

THE REVOLUTION OF HOPE  
*A REVOLUÇÃO DA ESPERANÇA*  
*LA REVOLUCIÓN DE LA ESPERANZA*

*Adrian SCRIBANO\**

**ABSTRACT:** This article aims to present hope as an emotion that motivates radical modifications in the constitution of people, communities and the relationship of human beings with the planet and all the living beings that inhabit it. To achieve this objective, the following expository strategy is used: a) it is synthesized as the relationship between interstitial practices, emotions, and sensibilities are understood, b) it is presented synthetically because hope is the opposite of patience and waiting as civic virtues, c) some characteristics of hope are outlined, d) hope and its relationship with love, trust, reciprocity, and happiness are presented in a summary, and finally it concludes with a line about the place of hope in a geometry revolutionary.

**KEYWORDS:** Revolution. Hope. Love. Reciprocity. Trust.

**RESUMO:** *Este artigo tem como objetivo apresentar a esperança como emoção que motiva modificações radicais na constituição das pessoas, das comunidades e na relação dos seres humanos com o planeta e todos os seres vivos que o habitam. Para atingir este objetivo, utiliza-se a seguinte estratégia expositiva: a) sintetiza-se como*

---

\* Director of the Center for Sociological Research and Studies (CIES estudiosociologicos.org) and Principal Researcher at the National Council for Scientific and Technical Research. He is also the Director of the Latin American Journal of Studies on Bodies, Emotions, and Society and the Program of Studies on Bodies, Emotions, and Society at the Gino Germani Research Institute, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Buenos Aires. He served as Coordinator of the 26th Working Group on Bodies and Emotions for the Latin American Association of Sociology (ALAS) from 2007 to 2024 and currently serves as President of the Working Group 08 on Society and Emotions for the International Sociological Association (ISA) and President of the International Network of Sociology of Sensibilities. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0523-8056>. Contact: [adrianscribano@gmail.com](mailto:adrianscribano@gmail.com).

*é compreendida a relação entre práticas intersticiais, emoções e sensibilidades, b) expõe-se sinteticamente porque a esperança é o oposto da paciência e da espera como virtudes cívicas, c) são delineadas algumas características da esperança, d) apresenta-se de modo resumido a esperança e sua relação com o amor, a confiança, a reciprocidade e a felicidade e, por fim, conclui-se com algumas linhas sobre o lugar da esperança em uma geometria revolucionária.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Revolução. Esperança. Amor. Reciprocidade. Confiança.*

**RESUMEN:** *Este artículo tiene por objetivo presentar la esperanza como una emoción que motiva modificaciones radicales en la constitución de las personas, las comunidades y de la relación de los seres humanos con el planeta y todos los seres vivos que lo habitan. Para lograr dicho objetivo se apela a la siguiente estrategia expositiva: a) se sintetiza como se entiende relación entre prácticas intersticiais, emociones y sensibilidades, b) se expone sintéticamente porque la esperanza es la contracara de la paciencia y la espera como virtudes cívicas, c) se esquematizan algunas características de la esperanza, d) se presenta de modo resumido la esperanza y su relación con el amor, la confianza, la reciprocidad y la felicidad, y finalmente se concluye con unas líneas sobre el lugar de la esperanza en un geometría revolucionaria.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Revolución. Esperanza. Amor. Reciprocidad. Confianza.*

## **Introduction: Pandemic, Emotions, and Hope**

Several years ago, Averill, Catlin, and Chon wrote *Rules of Hope*, and in the opening paragraphs of the book, they stated:

More than three decades ago, during the height of the Cold War, Menninger (1959) raised the question: ‘Don’t we have a duty as scientists, not concerning a new rocket or new fuel or new bomb or new gas, but concerning this ancient yet rediscovered truth, the validity of Hope in human development?’ (p. 491). Not in response to Menninger’s exhortation, but reflecting the salutary effects of hope in various challenging contexts, especially in recovery from illness, references to hope are now frequent in medical and psychological writings. (Averill, Catlin, Chon, 1990, p. 1, our translation).

