul grasping his last morsel of pleasure when the clock is within five minutes of striking” (Orwell 151). Julia and Winston frequent this place and allow themselves to be unreasonable in their actions due to their already-established ignorance and overconfidence. Later on Winston thinks. “Folly, folly, folly...It was inconceivable that they could frequent this place for more than a few weeks without being caught. But the temptation of having a hiding place that was truly their own, indoors and near at hand, had been too much for both of them” (Orwell 139). He knows that he had unreasonable hope and that was the path to damnation. Their hopes, however unrealistic, lie within each other and wherever there is someone standing up against the Party in a small way. Thus, there are two facets of pseudo-hope at work: confidence and placing hope in others.

It is this confidence that puts Winston and Julia in a precarious situation. It is this confidence that allows the Party to enact their entrapment in such a dramatic and soul-sucking fashion. The Party recognizes the power and usefulness of hope and consequently creates a method of subjugation that hits human beings at the very fundamental level. They build hope up and then bring it crashing down. They weaponize hope.

The Party orchestrates Winston’s demise because, as O’Brien tells him in the Ministry of Love, “[Y]ou are worth trouble. You know perfectly well what is the matter with you. You have known it for years, though you have fought against it the knowledge. You are mentally deranged” (Orwell 245). O’Brien engages in doublethink perfectly—as a good Party member should. He continues to state that reality is in the mind of a person and that it “is impossible to see reality except by looking through the eyes of the Party” (Orwell 249). This is what Winston

has to relearn. He needs an “act of self-destruction, an effort of the will. [He] must be humble before [he] can become sane” (Orwell 249). O’Brien believes that Winston has a mental illness—he simultaneously knows this isn’t true, but uses doublethink. He details the purpose of extracting confessions in such elaborate way and states that the Party manipulates public and private hopes as well as tortures people in order for them to have their hopes directed to the collective goal: Big Brother. O’Brien asks Winston why they bring people to the Ministry of love. Unsatisfied with Winston’s answer, O’Brien exclaims, “No! Not merely to extract your confession, nor to punish you...to make you sane! Will you understand, Winston, that no one whom we bring to this place ever leaves our hands uncured? We are not interested in those stupid crimes that you have committed...We do not merely destroy our enemies. We change them” (Orwell 253). Thus, hopes are manipulated in an effort to change the population. O’Brien continues to brag that “All the confessions that are uttered here are true...above all, we do not allow the dead to rise up against us. You must stop imagining that posterity will vindicate you, Winston. Posterity will never hear of you” (Orwell 255).

Additionally, O’Brien states that the reason they go to such lengths to manipulate the lives and reprogram an individual is that Big Brother must be loved. Only then does the Inner Party have true power. For them, power is paramount. They are not using it as means to an end, but power is the end (Orwell 254). Moreover, people like Winston, as O’Brien says:

“Are a flaw in the pattern...You are a stain that must be wiped out...When you finally surrender to us, it must be of your own free will. We do not destroy the heretic because he resists us; so long as he resists us we never destroy him...We make him one of ourselves before we kill him. It is intolerable to us that an erroneous thought should exist anywhere in the world, however secret and powerless it may be...we make the brain perfect before we blow it out...no one whom we bring to this place ever stands out against us. Everyone is washed clean.” (Orwell 255)

The Party’s ultimate goal is the elimination of the people they deem as enemies. However, the Party is not simply content with killing their opposition—after all, in a totalitarian government

simply killing off people would be too easy, and rudimentary. It would serve no real purpose. Rather the Party requires the subjugation of their victims before eventually killing them. The Party's goal is to purge the rebellion out of its victims, to force the inklings of doubt and dissent from their minds, to break the human spirit. In short, it must break them completely: mentally, emotionally, and eventually physically. It must redirect their hopes from where they stand and gear them towards the private and public hopes that Big Brother approves.

Winston also puts his faith in other minor characters. He lays his hopes on Goldstein and the Brotherhood, holding out that they exist and that they will play a significant role in a rebellion against the Party. This ambiguous society is one of the biggest instances for arguing that the entirety of hopeful figures is fabricated by the Party. In a world like the one that Winston lives in, people need to have an inkling of hope. An effective government such as the Party would recognize this and would decide to fabricate their own instances. By creating the Brotherhood and planting false deviants—like O'Brien—the government gives those who are unorthodox a means to keep hope alive but only in the amount and manner that they deem appropriate. This is evident when Winston and O'Brien speak about the Brotherhood and O'Brien clarifies that they may never meet again and that the Brotherhood operates as individuals. Winston thinks, "even if the legendary Brotherhood existed...It was inconceivable that its members could ever assemble in larger numbers than twos or threes. Rebellion meant a look in the eyes, an inflection of the voice; at the most an occasional whispered word" (69). Thus, there can be no collective. This creates a sense of hope in the individual without creating a need for organization. The individual is satisfied with the knowledge that there are others in the world like him and is placated in the knowledge that the official doctrine of this party is never to meet and organize. Only individual actions must be taken. This makes it easy to eliminate threats

because the individuals will either commit a crime against the Party or, as in the case of Winston, commit errors stemming from the pseudo-hopes that have been cultivated by the Party's meddling. He goes so far as to admit this to O'Brien during their first real conversation in O'Brien's office. Winston says, "We believe that there is some kind of conspiracy, some kind of secret organization working against the Party and that you are involved in it. We want to join" (170). Winston pledges his allegiance, and thus his hopeful aims, to a person he has never met. O'Brien, who is in on the charade, offers a toast to their "leader: to Emmanuel Goldstein" (Orwell 171). Winston has been given what he has hoped for all along: confirmation that the Brotherhood is real. O'Brien confirms, "Yes, there is such a person, and he is alive. Where I do not know...The Brotherhood, we call it [is real]. You will never learn much more about the Brotherhood than that it exists and that you belong to it" (Orwell 171). By confirming Winston's preconceptions on the Brotherhood, Winston is pushed towards the path the Party wants him to go. They ignite hopes that will be placed on an individual and hopes that are unreasonable.

Furthermore, Winston puts his hopes in the proles—the proletariat class, or the lower class which is mostly left to their own devices with only minimal surveillance. The proles are seen as a non-threat to the Party because they do not care enough to do anything about their situation. They are too ignorant to know their own strength and are easily controlled via simple means. Winston knows that "*if there is hope...it lies in the proles...it must lie in the proles, because only there, in those swarming disregarded masses, eighty-five percent of the population of Oceania, could the force to destroy the Party ever be generated*" (69 emphasis Orwell's). Again, Winston places his hopes in people. However, his hope is again ill-founded, and he knows it, yet still, he holds on to a sort of hope that is aimless and unreasonable. Winston

reasons that, “If only [the proles] could somehow become conscious of their own strength, would have no need to conspire. They needed only to rise up and shake themselves like a horse shaking off flies. If they chose, they could blow the Party to pieces tomorrow morning. Surely sooner or later it must occur to them to do it. And yet--!” (Orwell 69). Winston knows that the proles will never rise up; he thinks, “Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious” (70). Still, there is evidence of his preoccupation and interest of the proles that he still holds on to some hope that they will one day rise up against the Party in power. The Proles massively outnumber the entirety of the Party. Winston realizes that if there is ever to be a force that could conceivably take down the Party, then it must be the Proles, and yet, Winston realizes, they have no desire to rise up. Much like the paperweight, the song, and Mr. Charrington, the Proles designate a symbol of hope for Winston. They represent a form of humanity that is foreign and archaic to Winston. The Proles had been “[l]eft to themselves, like cattle turned loose upon the plains of Argentina, they had reverted to a style of life that appeared to be natural to them, a sort of ancestral pattern” (Orwell 71). Winston recalls an instant where the Proles gave Winston a glimpse into a world where they were in discord and in an uproar. It was a world and rage that Winston wishes would be directed at the Party. He wonders, “Why was it that they could never shout like that about anything that mattered?” (Orwell 72). This is an unreasonable object of hope. There is no evidence to suggest that they ever will. Thus the object does not seem plausible but rather impossible. True hope must have a future goal of good in mind—in this case, rebellion—that is difficult but not impossible. While a rebellion is technically possible, due to the state of the proles, it is highly improbable, rendering it and any hopes of rebellion impossible.