The pandemic, as a life scenario interacting over three years with hundreds of days of total confinement, involved the transformation of daily life, changes in the presence of the State in civil society, and the prevalence of emotions that, although responding to specific geopolitical issues, acquired a global reach.

The plurality of situations in the field of public health, common goods, and the political economy of morality led to variations in the politics of emotional sensitivities and ecologies. This caused daily, weekly, monthly, and semi-annual shifts in the predominant emotions on the planet: on one side, fear, anxiety, anger, and uncertainty; on the other, love, trust, reciprocity, happiness, and hope (Scribano, 2021a, 2021b).

A potent combination of fear, threat, and uncertainty enveloped the planet, about which Maximiliano Korstanje (2021) wrote:

Similar to the attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, a seminal event that marked the turn of the century, the recent virus outbreak in Wuhan, China, strongly resonates in the Western social imagination. Both events have differences and, of course, commonalities. September 11 encapsulates Western civilization's struggle against an invisible enemy, terrorism, while now the target is a virus. Both emulate the doctrine of living with the internal enemy. Another common point is that the very means of transport that facilitate the State of alarm are paradoxically and simultaneously its primary victims (Korstanje, 2021: XI, our translation)

Remaining still is to lock oneself in, and distrust became a way to structure the compass between the State, society, market, needs, and desires. Angélica De Sena, reflecting on the Argentine reality, wrote about the connection between social policies and emotions:

In this context, we will analyze the emotions these individuals mention in relation to the social program, and we present a word cloud to map the dimensions of the different emotions mentioned. The first word that decisively emerges is '**help**.' In this sense, we must analyze the nature of the dependency they imply." (Scribano & De Sena, 2018). Thus, it is possible to characterize these feelings: help, assistance, containment, benefit, relief, gratitude, acceptance, compliance, and conformity, as feelings not linked to autonomy and detachment from the law (De Sena, 2019). In another aspect, anguish, **pain, anger, sadness, shame, despair, and indignation arise, and then well-being, tranquility, joy, happiness, satisfaction, and enthusiasm** (De Sena, 2022, p. 145, our translation.).

It is evident that since 2020, very complex and, in a sense, paradoxical emotional ecologies have been structured in light of the incomprehension of many of the transformations that humans are witnessing at the beginning of this long century. Situated in England, in a cross-sectional view of globalization and drawing on her theory of the Virocene, Rodanthy Tzanelli (2022) stated regarding the connection between mobility, travel, tourism, and emotions:

This appears to be a dystopian world, where, to communicate effectively with others, one must adapt, but also acquire new skills and competencies. However, it is also a world full of new possibilities and potential to create new and better futures. The fair use of such transitions for the future of travel can be based on understanding the nature of the sensations of events as they emerge. Feeling the present is one thing, and finding effective ways to share those sensations is another. How can this happen in a world episodically locked down? The answer in the case of travel does not lie in orderly planning without the help of what cannot be seen, a non-matter that shapes the materialities and futures of mobility: affect. The ‘transversality’ of affect, its potential to be transformed into good and just emotions, becomes possible through different temporalities — what Deleuze (1992) and Guattari (1995) discuss as the virtuality of affect (Tzanelli, 2022, p. 3, our translation).

The pandemic reinforced the experience of “feeling good” in tension with “well-being,” while at the same time offering the possibility of “novelties” and diverse paths, as well as new commodifications, but of different experiences of time/space that “affected” the century in terms of the politics of sensitivities.

In the context of the Pandemic, during 2020, we held a series of lectures with groups that make up our networks across various Argentine universities and research programs on “*Teoria social e política das sensibilidades em tempos de pandemia*”, where we discussed love, trust, reciprocity, happiness, and hope. This article is the result of a partial and restructured recording of the lecture on hope and is part of the ongoing effort we have made to present a systematic view of the sociology of hope (Scribano, 2023a; 2023b, 2023c).