### Symbols of Hope

*1984*'s use of hope as an emotion is key to the narrative and the themes. While it is true that the narrative deals with weaponization of hope—that is a use of situations to give rise to hope and then plunge the subject into despair—the machinations of the Party would not be effective nor complete without the explicit manipulation of this innate human emotion.

This brings us to the next point: symbols of hope. Though they may not be symbols that a reader can readily get behind and follow into battle, there are various elements in the story that serve as symbols of hope. The paperweight is a symbol of Winston. It was reminiscent of a time when things didn't have to have a purpose. The thing exists merely to exist—though, to weigh paper down is in itself a purpose. Winston believes the paperweight to be a symbol, "The paperweight was the room he was in, and the coral was Julia's life and his own, fixed in a sort of eternity at the heart of the crystal" (Orwell 95). When Julia brings the paperweight over to Winston, he inspects it. Winston "[takes] it out of her hand, fascinated as always by the soft, rainwatery [sic] appearance of the glass." Julia asks him what he thinks it is and Winston responds: "I don't think it's anything—I mean, I don't think it was ever put to any use. That's what I like about it. It's a little chunk of history that they've forgotten to alter. It's a message from a hundred years ago if one knew how to read it" (Orwell 145). Winston demonstrates his fascination with the paperweight because it serves no purpose. It's something that has no equal in the utilitarian world that he lives in. Everything must have a function, but this paperweight is a window to the past. It's a window to a time when things existed just to exist. Winston wonders if people just existed to exist, if things were different or if things were better. He also focuses on the fact that the Party forgot to destroy the paperweight. It's a symbol of a chink in the infallible armor of the Party. If this useless object could survive the purging of history, then surely other people and other objects must have survived as well. It allows Winston to believe that a life

different from his is possible. It allows him to believe that like the paperweight and himself, there are others whose minds are a window to the past and a hope for the future.

It's because of these objects stimulate memories of a different version of the world, that the Party makes it a point to destroy the paperweight in front of Winston. Orwell writes, "There was another crash. Someone had picked up the glass paperweight from the table and smashed it to pieces on the hearthstone. The fragment of coral, a tiny crinkle of pink like a sugar rosebud from a cake, rolled across the mat. How small, thought Winston, how small it always was" (Orwell 223). While seemingly an insignificant scenario, the destruction of the paperweight actually quite poignant. One must remember that this is a world where, conceivably, they are always being watched. In fact, this chapter argues that Winston is not only being watched at all times but is set up. Thus, if Julia and Winston are watched, then surely, they know that this object is more than just a keepsake of Winston's. It has a strong meaning to him. They know exactly what it symbolizes and what it represents. Thus, the destroying of the paperweight becomes one of many deliberate acts to systematically destroy any morsel of hope that Winston may have left. Winston's haunting observation, "how small it was" is, on the surface level, a demoralizing realization about the miniscule nature of the world inside the paperweight; it is also a realization that the plausibility of change and the hopes Winston had ascribed to object are gone. The Thought Police make a point to smash the symbol in front of Winston as if to represent his shattered illusions and hopes he holds. He realizes, as the Party intends him to, that his dreams of autonomy are merely delusions, and any hope he had about things being different, or may one day be different are inconsequential: a shattered piece of corral rolling across the floor.

The underlying pattern of Winston's foray into pseudo-hope and his eventual demise is that, given the situation that he is in, his hopes are unreasonable. Hope has only some meaning when "at least some degree of free will, practical thinking, and individual or collective choice is assumed" (Cartwright 170). Winston's choices are not truly the effect of freewill, his will has been manipulated by the Party ten times over. He is led into a false sense of security by both the alcove in his apartment and by O'Brien. He is allowed to continue his crimes of adultery and thoughtcrime with Julia. He is even given assurance that the rebellious Brotherhood is real and that his actions should reflect the values of such an entity. Thus, Winston's choices are not his own. Like a student guided to the correct answer on an assignment, so too is Winston guided to the desired result by the ever-reaching hands of the Party. Furthermore, his practical thinking is abandoned when situations arise that stir the emotions in him. When he receives a note from Julia, he admits his unreasonableness. Orwell writes, "The unreasonable hope persisted, and his heart banged, and it was with difficulty that he kept his voice from trembling as he murmured his figures into the speakwrite" (Orwell 107). Further on, Orwell writes, "at the sight of the words *I love you* the desire to stay alive had welled up in him, and the taking of minor risks suddenly seemed stupid" (Orwell 109). It's ironic that the very words that inspired him to stop taking minor risks are the same words that would spur him on to take major risks.

Winston allows himself to get carried away by romantic notions. His choices are not really his own, and his hope is not true. Winston is carefully manipulated by the Party to make choices that lead Winston down a path of pseudo-hope: a life of aimless hope, of placing hopes in others, of allowing himself to stay ignorant of the situation at hand, and of making unreasonable choices. Without true hope to guide him in a situation where despair is the only other option, Winston becomes a character who, like the story he resides in, becomes a

cautionary tale: One should be careful in what and how one hopes, for false hopes will lead to demise.

## CHAPTER IV

### AN INADEQUATE COPYCAT: HOPE IN COLLIN'S *THE HUNGER GAMES*

Young-adult (YA) dystopian literature contains all the facets of a dystopian novel akin to Orwell or Bradbury: an overreaching government; a world where daily freedoms and privileges are taken away and replaced with ceremonies, rituals, or customs that would seem atrocious to the reader; a general lack of freedom; and, lastly, a protagonist who goes against the status quo. However, the YA dystopian novel varies from its literary kin in that it is directed towards a young audience and therefore bears greater responsibility. An author “can lead them to darkness, but [one] cannot extinguish the light” (Reber 4). That is to say that while YA authors may delve into dark topics and themes, one cannot leave a young adult reader in despair. This would be a betrayal of the responsibility of the author who has purposefully targeted an audience of youths.

One such example is Suzanne Collins' *The Hunger Games*. The first part of a trilogy, the YA novel deals with adult themes of survival, self-reliance, despair, hope, and uprising. At times, the series deals with adult ideas of revolution, death, mourning, depression, and inspiration. However, unlike its counterpart in the genre, *1984*, *The Hunger Games* leaves the reader with a sense of hopeful optimism.

I have discussed the importance of hope in *1984*. I will further extend the analysis I used there into *The Hunger Games*. It argues that the ruling party, in this case, “the Capitol” and its figurehead “President Snow” purposefully perpetuate acts of manipulation and subterfuge to guide the public and private hopes to make people conform to behaviors the rulers deem acceptable. Furthermore, this chapter argues that the reason that the Capitol fails is that they try to eliminate hope entirely rather than effectively misdirect it towards their own goals. This chapter also contends that the protagonist of this novel is a true symbol of hope and her actions

follow the framework for true hope. Lastly, this chapter will also look to see why maintaining hopefulness is important in the YA genre.

While *1984*'s protagonist Winston Smith leaves something to be desired, *The Hunger Games*' series protagonist Katniss Everdeen does not. She is not a perfect character of course—no interesting character is. However, she possesses some qualities that make her stand out when using the framework for what hope is that has been provided. True hope comes when one is reasonable, plans for action, does not put their hopes on others, is not ignorant to the dangers at hand, and is not confident in the outcome of dire situations.

Katniss is everything that Winston Smith is not. Unlike her counterpart she *can* be a symbol and example of true hope. Katniss is always focused on a future goal that is difficult to obtain but not impossible: Saving her sister, winning the Hunger Games, rescuing Peeta, etc. She never relies on others for her hope; she creates her own. Additionally, she does not let experience and cheerful optimism blind her: her experience in the Hunger Games does not make her confident she will win again, but rather makes her feel that the odds are stacked against her even more. Furthermore, Katniss is not ignorant but very well aware of her situation as the games play out. The one instance where she is not keenly aware of her situation does not disqualify her from being a hopeful symbol—an issue that will be addressed. Finally, she is courageous in the truest sense of the word. When her world gives her despair (a necessity for hope), she does not wallow and weep but rather forges her own path and plan with the expectation that things might not occur as would be ideal. She is courageous in the face of hopeless circumstances, and she is able to turn that courage into hope—for herself, for her family, for the nation, and for the readers.

In summation, this section of this thesis argues that the Party uses special tactics such as the Hunger Games to manipulate the public and private hopes of its audience to pseudo-hope—and analyzes why it ultimately fails—as well as contends that Katniss Everdeen is a symbol of true hope via the framework of hope previously established.

### The Capitol's Failed Manipulation

The Capitol is the ruling city of the country of Panem in the fictional world of *The Hunger Games*. Like the Party in *1984*, the Capitol is the upper-class portion of society which controls the rest of the nation. In the series, the term “the Capitol” is used to refer to both the city and all its citizens, but also to refer to the political entity that resides in the Capitol. This includes figurehead President Snow. Snow is akin to Big Brother in that he is the ubiquitous face of the Capitol. The biggest difference is that Snow is a real person who is part of the plot, unlike the ambiguous Big Brother who is likely a fabrication of the Party. The novel does not expound on the process of being placed as “president” of Panem, but Snow is portrayed as the all-powerful leader whose word is the law.

Snow and the Capitol are very keenly aware of the power that hope has on a population. Though not overtly stated in the first novel, Snow expresses his concerns over the hope that Katniss has created throughout the districts of Panem. In a private conversation with Katniss, he addresses the fact she cheated at the Games, and Katniss assures him that it was not meant to cause any uprisings. Snow goes on, “I believe you. It doesn't matter. Your stylist turned out to be prophetic in his wardrobe choice. Katniss Everdeen, the girl who was on fire, you have provided that spark that, left unattended, may grow to an inferno that destroys Panem” (Collins, *Catching Fire* 23). The spark that he is referring to is the spark of hope that Katniss has given to the nation by her act of defiance. By refusing to play by the Capitol's rule, she has inspired a

nation to believe that they too can defy the Capitol's ruling. Snow knows how dangerous this can be. Hope if left unchecked can take down the Capitol.

It stands to reason that a ruling party in a totalitarian government would want to control that hope. They must control it and aim it at the goals of the Capitol. One way that they go about doing this is through the tokens given to citizens called "tesserae." Collins writes:

The reaping system is unfair, with the poor getting the worst of it. You become eligible for the reaping that day you turn twelve. That year, your name is entered once. At thirteen, twice and so on until you reach the age of eighteen, the final year of eligibility, when your name goes into the pool seven times...but there's a catch. Say you are poor and starving as we were. You can opt to add your name more times in exchange for tesserae. Each tessera is worth a meager year's supply of grain and oil for one person. You may do this for each of your family members as well. (13)

The system is set up to influence public hope. As previously stated, public hope is the hopes that are created and expounded by institutions of which the population is a part. This can include government. These institutions seek to influence private hope, that hope which is kept by an individual—possibly synonymous with the public and collective, but not necessarily.

In this instance, the government is to facilitate the public institution itself (a public hope) as the private hope of the people. The Capitol aims to be the source and purveyor of hope. They create the squalid conditions that its citizens live in, then offer a means to mitigate their condition. The tesserae are nothing more than symbols, symbols of pseudo-hope that say, "we can help you" but also "we own you." The added dimension that this may only be obtained by children in order to feed their families is a particularly nefarious one. Even Katniss has fallen prey to this tactic, and after her father dies in an accident, she finds herself hoping and longing for the day that she can enter her name into the Reaping and add tesserae for her family's name. Katniss reminisces, "I kept telling myself if I could only hold out until May, just May 8<sup>th</sup>, I would turn twelve and be able to sign up for more tesserae and get that precious grain and oil to

feed us” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 28). Due to Katniss’s mother's mental departure—she falls into a presumed deep depression after the death of her husband—Katniss has to rely on herself to keep the family alive. The system gives Katniss hope in the times where she struggles. Of course, this is a pseudo-hope as well. The Party forces a reliance on other people. Thus, twelve-year-old Katniss has placed her private hopes unwittingly in the arms of the Capitol; she allows the very institution that is responsible for her starvation to be the source of her hopes and potential salvation.

Generally speaking, this works as a method of control and as a way of shifting private hopes towards the institutions. The Capitol has become a trader in public and private hope. However, where it falters is that the Capitol takes too much. In 1984, the system worked so efficiently because the Party gives them just enough to be sated. To the Inner Party, they give them rations and allow them copious amounts of alcohol which also keeps the Inner Party numb. To the Proles, they allow relative freedom, as they are not perceived as a threat. The system balances itself out. When rations are lowered, they are justified via propaganda that is taken as truth. Conversely, the system that is implemented in *The Hunger Games* universe takes a more direct approach. They make it a point to explicitly emphasize the Capitol’s control over the population. Thus, something that was supposed to lead to a transferred feeling of hope often leads to resentment and ironically (or perhaps unironically) to more hope.

The titular “Hunger Games” are an exhibition where two children—one male and one female that range from ages twelve to seventeen—are plucked from their families in the twelve districts via the aforementioned lottery system. This exhibition pits the twenty-four contestants in an elaborate arena styled to look like a particular environment (desert, forest, frozen tundra, etc.). The object of the contest is to be the last person remaining. Killing is encouraged, and weapons

are provided—though some choose to hide and try to wait it out. The entirety of the spectacle is broadcast around Panem for the entire nation to see. The nation is forced to treat it like a holiday as if the reaping and the Hunger Games themselves are a thing to be cheered and reveled in.