The purpose of this article is to present hope as an emotion that drives radical transformations in the constitution of individuals, communities, and the relationship between human beings and the planet, as well as all living creatures that inhabit it. In this way, it attempts to outline the central characteristics of what is revolutionary about hope as an interstitial practice that paves the way for a revolutionary disposition aimed at improving collective life and health.

---

<sup>1</sup> Social Theory and the Politics of Sensibilities in Times of Pandemic.

To achieve this objective, the following expository strategy is employed: a) synthesizing the relationship between interstitial practices, emotions, and sensibilities, b) briefly explaining why hope is the opposite of patience and waiting as civic virtues, c) outlining some characteristics of hope, d) providing a summary of the relationship between hope and love, trust, reciprocity, and happiness, and finally concluding with some remarks on the place of hope in a **revolutionary geometry**.

The development of a sociology of hope requires elucidating what is interstitial about it and how this implies an approach to the concept of revolution.

## **Interstitial Practices, Emotions, and Sensibilities**

There are unnoticed, interstitial, and hidden folds in the “everyday life” of millions of subjects expelled and discarded from the Global South. Lived practices of life are thus actualized as a power of energies surplus to predation. In this context, practices emerge for which sociology typically lacks a well-developed critical, conceptual, and methodological framework. Some of these practices include happiness, hope, and joy, which, in one way or another, emerge as a counterpoint to the axes of neocolonial religion mentioned above.

Interstitial practices are those social relations that appropriate the open and indeterminate spaces within the capitalist structure, generating a “behavioral” axis that exists transversally in relation to the central vectors of the politics of bodies and emotions. Therefore, they are not orthodox practices, nor are they paradoxical or heterodox in the conceptual sense given by Pierre Bourdieu. Among the many ways to conceptually understand what these practices signify, we will mention three here: as folds, as breaks, and as “unexpected” parts of a puzzle.

Interstitial practices nest in the unnoticed folds of the naturalized and naturalizing surface of the politics of bodies and emotions that neocolonial religion presupposes. They are ruptures within the context of normativity. They are emergences that (rebel and) reveal themselves in relation to the inertial void to which mimetic consumption confines, the labeling of impossibility to which resignation condemns, and the enclosure served by diminished humanism, marketed as false solidarity.

The practices to which we refer are actualized and instantiated in interstices, understood as structural ruptures through which the absences within a given system of social relations are made visible. These ruptures are irregular spaces where subjects construct a set of relations aiming to weld together the conflicting structure, but with different and multiple latencies. These welds cross bodies and emotions, enhancing re-passions, uniting with reciprocity where there was mimetic consumption, combining the “we” of festive expenditure where there was solidarity, and expanding hope where resignation had occurred.

Interstitial practices are “unexpected” parts that seem connected but are not part of the puzzle that combines mimetic consumption, diminished humanism, and resignation. The pictorial metaphor of the puzzle is an insufficient representation, but it “triggers” the observation that within the framework of a set of social relations, there are others corresponding to the “entrances” and “exits” of what the figure implies. The interstitial, then, enters and exits the puzzle in a contingent and indeterminate manner, as it depends on its particular historical and structural configuration.

During the Pandemic, some highly relevant connections between emotions and hope were emphasized for social organization. In this context, it is necessary to insist on the urgency of developing a systematic reflection on interstitial practices as a pathway or “prequel” to the study of hopeful practices of feeling that become transformative or, if preferred, revolutionary practices.

Revolutionary practices are those that manage to modify the political economy of morality and truth from which transformations are structured in the personal autonomies of human beings and in communal potentialities. To this end, it is necessary to locate interstitial practices within the scenario and horizon of transformations that imply a “feeling-thinking” and a “doing-feeling” of the connection between love, trust, reciprocity, and happiness.

For more than 30 years, the author (collectively with CIES and generally from social theory and sociology) has reflected on disruptive, repulsive, and transformative practices. Today, the new and complex relationships between sensibilities and emotions motivate us to discuss the horizons of hope within the scope of sociological theories of revolution, utopia, social change, and collective action.