This situation is analogous with Peter Drahos' examples in "Trading in Public Hope." He writes, in dealing with situations we face today in the real world, "the levels of poverty, sickness, and starvation in the world mean that a strong demand for hope exists in the world" (Drahos 19). Hard times create the need for hope. Furthermore, he explains that "hope is a psychological event or process that is distinct from the services and products to which it may be linked. Companies charge for their services and products. They do not charge for hope" (Drahos 19). That is to say, that hope occurs as an event outside of the institution that provides it. They may sell hope via their message or via the product that they sell, but they do not outwardly sell hope as it is not a palpable or tradeable commodity. Successful companies know that by "creating links between their products and individual hopes, they potentially gain the benefit of a powerful driver of human emotion" (Drahos 19).

The Capitol attempts this via the tesserae and The Hunger Games with little success. The tesserae are a source of hope, as they were for Katniss, but they are also a source of contempt. Gale, Katniss's closest friend, and potential love interest, demonstrates this when he and Katniss visit the mayor's daughter, Madge. When conversing about the risks of being chosen, Gale retorts, "You won't be going to the Capitol...What can you have? Five entries? I had six when I was just twelve years old" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 12). Katniss elaborates on the situation, "You can see why someone like Madge, who has never been at risk of needing a tessera, can set him off. The chance of her name being drawn is very slim compared to those of us who live in the Seam...it's hard not to resent those who don't have to sign up for tesserae" (Collins, *The*

*Hunger Games* 13). The resentment that Gale harbors towards Madge is merely a symptom of the overall resentment that Gale has for the system. Ultimately, Gale knows this and knows that his anger is being misplaced. His resentment, and a good portion of the population's lies with those responsible. The government forces themselves to become the source of hope to the people by presenting false solutions, but ultimately end up the object of much ire. This ultimately has no influence on public, collective, or private hopes. The tesserae are items of despair, and where despair is present, hope is not far behind.

The Hunger Games themselves are meant to provoke fear and compliance. They are a "punishment for the uprising [that happened decades ago]" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 18). Katniss reflects on the nature of the games, "this is the Capitol's way of reminding us how totally we are at their mercy. How little chance we stand of surviving another rebellion" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 19). The Capitol does this to influence the private hopes of the individuals and not allow any sort of collective hope about rebellion to spread. Like many totalitarian states, its power relies on fear and despair. They are trying to crush the hopes of its public effectively. The demonstration of the games serves as a reminder that your wish to rebel is unreasonable. Katniss thinks, "Whatever words they use, the real message is clear. 'Look how we take your children and sacrifice them, and there's nothing you can do. If you lift a finger, we will destroy every last one of you'" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 19).

Katniss believes that in order to make it more humiliating to the districts, the Capitol requires the citizens to treat The Games like a special event; something to be looked forward to and lauded. Some people in the districts actually believe this. Katniss thinks, "The Capitol requires us to treat the Hunger Games as a festivity, a sporting event pitting every district against the others. The last tribute alive receives a life of ease back home, and their district will be

showered with prizes, largely consisting of food. All year, the Capitol will show the winning district gifts of grain and oil and even delicacies like sugar while the rest of us battle starvation” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 19). This is an exercise in hope-manipulation or weaponization. The Capitol forces children into battle to the death against each other and showers the winners and their districts with gifts. As if to say, “Look how benevolent we can be when you do well!” the Capitol broadcasts the entire spectacle. It’s a stark reminder that the Capitol is simultaneous—and regretfully—the people’s source of strife and relief and by extension, of hope. The Capitol uses this game to control the focus of the public’s hopes and to divide them: each District’s hopes are focused on their own tribute. They are trying to create a link between their product, The Hunger Games, and individual hopes (Drahos 19). The people will “hope” that their victor wins so that they will reap the benefits.

The forced divisiveness is likely to create resentment amongst the population, as is seen in Gale. Rather than creating a positive “link to their product” and their hopes, the Capitol has linked their product to resentment. Like hope, resentment that goes unaddressed will fester until it boils over. Instead of the Games creating a sense of pride in the people of the districts, the Games causes people to fear the government coming in and taking their children. Drahos states, “outside threats [affect] the needs for peace and security, thereby triggering increased levels of hope” (21). Drahos uses an example of a judge from Czechoslovakia who had been imprisoned and sent to the uranium mines during the Russian occupation. He and his fellow prisoners were not given protective gear, and many of them died in the mines. When asked if they had lost hope, the judge said: “No...we never gave up hope” (Drahos 22). Drahos continues, “on inductive grounds, the rationality of the judge’s hope seems irrational. Yet at least some of the prisoners in these mines felt themselves to be in possession of an emotionally known truth that ultimately

enabled them to see off the Soviet tanks that had so crushingly ground their way through the streets of Prague in earlier years” (22). This is like the situation for the people in the Hunger Games—even fitting that District 12 is known for coal mining and Katniss’s father died in a coal mine: the people are given an option to hope for something in the government that is ultimately futile, or despair as the government wishes. However, the people, like the miners in the story, do not despair. There is within them what is within every human: hope. Drahos continues, “On inductive grounds, the rationality of [their] hope seems irrational. Yet, at least some of the prisoners in these mines felt themselves to be in possession of an emotionally known truth that ultimately enabled them” (22). Like the miners in Drahos’ story, so too do the miners in *The Hunger Games* feel truth in them. This is evident when Katniss volunteers for her sister. Collins writes, “[the crowd] takes part in the boldest part of dissent they can manage. Silence. Which says we do not agree. We do not condone. All of this is wrong...Then something unexpected happens...at first one, then another, then almost every member of the crowd touches the three middle fingers of their left hand to their lips and holds it out to me. It is an old and rarely used gesture of our district, occasionally seen at funerals. It means thanks; it means admiration, it means good-bye to someone you love” (*The Hunger Games* 24). The people of District 12 have now focused their private and collective hopes towards a teenage girl who is about to face the greatest obstacles of her life. They hope for her survival, and they hope for their future.

#### Katniss Everdeen: Symbol of True Hope

As the object of hope, Katniss has a responsibility—albeit an unwanted or even acknowledged one—to the people of District 12. She becomes the unwitting symbol of hope for them and eventually for all the people of Panem. Though Katniss does not intend to become an overt symbol of hope—she is already an unsuspecting symbol by her actions—she plays the role

to perfection by simply being herself. For Katniss, that involves being courageous in the face of dangers, avoiding ignorance by being fully cognizant of the dangers at hand, making a plan or taking hopeful action to avoid those dangerous situations, she does not place her hope solely on others, is not over-confident that her experience will carry her through the darkness, and through it all she constantly and effectively uses reason in her actions and plans.

Katniss is courageous in the face of the danger that lies before her. Unlike her counterpart, Winston, Katniss is faced with more evident dangers that she chooses to tackle in a straightforward manner, the first of which arises at the Reaping ceremony. After much-forced pomp and circumstances, the names are drawn from a bowl. Much to the dismay of many and of Katniss herself, the name read is Primrose Everdeen, Katniss' sister. Katniss realizes the severity of the situation. Her sister is now to be prepared to go into a battle of kill or be killed. She cannot let this stand. Katniss recalls, "I reach her just as she is about to mount the steps. With one sweep of my arm, I push her behind me. 'I volunteer!' I gasp. 'I volunteer as tribute!'" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 22). To volunteer as a tribute in place of her sister is not only a noble act, but it is definitely a courageous act. She knows what is at stake and how the odds are stacked against her, especially being from District 12. Unlike some districts that actually treat the games as an event to look forward to, District 12 hasn't had a volunteer in decades. Katniss mentions that "the word *tribute* is pretty much synonymous with the word *corpse*, volunteers are all but extinct" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 22). She realizes the severity of her situation. She is in all likelihood going to be killed. The odds are not in her favor. Yet, she cannot let herself fall into despair.

Aquinas once states that "there is no hope to be found in the blessed or the damned; it exists only in those who are still en route" (192). Katniss becomes what Aquinas would call a

*viator* or traveler. Given her current situation, she is neither blessed (a citizen of the Capitol or a safe citizen of District 12) nor is she damned (helpless in *The Hunger Games*). As Aquinas states, the traveler is constantly confronted by trials and tribulations. The traveler may find secondary objects of hope. For Katniss, that object of hope is her sister Prim. Katniss believes she can't win at first but decides that she must try. Katniss states, "Besides, it isn't in my nature to go down without a fight, even when things seem insurmountable... (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 36). Collins writes, "I just want you to come home. You will try, won't you? Really, really try?" asks Prim. "Really, really try. I swear it," I say. And I know, because of Prim, I'll have to" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 36). Like Aristotle's courageous man who "has turned away from the judgment that he will be saved," so too does Katniss reject the idea of being saved (Gravless 468). She bluntly thinks, "I can't win. Prim must know that in her heart. The competition will be far beyond my abilities...Oh, there will be people like me, too. People to weed out before the real fun begins" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 36). Katniss demonstrates that she is not optimistic like the soldier who has survived the battle or the sailor who has overcome rough seas. No, she is not marred by the optimism and tipped off by the "false alarms which war seems to [bring]" (Gravlee 463). Nor does she "fight with the advantage that trained athletes [have] over amateurs" as the "career" tributes—those who have been preparing for the games their entire life—have (Gravlee 463). Katniss has none of these things. She remains on a path with the likelihood of death. She is en route to either hope or despair and has outside threats beating down on her. It is here that she is the most hopeful. With the identification of her secondary object of hope in her sister Prim, Katniss is now a courageous traveler en route to salvation. Katniss' actions, though not her feelings, show that she is a person who is truly courageous and via her courage truly a figure of hope.

Furthermore, Katniss does not fall into pseudo-hope by being ignorant of the dangers that come before her. From the start of the novel, it is established that Katniss is a very capable individual who is fully cognizant of the situation that she is living in. Unlike Winston, who deludes himself by negating the true power of his Party, Katniss is fully aware of the true power and reach of the Capitol. It's something that she deals with daily as she and Gale go on their excursions. Katniss mocks the Capitol, "'District Twelve. Where you can starve to death in safety.' I mutter. Then I glance quickly over my shoulder. Even here, even in the middle of nowhere, you worry someone might hear you" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 22). She further remembers being younger and unaware of the gravity of the situation. From a young age, she had a spark of rebellion in her, Katniss states:

When I was younger, I scared my mother to death, the things I would blurt out about District 12, about the people who rule our country, Panem, from the far-off city called the Capitol. Eventually, I understood this would only lead us to more trouble. So I learned to hold my tongue and to turn my features into an indifferent mask so that no one could ever read my thoughts....even at home, where I am less pleasant, I avoid discussing tricky topics. Like the reaping, or food shortages, or the Hunger Games. Prim might begin to repeat my words and then where would we be? (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 7).

From early on, she makes the realization that what is going on around her is bigger than what she can handle at the moment. She knows that she cannot take the smallest act of dissent without her or her family suffering the repercussions. Gravlee writes, "[t]he ignorant person is not self-confident, but is confident in the circumstances because she does not know what dangers she faces" (464). Katniss is self-confident; confident in her ideas, her feelings; but she is not confident in the circumstances in which she lives in. She adjusts her behavior to fit the needs of her life and her family.

Additionally, Katniss does not sit on her laurels nor does she wistfully hope for anything abstract. As the proverb states "prayer without action is lost," so too is hope. One of the major things that separates Katniss from Winston in being a symbol or an example of true hope is that

unlike Winston, Katniss has a clear-cut goal: she must win the Hunger Games to return to her family. While Winston flounders around in vague political dissent, Katniss has no interest in taking on an entity so overwhelmingly powerful—at least, not just for the sake of it. She only dissents or rebels when it suits her ultimate goal, which is to win. Katniss is, for the most part, true to herself or at the very least true to her goals. The deceptions that are put into play are, again, only to suit her ultimate goal. Thus, Katniss is taking part in purposeful hopeful actions.

She demonstrates her participation in hopeful actions early when she describes taking responsibility for her family upon her mother's mental breakdown following her father's death. As discussed previously, Katniss has to take care of her sister and herself, using the money that is given to families when a member dies in an accident in the mines. Once the money runs out, she has to fend on her own, even consuming "nothing but boiled water with some old dried mint leaves [she had] found in the back of the cupboard" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 28 ). Katniss describes planning to wait for her twelfth birthday so she could sign up for tesserae. The day that Peeta gives her the bread that quite possibly saves her and Prim's lives, she recalls seeing a dandelion. "I knew hope was not lost," Katniss reminisces (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 49) . After that, she recalls what her father had taught her, "I grabbed a bucket and headed to the Meadow, and yes, it was dotted with the golden-headed weeds...[we] filled the bucket with dandelion greens, stems, and flowers. That night, we gorged ourselves on the dandelion salad and the rest of the bakery bread" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 50). She continues to recall that there are various types of plants that can be eaten, all she needs is to find the book her parents kept regarding plants for consumption. She then proceeds to hunt. This is key in establishing Katniss as a symbol of hope because it shows that she is not a person that places her future desires in unsubstantial things. She also demonstrates that she does not put her hope primarily in

a person—Peeta, like the dandelion, becomes a secondary symbol of hope for Katniss rather than someone she relies on. He is someone who represents a kinder, better world, but not someone who she needs to succeed. More on this later.

She further demonstrates her forward-thinking courage after being selected to be a tribute in the Hunger Games. This is evident after she volunteers as a tribute and has to say goodbye to her family. Katniss thinks, “I cannot afford to get upset, to leave this room with puffy eyes and a red nose. Crying is not an option. There will be more cameras at the train station” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 34). Already in the midst of her despairing future, she must exhibit the courage that has been mentioned before. She is formulating a strategy for the future to achieve that “good future outcome” that is required for a hopeful person.

Furthermore, when she is about to be presented to the crowd as a tribute, she and Peeta have a plan in place to win over the crowd. Katniss recalls Cinna’s advice: “remember, heads high. Smiles. They’re going to love you! I hear Cinna’s voice in my head...As I gain confidence, I actually blow a few kisses to the crowd. The people of the Capitol are going nuts, showering us with flowers, shouting our names, our first names, which they have bothered to find on the program” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 70). This small act is later referred to as “just the perfect amount of rebellion” by Haymitch (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 79). Katniss reflects on the act, “Presenting ourselves not as adversaries but as friends has distinguished us as much as the fiery costumes” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 79) Katniss knows what is at stake and knows that her actions have direct consequences for her future desires, so despite being taken aback by the situation and adulation that she is receiving, she manages to compose herself and partake in actions that will take her closer to her future desire.