It is timely to discuss hope as a disruptive practice, as an action that stirs and raises new questions; but it is essential to caution against any romantic, miserabilist, or Enlightenment prejudices about this interstitial practice, especially regarding hope that aspires to be a revolutionary practice. The term revolution here alludes to the limited capacities that humans have as individuals and as a collective to transform the world.

The Pandemic was a moment to live through a “now is the time,” a “this is the moment,” a “we have the opportunity,” because phases of transformation on the planet, from positive to negative, from moments of revolution-based transformations such as the French Revolution, great cataclysms, or economic crises, generally offer a new opportunity.

In the next section, the difference between hope, resignation, and “waiting” will be presented as civic virtues of the consumerist and bourgeois conformism of normalized society in pursuit of immediate pleasure.

## Hope as the Other Side of Patience and Waiting

The democracy of consumption characteristic of normalized societies, focused on immediate gratification through consumption, rests on two pillars: the creation of patience and the “need to know how to wait” as civic virtues of a politically correct citizen.

In this framework, hope is a rejection of patience and waiting as civic virtues of bourgeois democracy. Since the citizen is prohibited from advancing into the future, they must be governed by the rules of “emotional control,” emotional regulations, and the structuring of patience and waiting. For the citizen, patience is a bridge to tomorrow; in any case, bourgeois democracy shapes tomorrow in the form of consumption, installed/inscribed in immediate gratification through consumption. The citizen must regenerate/reproduce these new rules as the basis of their access to “another opportunity.” Having hope means that we can civilly disobey patience and waiting. We do not have to wait. We do not need many years to solve something.

Consider the objective fact that there is a demand for values and virtues aligned with electoral periods—4, 6, or 3 periods of 4 or 6 years. A good citizen is one who knows how to accept with resignation what they have and rejects any temptation to inhabit the future. Hope begins as a way to reconstruct what it means to be patient in this democracy; the first approach is that hope is a critical practice, a way to challenge this logic of contemporary civic virtues, where if someone wants to do something, they must rebuild themselves, be content, and know that “it will come.” In this democracy, happiness as containment, as being contained, as being content, is the prelude to the logic of patience as an adjustment to a rule—a rule made for the few, a rule that contemplates inequality and unequal appropriation as the norm.

In this context, the ability to formulate a logic of negation appears as the first approach to hope; it is a signal. There is an interpellation in hope, and the relationship between hope and pointing is instantiated. The pre-tension, this tension toward the future, shows that a hopeful person is pretentious, a human being propelled into the future. This is why both phenomenology and Bourdieu discussed the concept of tension. The hopeful individual is like an arrow moving forward, and hope is perceived and experienced as a critical stimulus. That is why hope stands in opposition to resignation, which is demanded by ascetic saving and abstinence, considered key to the political economy of morality for a democrat who dares not move forward but adheres to the rhythm of consumption and virtuous waiting.

Why is hope the opposite of resignation? Because hope gives us the power to build something called tomorrow. This tension, this pretension, this state of being stretched towards the future, makes hope an opposite force that critiques ascetic saving. Along with the critique of reciprocity and happiness, it disrupts the “social

mandate” to view the logic of desire associated with consumption as the only way to comprehend the future. If someone simply accumulates—through ascetic saving, accumulation, or the conquest of the future—it is tied to productivity, development, and the practices that capitalism has employed for at least three centuries. The original foundation of capitalism as we know it today is ascetic saving, a regulatory relationship between saving and waste for the bourgeoisie, while abstinence is “commanded” for the lower classes, who are expected to leave behind their desires and goals, shifting this logic towards the future. The good citizen lives within the “paradox” of desire and the future; the desiring and the parsimonious individual are moments regulated by class-based timelines and classifications.

This can be understood as confinement, a setting of goals without providing the tools to achieve them. What does it mean to abstain? It means not to produce action, a paradox in which humans are asked not to act in order to produce something. This practice, inscribed within the logic of morality, is expressed as an imperative: abstain! If you abstain from being conflicted, if you abstain from not following the rules, if you abstain sexually, then the modeling between sexual abstinence, the consumption of sex, and the abstinence from conflicted autonomy occur within a dialectical game.

These are the keys to the contemporary political economy of morality, where a hopeful person represents a negation of the immutable relationship between ascetic saving and abstinence as a mandate to act by not acting. It is at this point that, within the resignation of bourgeois democracy, one can observe what Herbert Marcuse points out regarding repressive desublimation: the logic that knowing how to wait for consumption, critically aware of consumption, sacralizes consumption as the organizing principle of reality. In this sense, the connection between waiting, abstinence, and happiness—denied by hope—emerges. In the logic of today’s political economy of morality, happiness is an imperative: we are required to be free, but if we obey, we are not free; and if we disobey the command, we are also not free.

It is precisely within this relationship of impossibility that capitalism imposes in its structure of resignation, which involves waiting and patience, that hope emerges as the transition from the interstitial to the revolutionary.

In the next section, we will reconstruct some characteristics of hope that allow us to understand it as a radical rupture.

## **Characteristics of Hope**

Starting from hope as a negation of patience, waiting, and resignation, we can identify some of its central characteristics. What becomes visible in hope? It becomes visible in the presentification of time. An instantiation, a reality in becoming



reproduces a social practice that lives the past, present, and future, all at once in the today/now. To be here now is to amalgamate and reconstruct the past, present, and future into one time. What is the logic of the political economy of contemporary morality? The instant. That is why the instant, in its impetuosity and fleeting nature, leaves something behind. It loses the past as history, the natural history of the planet, and the past of human beings themselves. And what is to come, the future, emerges as the possibility of creating the present in a different way. This is why hope relates to the now, to the today/now. Hope is precisely that gesture of anticipatory practices that are not yet, but are becoming.

One of the characteristics of hope is that it is never definitive; it is always becoming. These are practices that are not yet complete. Within the logic of impossibility, this is the logic of the instant, where there is no past and there can be no future. In the sacralized present, as immediate enjoyment, what is absent is the possibility of action.

From this surface and horizon, some characteristics emerge that allow us to understand what is revolutionary in hope.

First, hope consists of anticipatory practices of the future. A human being has no hope unless they are doing something that refers to the future for its realization. It is interesting to see that in any form of organizing human reproduction as a mammal, there is a relationship between reproduction and the future.

Because reproduction is a bet on the future, it implies doing something that will have its result in tomorrow—something that is “projected” into tomorrow, a practice that is amplified by being performed for its outcomes.

Similarly, in both trust and love, we can observe that revolution occurs when the mountain of ego is overcome. Anticipatory practices of the future signify this: betting on a scale of action, while reproduction means doing something for tomorrow, not just for the now, consecrated in egocentrism.

This also has its consequences. One of the important aspects of the future is that humans are making it now. Thus, it is not that we “must” wait. Hope is not associated with chronology; hope is associated with the dialectic of time and space, with how we inhabit the past, because it is our present. The future is not simply made from here onwards. Many ideas about social pacts that emerge in today’s public conversation refer to agreeing on a “now” that leaves the past intact, yet it is impossible to have a now that leaves the past untouched, because transforming the future means altering the past.

There are no other paths, which is why many discursive or subjectivist responses attempt only to narrate the past and conquer the future. In this sense, the institutional politics of consumer democracies is the most effective way to coagulate hope as nostalgia and melancholy.

To exhaust and narrow hope in its narration as practice is to deprive it of its disruptive value, because this would mean reconstructing the past discursively. This is why it is said that the first political act is not memory, but recollection. Memory is a consequence of recollections, which are social, constructed intersubjectively, and radically intersubjective. It is not merely a narrative relationship with the past. Hope is an anticipatory practice of the future; it is a being that inhabits the future.

We, as human beings, have the ability to engage in a practice that, when exercised, is to inhabit, to dwell, from the idea of habitability, of being present. This is linked to the concept of presentification, which means to be in the world.