Katniss has secondary sources of hope along the way. It has been established that one of these sources is her sister Prim, for whom she fights the games so courageously. Secondly, there is Haymitch. Though, Haymitch is an uncouth character he controls the “sponsors” for the tributes. These sponsors can send gifts to the tributes during the games that would aid them in their quest to win. It is up to Haymitch to sell the story of his tributes and attempt to have sponsors buy-in. Haymitch facilitates Katniss’s hopeful and purposeful actions, “One last thing. In public, I want you by each other’s side every minute” says Haymitch. We both start to object, but Haymitch slams his hand on the table. ‘Every minute! It’s not open for discussion! You agreed to do as I said! You will be together; you will appear amiable to each other” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 92). Thus, Haymitch is a secondary source for keeping Katniss’s hopes of winning on track, reasonable, and future-oriented.

Haymitch even helps when Katniss begins to wander astray. After Peeta publicly announces his love for Katniss in front of a worldwide audience, Katniss believes that he has sabotaged her public persona—which is crucial in the perception by the other tributes and by the sponsors. Katniss berates Peeta and Haymitch for “making [her] look weak.” Haymitch responds, ““He made you look desirable! And let’s face it, you can use all the help you can get in that department. You were about as romantic as dirt until he said he wanted you. Now they all do. You’re all they’re talking about. The star-crossed lovers from District Twelve!”” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 134). Although Katniss objects initially, she does not become unreasonable and ignore the plan. She knows that if her hopes are to be fulfilled, then she must do what is asked of her and what she feels is right. This relates to Aquinas’ view that one must “be trusting in present help to come to it” (Halpin 394). That is, one must trust the process that one

undertakes en route to achieving hope and happiness. Katniss does this the entirety of the Hunger Games.

Furthermore, as established by Aquinas, Katniss does not place her hopes primarily in others. It has been discussed that she does have secondary objects of hope, namely her sister, Haymitch, and to some extent, Peeta. However, her hope and courage are placed primarily in her ultimate goal and in herself and her hopeful actions. This is evident in her character from early on. When Katniss's mother mentally abandons them Katniss is forced to fend for herself. Her father dead and her mother effectively useless, Katniss can no longer place her hopes in her parents. Katniss comes to terms with this: "I knew...that I had lost not only a father but a mother as well. At eleven years old, with Prim just seven, I took over as head of the family" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 27). To place her hopes and safety in her parents is foolish. Even when things get particularly hard, she does not place her hopes in her mother or the government. She ruminates on the community homes, the destitute places where orphan children are taken, "[They would have placed us] in community homes. I'd grown up seeing those home kids at schools. The sadness, the marks of angry hands on their faces, the hopelessness that curled their shoulders forward. I could never let that happen to Prim....So I kept our predicament a secret" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 27). Then when she is at the point of starvation, she thinks, "The realization that I'd have nothing to take home had finally sunk in...it was too much. I was too sick and weak and tired...*Let them call the Peacekeepers and take us to the community home, I thought. Or better yet, let me die right here in the rain*" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 30). Even when she is at her lowest, her sister and her on the verge of literal starvation, she does not resign herself to place her hopes in an outside someone or something. To the point, even her resignation that going to a community center would be better than this does not come with a hopeful goal.

Rather she thinks that dying on the spot would be better than being put in a situation where life is worse than what a normal citizen has. Though perhaps not her most reasonable moment, the point stands: Katniss is not a character who places her hopes primarily in outside sources.

Katniss doesn't even place her primary hopes in her now rehabilitated mother. Though still a child herself, she states, "I had taken a step back from my mother, put up a wall to protect myself from needing her, and nothing was ever the same between us again" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 34). This is evident again when she is saying goodbye to her family before leaving District 12 for the Capitol. Katniss states, "[y]ou can't leave again...you can't clock out and leave Prim on her own. There's no me now to keep you both alive. It doesn't matter what happens. Whatever you see on the screen. Promise me you'll fight through it!' My voice has risen to a shout. In it is all the anger, all the fear I felt at her abandonment" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 35). Katniss's hope in her mother being a reliable figure all but expired when she was eleven and left to fend on her own. While she tries to trust her mother and place her hopes on her, she cannot. She looks to Gale and the Peeta's father as secondary sources of hope in relation to the care of her sister.

Moreover, her mother's mental abandonment occurs right before fellow tribute Peeta comes and gives her two loaves of bread that would save their lives. During this time, Katniss sees the dandelion that gives her hope. From this day she cannot disassociate Peeta with the kindness that he gave her. Still, even this uncharacteristically sentimental feeling is not a sign of her placing hope in someone especially once they have been selected as tributes in the Hunger Games. When Peeta offers to clean up a disheveled Haymitch, Katniss wonders if he's doing it to gain his favor, but then comes to the realization that he is just being kind. Katniss thinks, "The idea pulls me up short. A kind Peeta Mellark is far more dangerous to me than an unkind one.

Kind people have a way of working their way inside me and rooting there. And I can't let Peeta do this. Not where we're going....I decide....to have as little as possible to do with the baker's son" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 49).

Additionally, Katniss is not, as Aristotle would say, confident. She is truly courageous. To Aristotle, a person with the pseudo-courage of experience cannot be truly hopeful—what this paper is calling pseudo-hope. Katniss is not like “sailors at sea or the mercenaries in battle, [or] soldiers who have professional experience and skill in warfare” (Gravlee 463). She does not have the “insight into the many false alarms which war seems to bring” (Gravlee 463). Katniss does not have any experience in this type of warfare. Thus she is not confident in her abilities. Gale tries to convince her that her experience as a hunter will prove beneficial and implores her to get a bow or fashion one. Katniss replies, “They don't always have bows... I have tried copying my father's bows with poor results...I don't even know if there'll be wood... [although] there's usually some.” Gale responds, “Katniss, it's just hunting. You're the best hunter I know.” Katniss replies, “It's not just hunting. They're armed. They think” (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 40). This exchange is important because it shows how grounded Katniss really is. She does not take it for granted that her opponents are humans of free will nor does she put too much confidence in her skill as a hunter. She recognizes that the task in front of her will be an arduous one with intricacies that are unfamiliar to her. Her future desires to come out successful lie in that she doesn't forget that and become confident in her abilities nor ignorant of the capabilities of the others. She will go into the games with a fresh outlook and a fresh set of fears. This is truly courageous, Gravlee writes: “courage is displayed precisely where there are fears to face (i.e., where there is no confidence in a positive outcome)”. This is true of Katniss' state of mind. While she places her hopes (future desires) ahead of her and strives to achieve them, she

is not confident that she will win. In fact, she is quite certain that she will lose. This is true courage; her future desires: true hope.

Lastly, all of Katniss's hopes are not without reason. Aquinas states that hope must "be directed towards a future good that is difficult but not impossible to attain" (Gravlee 176). Unlike Winston, who is unreasonable in his actions to rebel against an impossibly pervasive government, Katniss merely hopes to succeed at the task at hand. It is a difficult but manageable task, whereas Winston's is not. Katniss's hopes are to win the Hunger Games; not for the sake of winning but to be able to come back and provide for her family. Katniss is an experienced hunter and a person who is clever and self-reliant. The hope of winning is a real, palpable goal. Katniss herself starts to believe this in the midst of the games. A rule change is spurred on by the narrative of the two star-crossed lovers, Peeta and Katniss. Two winners will now be allowed. This makes Katniss reevaluate her chances, "Who is there left to be afraid of?...[She evaluates each member left.] Do I run from them now, on the chance they heard me call Peeta's name? *No*. I think. *Let them come*. Let them come with their night vision glasses and their heavy, branch-breaking bodies. Right into the range of my arrows...Today, I'll be scrupulously careful" (Collins, *The Hunger Games* 248). Despite the announcement, Katniss does not get over excited, nor do her expectations change. She remains level headed, and her hopes stay focused and grounded. She does not rush to take action but rather waits to evaluate and then take aim.

The fact that the Capitol fails in its control of hope and that Katniss is a true symbol of hope is important because of the genre in which Katniss and *The Hunger Games* exists. At first glance, it may seem bewildering that a teenage girl would have more success in a dystopian totalitarian world instead of Winston, the would-be hero of *1984* (Reber 1). Lauren L. Reber, author of *Negotiating Hope and Honesty: A Rhetorical Criticism of Young Adult Dystopian*

*Literature*, writes “and yet, twelve-year-old heroes seem particularly apt to resist the impulse of dystopian worlds...It is clear that young adult dystopian literature has significantly adapted the adult dystopian genre to include hope” (1).

The young adult dystopian novel is one that is purposefully infused with the hope the way that adult novels are not because of certain responsibilities that authors undertake when writing. Reber writes, “at some point, whether in the beginning stages of the writing process or at publication, a writer has to realize who the audience is” (1). Monica Hughes states, “you may lead a child to darkness, but you can’t turn out the light” (156). This is evidently true in the dystopian world. For young adults or children, they need hope in the worlds that they escape to. Efforts to manipulate and weaponize hope cannot be successful for too long, or at least, that’s not where the story should end. Children are “humans with less experience and a narrower perspective than we have. They are, therefore, more vulnerable to injury...to write for them is an enormous responsibility, and the writer for children must never be allowed to forget that fact” (Peterson 67). Thus, a writer must take accountability whom they are writing for and how impressionable the audience is.

That is not to say that children cannot handle dystopias. In fact, some argue that they see a version of this every day in their lives via their dysfunctional families, violence in schools, etc. (qtd. in Reber, 2). Thus, the dystopias like *The Hunger Games* can, in fact, deal with some very dystopian and adult issues. Young adult authors can go into the darkness, but they cannot dwell in it. Lois Lowry, author of YA dystopian novel *The Giver*, believes that “they need to see some hope for such a world. [He] can’t imagine writing a book that doesn’t have a hopeful ending” (qtd. in Reber 2). In conjunction with Hughes’ statement, Lowry believes that it is the responsibility of the author not to extinguish the light. Reber further comments, “these authorial

comments also reveal a belief that books can, in fact, affect a reader's state of being for better or worse" (2). Hence, it is of utmost importance that young adult dystopian literature end with some hope and not total despair (Reber 2).

In conclusion, the Capitol's shortcomings in the manipulation of hope and Katniss's ascent are true symbols of hope. The Capitol's attempts to snuff out hopes in the hearts of its citizens backfires for it is in despair that hope is most needed and where levels of hope are often the highest. Furthermore, helped largely by the structure of the novel itself—and thus the shaping of the character's hopes—Katniss is the antithesis of Winston Smith: She is a character who is hopeful and courageous, but not confident nor overly optimistic. Her hopes are difficult but reasonable, and she places her hopes in herself and secondary sources of hope rather than solely placing them on other people or institutions. Lastly, her hopes are reasonable and focused. Katniss Everdeen provides an example of what it is to hope with prudence and to exemplify true hope. Through this, *The Hunger Games* becomes a hopeful novel in consideration of its responsibility to its audience: its enemy failing, its protagonist on the rise.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

Hope is part of the human experience. It is engrained in the very essence of what it means to be alive. As such, it is a concept that is often discussed in conjunction with dystopian literature. Philosophers like Aristotle and Aquinas outlined what it meant to truly hopeful. They laid out what it entails for one to be hopeful in the best sense. Aristotle notably discusses hope in relation to courage and links them inextricably. Aquinas links them to reason, action, and the Catholic virtues of faith, hope, and love. Moreover, Peter Drahos, dealing within the socio-political world, reasons that the two types of hope exists on three axes: private, collective, and public. Drahos states that hope can be abused and that public is the most dangerous for that end. Often, hope is discussed in reference to the lack of hope that is present in some texts like Orwell's *1984*, but hope actually plays an integral role in dystopian literature. In *1984*, it serves as the weapon that leads to the demise of the protagonist, Winston Smith, via manipulation of his hopes. The Party manipulates Smith's life to ensure that his hopes are never true and remain pseudo-hope. Through his actions, Smith exemplifies the character whose demise is a result of his inability to possess true hope. On the other hand, in *The Hunger Games*, the Capitol fails in its attempt at weaponization and manipulation of hope due to its own overzealousness. While it forces Katniss Everdeen into a situation that creates new hopes, the Capitol does not succeed in controlling her hope. Through her thoughts and actions, Katniss is an exemplary symbol of true hope. I contend that establishing a framework for hope using the secular and theistic ideas of Aristotle and Aquinas as well as Drahos' categories of hopes, allows the one to analyze the role of hope in a dystopian novel. I also contend that the prevailing type of hope dictates the fate of the protagonist in any given dystopian work.

Generally speaking, hope is the desire for something good in the future. I chose Aristotle and Saint Thomas Aquinas as they come from two different worlds yet complement each other to form a complete definition of hope. I joined them with Peter Drahos' socio-political categories of hope to create a framework of hope which can be applied to dystopian literature to analyze character actions and plot points. By combining their ideas, we get a sense of what pseudo-hope and true hope is. Aristotle believed that and expanded on the idea in dealing with the virtue of courage. He believed that one could not have hope if one does not have true courage. Often, he reasoned, courage is confused with confidence. He labels these confused concepts as pseudo-courage. The first type of pseudo-courage that Aristotle details is that of experience. To Aristotle, the experience is qualified by those perilous events one's skill has led one out of. When one is confident in one's experiences and in one's skill, one cannot be truly courageous. He likens this to soldiers experiencing war. They are not courageous as they are confident they will prevail as they have before. The second type of pseudo-courage Aristotle details is that of hopeful optimism from good fortune. This, like experience, is a form of confidence, yet it does not have the merit of one's skill to reinforce it. A person who experiences hopeful optimism has prevailed in their situations out of sheer luck rather than skill. This is not true courage. Thirdly, Aristotle details ignorance. When one is confident due to ignorance of the severity of one's situation, then one cannot be truly courageous. Thus, confidence does not equal courage, and without true courage then one cannot hope in a true sense.