The future is now, as we inhabit it. What does it mean to inhabit? It means being with others. Despair, in contrast, sinks into the roots of solipsism, into the emphasis on the insular individual who lives in isolation. The construction of this habitability involves at least three things: Hope is a being that provides shelter, hope is a being that brings others into proximity, and hope is a being that inhabits the future because it serves as a point of reference in our journey towards it.

It is often said in media jargon that “it is this kind of light at the end of the tunnel.” In truth, it is very interesting to revisit the idea of hope as something that illuminates because, in any case, light is not captured here through Enlightenment, the avant-garde, or bourgeois forms of seeking the happiness of immediate gratification, but rather by inviting a future in which human beings are sheltered in a different way. Why? Because the radical aspect of every revolution, especially this revolution of hope, is not to dogmatically construct a new human, but to establish a new human practice.

What does it mean to shelter, cohabit, to be close? There is a characteristic of hope in being. What does it mean to be in the process of becoming? It is always a fruit; it is planting something for tomorrow. It is about revisiting the idea of the etymology of happiness associated with agriculture, about revisiting the idea of the root, which signifies that a plant wishes to be planted.

It is interesting to note that when something is acquired in capitalism, even in the customs of Argentina, it is said that what is planted and nailed is bought; to measure it, stakes are placed and planted, breaking the hyper-individualistic act. Hope marks the future because it is a being. One of the best ways to reject hope is to demand fruit before it has bloomed. It is like wanting to have an orange before the tree bears fruit, and in this sense, the co-construction of habitability is clearly radically cooperative.

It is from these initial approaches to the characteristics of hope that we can move toward more complex relationships with other practices of feelings and emotions that organize a special geometry.

## **Hope and Its Relationship with Love, Trust, Reciprocity, and Happiness**

The hope of today is the result of the love of yesterday. It is not that we have nothing to do today; we must devote ourselves to rebuilding love as a possibility of encounter. Thus, if we understand hope as practices that anticipate the future, they are already becoming the future because, in a certain sense, they already were.

In this sense, to have hope, we must abandon the history of hatred—not in the sense of forgetting but in the sense of reconstructing history itself. The theoretical reconstruction of hope involves rebuilding history from places where there was love, trust, reciprocity, and happiness as collective practices. In this way, hope is a today, but the result of a yesterday.

This does not mean a linear causal sequence of events; it is not that “in the now” we will have hope, and in ten years after certain things happen, certain other things will follow. This has nothing to do with denying that the social is a process or with denying that for there to be fruit, there must be a process of relation with the earth, with oxygen, with water. Because there are various components, and they are tensioned and dialectical. Therefore, this agrarian metaphor seeks to reconstruct the notion of hope, not from the side of immediacy but from the side of wisdom—the reconstruction of being with the fruit and being. The worst trap of the liquidity of hope is to demand it to bear fruit before its time.

This is better understood because these practices “are not yet, but are becoming.” That is why the relationship of today’s hope can be thought of as the result of yesterday’s love. We work with love as a kind of scandalous gaze upon the present that denies the value of the totality of the political economy and the morality of those who dominate—or of those who hold the whole or try to pass a part as the whole. But hope also presupposes trust in others, because as actions, they hold a critique of asceticism and abstinence economies. It assumes others as objects of enjoyment (*sensu Marx*), implying and presupposing action with others. Therefore, hope is never individual, never a soliloquy. Hope, as a social practice, denies the totality of capitalism that consumes through immediate pleasure.

In hope, there is always a multiplicity of relationships. Just as trust helped map the world, hope is a form of future habitability. This is based on the fact that through hopeful practices, human beings “discover” new territories.

These are territories that are shared, a relationship between trust and love in this sharing with others as a practice of opening the world. Hope is precisely that light that moves forward depending on how this interrelationship can be configured, from these shared forms of understanding the map of these territories, of this habitability, of the comfort of hope, of the practice of being with others.