Saint Thomas Aquinas builds on Aristotle's definitions by stating that hope must be directed toward a future good that is difficult to attain but not impossible. He also believed that the primary object of one's hope should be the divine. By extension, one can argue that, in a

secular sense, one's object of hope is simply a good outcome. True hope cannot be malicious. Furthermore, Aquinas believed that hope must employ an exercise of reason. Hope cannot be irrational. Moreover, hope should stir a man to a plan of action. One may not hope for something and expect it to come without action; to do so would be more akin to wishing than hoping. Finally, Aquinas states that hope allows one to have secondary objects of hope, but they may not be the primary source or object of hope. They may guide in the voyage of the hopeful person, but may not be the sole purveyor of hope.

Aquinas states that like most things, hope can be abused. One can abuse hope by wishing for bad things, but this would not be a true hope. He does not elaborate on how one may abuse hope, but Peter Drahos does. Drahos states that there are three categories of hope: private, collective, and public. Private is that which an individual holds. Collective hope is that which is held by the public, and public is that which is expounded by political actors or figureheads (Drahos 20). Drahos contends that public is the most dangerous as it can be used for selfish or malevolent ends by corrupt political actors to influence the private and collective hopes of a society. By combining Aristotle's and Aquinas' notions of hope and Drahos' categories of hope, I establish a framework that can be used to analyze the actions in dystopian literature. I contend that whether a character is a truly hopeful character or one that experiences pseudo-hope determines their outcome.

By combining the secular notions of Aristotle and the theistic notions of Aquinas, a clear concept of hope is established. Joining the concept of what hope is—and isn't—with the categories of hope that people hold, a complete framework of hope within a dystopian world is established. This framework allows one to systematically analyze the presence and effect of hope in a text. This is particularly useful for analyzing a character's action. It is my contention that the

type of hope that a character holds for the majority of the novel ultimately dictates (or explains) the outcome of that character. Based on this framework, I contend that Winston is a symbol of pseudo-hope. Though often the victim of manipulation by the Party, Winston is never a character that embodies true courage. He often experiences pseudo-courage, like when he sits to write in his journal thinking that he is not being watched, or when he continually visits Mr. Charrington's shop to have trysts with a love interest, Julia. He allows his experience to give him confidence that he will come out relatively unscathed—though deep down he knows it's a matter of time. Furthermore, he is ignorant of the dangers that are really about him as is evident by his shock when the robotic voice speaks in the room in Charrington's shop. Moreover, he puts his faith and hope solely in others and not on a divine good. Winston's hopes lie in secondary objects as primary sources. He puts his faith and hopes in O'Brien, Julia, Mr. Charrington, and even the proles. Winston is also a character who dwells in his irrationality. Often he knows that what he is doing will end poorly, yet he ignores the warning signs and pursues it anyway. His hopes lie in a fanciful and unreasonable place like the Brotherhood or the past. The Party is wholly responsible for this as they have created the circumstances, and even the people, that lead Winston to this path. Winston is an example of character in whom pseudo-hope prevails. He can be used as a point of reference from which to compare other literary characters.

Unlike Winston, Katniss Everdeen is the personification of true hope. Katniss is a character whose personality lends itself to being a symbol of true hope. Katniss is thrust into a situation where she is forced to be courageous from a young age. Katniss loses her father in an accident, and her mother goes through an intense period of depression. Katniss is forced to be the provider for her sister and herself. She did not have confidence that they would survive, but she hoped that they would, and she did everything in her power to ensure that they did. This is being

truly courageous and truly hopeful. When she thrusts herself into the titular Hunger Games to replace her sister, she also does not have confidence that she will make it out alive. She believes that she is going to die, but she promises her sister that she will try and she does. Again, this is true courage. While she doesn't believe that she will win the games, she hopes that she will and hopes that she will see her sister again. This is true courage, even incorporating a secondary object of hope properly. Katniss never allows herself to be irrational or unreasonable. Moreover, she lets her hope stir her to action. When she doesn't believe that she will win, she thinks of her ultimate hope of staying alive and keeps moving forward. Katniss, a character entrenched in true hope, becomes the explicit symbol of hope that Smith could not be and an example of a character in whom true hope prevails.

In summation, true hope is a desire for some future good that is difficult but not impossible to attain. It is reasonable and good and stirs one to action. Hope does not rely on the confidence gained by experience or good fortune, nor is it ever ignorant of the dangers at hand. It can appear in three categories: private, collective, and public. Private hope is held by an individual, and collective hope by a society, while public is that which is pronounced by political actors. These hopes influence the other with the most dangerous one being public as it can be used to manipulate the other two in nefarious ways. By combining all of these facets of hope, there stands a framework of what hope is and how it can be used for manipulation. By applying this framework to a work of dystopian literature, one can determine which type of hope is prevalent in a character. These characters' fate and the types of hope that prevails within them should coincide: pseudo-hope begets failure, while true hope begets success.

### WORKS CITED

- Aquinas, Saint Thomas. *The Summa Theologica Volume 1*. BiblioBazaar, 2007.
- Baccolini, Raffaella. "The Persistence of Hope in Dystopian Science Fiction." *Pmla*, vol. 119, no. 3, 2004, pp. 518–21.
- Bloeser, Claudia, and Titus Stahl. "Hope." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford University, 8 Mar. 2017, plato.stanford.edu/entries/hope/#AnciAccoHope.
- Cartwright, John. "From Aquinas to Zwelethemba: a Brief History of Hope." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Ann Am Acad Polit Ss*, vol. 592, no. 1, 2004, pp. 166–84.
- Collins, Suzanne. *The Hunger Games*. Scholastic, 2010.
- Collins, Suzanne. *Catching Fire*. Scholastic, 2009.
- Drahos, Peter. "Trading in Public Hope." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 592, no. 1, 2004, pp. 18–38., doi:10.1177/0002716203261614.
- Gravlee, G. Scott. "Aristotle on Hope." *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, vol. 38, no. 4, 2000, pp. 461–77.
- Halpin, David. "The Nature of Hope and Its Significance for Education." *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 49, no. 4, 2001, pp. 392–410.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. Signet Classics, 1950.
- Pettit, Philip. "Hope and Its Place in Mind." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Ann Am Acad Polit Ss*, vol. 592, no. 1, 2004, pp. 152–65.
- Reber, Lauren Lewis. "Negotiating Hope and Honesty: A Rhetorical Criticism of Young Adult Dystopian Fiction." *All Theses and Dissertations, Birmingham Young University*, Paper 284, 2005.

*The Bible*. Authorized King James Version, Oxford UP, 1998.

## VITA

Luis Alberto Ramirez received his Bachelor of Arts degree in English with a minor in Psychology from Texas A&M International University in Laredo, Texas in December of 2008. He began the pursuit of his higher education at Texas A&M International University in January 2009 and received his Master of Arts degree in August 2018. His research and writing interests include adult and young adult dystopian literature, creative writing, education and professional wrestling scholarship. He plans to continue teaching high school English literature and writing, venture into publishing scholarly articles on pop culture and professional wrestling, and pursue his doctoral degree.

Mr. Ramirez may be reached at [luisrmz0@gmail.com](mailto:luisrmz0@gmail.com).