In this sense, trust in relation to love, and sharing, implies “starting with,” as it also serves as a map that makes us aware of territories we did not know. Hope also

means advancing into unknown territories. A characteristic of the security of ascetic savings based on what has been accumulated is that the other is valued by what they possess. When one steps away from that, returning to Erich Fromm's book, *To Have or To Be*, when one moves forward guided by a different map, one discovers that trust offers another perspective, shows us other streets, navigate other rivers, and ventures to other places. Hope involves trusting in the actions of others, provided we take risks—not in the theoretical sense of risk, but in the sense of embracing risk. It means walking with others and building that map together, making the past, present, and future dialectically contiguous and intertwined. For when you traverse an unknown territory, you carry some knowledge of the past, something in front of you, the present, and something ahead, which is where you are headed with that map.

This is what the revolution of hope offers: the idea that taking risks by trusting others is not forbidden. The other is not measured by the logic of accumulating wealth, power, and/or knowledge but is valued and connected to the collective. This allows us to explore another aspect: hope is having certainty about the consequences of processes of reciprocity.

When discussing the notion of love alongside trust and reciprocity, it becomes clear that what trust and love provide us with is the knowledge that the outcome of equal exchange, of considering the other as a peer, someone who builds horizontally with me, is linked to having a certain confidence in common reproduction. Hope returns as a logic of inhabiting a territory, having a map, and making progress step by step because, in any case, we have the prior knowledge that people's actions will have certain consequences. Therefore, the goals are not at the end; rather, the goals of the here and now are the ones that ensure the goals of the future. In the practice of hope, there are always goals that guarantee other goals—it's a process in constant production.

Thus, when “we” decide to continue towards a destination, we go step by step, not directly to the end goal; hope is the consequence. Reciprocity is both a resource and the result of equivalent interaction. What we share in trust, what we scandalously stake in love, what the other “finds in me”—this co-presence in the habitability of hope is linked to the possibility of being reciprocal. Hope is the certainty that the consequences of reciprocity point toward the common good. What I seek will come because it is tied to reciprocity; thus, hope is a form of reciprocity, hope is a form of trust, and it is the practice of love as a scandalous act.

For all these reasons, hope is the pursuit of happiness that is yet to come. We cannot cease to hope if happiness is something still forthcoming. Whether subjective or objective, theories of happiness have different logic depending on their satisfiers. There is an interesting characteristic of the world of hope: it is tied to happiness that is yet to come. Because the logic of happiness is not understood as a mystified, fetishized, or objectified totality. It is not about saying, “Be patient,

happiness will come at some point,” or “Consume and be happy today.” No, hope is another practice.

Thus, an exciting reflection arises, because the certainty that hope will come rests on the fact that we had the assurance of the consequence of reciprocity, which stems from having trusted others, which emerges from a past love and, therefore, is already approaching. Hope has to do with happiness that is yet to come. And in any case, it already begins to manifest in this state of happiness. Certainty does not come in absolute terms, black or white, but rather in possibilities.

Hope, connected to love, trust, reciprocity, and happiness, forms the axis of the sociology of hopeful practices and a way of understanding revolution. A sociology of hope starts from the fact that human beings, through these relationships (complex and dialectical), find a solid foundation to establish a radical intersubjectivity, with radical constructiveness and a recognition of the material conditions of existence that excludes any form of misery, romanticism, or Enlightenment thinking. Yet it also encompasses an intersectional, post-speciesist, and communal perspective.

## **Revolutionary Geometry: By Way of Conclusion**

It is within the framework of this discussion that the chapter’s title, “The Revolution of Hope,” can be better understood. The geometric space that emerges from these five practices encompasses an emotional ecology and a politics of sensibilities of a new character, deepening the challenge of producing radical change.

If we are to name hope as a revolutionary practice, its quality lies in its outcome, making other interstitial practices possible and presupposing them. Hope does not happen in isolation; it does not happen alone. Human beings do not hope for things to happen “on their own.” They act to make things happen.

But understanding that hope is not condemned, frozen, consecrated, or dogmatized by its characteristics means opening it up and reconstructing it. This tension between the feeling practices, associated with love, trust, reciprocity, and happiness, forms the platform for a revolution that considers the common good.

Reciprocity as a path to equality, happiness as a path to justice, trust as an experience of community, and love as an experience of autonomy. Therefore, hope is nothing more than the definition of the complex and dialectical sum to which we allude. It may seem like an oxymoron, but it is not, because each moment implies the other, but in a different state. Love as autonomy presupposes a state of justice that implies equality but can only be exercised if there is community.

Hope is a radical shift toward personal autonomy in a communal context that fosters justice and equality. It is a politics of diverse sensitivities. This changes the definition, because one of the characteristics of hope is that it cannot be defined a

priori, but it needs to follow a path, which involves a process, and this process of hope signifies a radical change, now indeed.

That is why it is possible to reclaim the revolutionary nature of hope, without feeling embarrassed by its utopian aspect. It is a moment when we can review the critical force of interstitial practices without being embarrassed for not engaging in classic political sociology, where the oppressive power is the sole focus of analysis.

This is a moment in humanity where emotions are clearly being recognized and valued as important. This is an opportunity, and we realize what it means to have an opportunity. Thinking radically does not happen often in the history of nations or humanity.

Tomorrow morning, when we wake up, the same rulers, the same capitalist corporations, the same classmates, the same faculty authorities, the same president of the nation, etc., will still be there. The same remains. Yet, there is an opportunity to reflect on this. Shall we truly debate whether it is impossible to have hope? Let us discuss this. Returning to the definition I gave at the end, it is impossible to understand hope without a radical change that tends toward personal autonomy in a communal context that promotes justice and equality.

## REFERENCES

AVERILL, James; CATLIN, George; CHON, Kyum. **Rules of hope**. New York: Springer, 1990.

DE SENA, Angelica. Pandemic, Social Policies and Emotions in the Metropolitan area of Buenos Aires. *In*: SCRIBANO, Adrian; ROCHE CÁRCEL, Juan Antonio (Eds.). **Emotions and Society in Difficult Times**. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2022. p.139-159.

FROMM, Erich. **Del tener al ser**. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2007.

TZANELLI, Rodanthi. Feeling Like a Traveller vs. Seeing Like a State: The Affective Poetics of Emotion in the Virocene. *In*: SCRIBANO, Adrian.; KORSTANJE, Maximiliano; RAFELE, Antonio. (Eds.). **Global Emotion Communications: Narratives, Technology, and Power**. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2022. p. 3-23

KORSTANJE, Maximiliano. The Dilemmas of the Lockdown: A Society in Post COVID-19 Days. *In*: KORSTANJE, Maximiliano; SCRIBANO, Adrian (Eds.). **Emotionality of COVID-19. Now and After: The War Against a Virus**. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2021. p. 1-11.

SCRIBANO, Adrian. Founding Women, Sociology, and Hope. **American Sociology**, United States, March 2023. Vol 54 (1), 36–55, 2023a. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-022-09552-1>.

SCRIBANO, Adrian. The Sociology of Hope: Classical Sources, Structural Components, Future Agenda. **Society**, 2023b. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-023-00888-z>.

SCRIBANO, Adrian. Social Theory Today: Revisiting Hope. In: KUMAR D. V. (Ed.). **Revisiting Social Theory: Challenges and Possibilities**. UK: Routledge, 2023c. (forthcoming).

SCRIBANO, Adrian. Emotions and politics of sensibilities in Latin America. **International Sociology**, United States, June 2021. Vol 36 (4), 585-604, 2021a. DOI:10.1177/026858092199451

SCRIBANO, Adrian. Other emotions: A global look at the politics of sensibilities. **International Sociology**, United States, June 2021. Vol 36 (4), 491-497, 2021b. DOI:10.1177/02685809211018080.

**Received on:** 30/01/2024

**Approved on:** 24/06/2024