Chapter Four
The Sleep of Reason

A Monster Comes to Life

The sleep of reason breeds monsters.

—Goya

(This inhuman place makes human monsters. This inhuman place)

repeating the same incomprehensible things over and over.

(makes human monsters.)

—Stephen King, The Shining (159)

The epigraph of The Shining, “The sleep of reason breeds monsters” (El sueño de la razón produce monstruos), is taken from Francisco de Goya y Lucientes’ painting (1799). The “dormancy or inactivity” of “normal or sound powers of mind; sanity” would lead to “any animal or human grotesquely deviating from the normal shape, behavior, or character” (Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)). No matter how monstrous the monster is, in this case, it is a human monster, Jack. Moreover, “the inhuman place”—the Overlook Hotel—is what recreates Jack “a human monster.”

The Overlook is an inhuman place because it is “not suited for human needs” (Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)) but also because it makes Jack “not of ordinary
human form” (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition). This chapter examines how the Overlook as an inhuman place conducts the sleep of reason to transform Jack into a human monster.

In “The Uncanny” (1957), Sigmund Freud describes monsters as “the products of our repressed and projected fears and desires” (241). Yet, everyone has his/her own repressed and projected fears and desires. However, most people are not human monsters. The key to becoming a monster is that the individual is a product, that is to say, he/she is “a consequence of someone’s efforts or of a particular set of circumstances” (WordNet® 3.0). In order to be a monster, Jack must be under the influence of the Overlook. The reason why the Overlook constitutes a particular circumstance under which Jack can be a product of his repressed and projected fears and desires is, as Roland T. Curran states, because “the intensification of homicidal anger towards Wendy and Danny coincides with his control by eventual absorption into the all-encompassing evil represented by the Overlook” (34). Thus, I would rather assume that the Overlook relieves Jack’s repression of his “homicidal anger towards Wendy and Danny,” which is one of his most profound fears and desires. The fact that repression malfunctions as a defense mechanism in this case is primarily due to Jack’s intolerance of Spältung (splitting). As Steven Bruhm remarks upon the radical alterity, which King’s heroes cannot but suffer from:
Thus does the King hero undergo the castration of the Name of the Father, the symbolic commandment that orders, punishes, delimits, and frustrates the subject. Yet, ultimately, it is also the Name that capitulates the subject into a battle for self-definition and self-assertion, for it is that Name that figures as evil to be beaten in the novel. (Bruhm 60)

However, in this case, neither Jack nor Danny can bear the castration of the Name of the Father and then survive the plight at the Overlook. As I argue in the previous chapter, Danny successfully “splits his own image of his father” (Hanson 148) and “abandons Tony like an old toy” (Killer 61) so that he comes through “the battle for self-definition and self-assertion.” That is to say, the Name for him represented by Jack and Tony gives him chances of “self-definition and self-assertion” once again, so he can develop a stable self without becoming immersed in the “father-son wounded narrative” (Davenport 310).

As for Jack, he is not as fortunate as Danny—”the Name” for him, the Overlook, does enforce being “into a battle for self-definition and self-assertion” on him, but he is unable to beat “that Name that figures as evil” for the sake of being trapped in “self-definition and self-assertion.” “Definition of one's identity, character, abilities, and attitudes, especially in relation to persons or things outside oneself or itself” (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition)
and “insistence on or an expression of one's own importance, wishes, needs, opinions, or the like” (Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)) have to heavily rely upon one’s capacity for distinguishing himself/herself from the Other. Thus, Bruhm brings up the idea of the discourse of Other/evil other to expound the radical alterity, “the state or quality of being other” (Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary), King’s heroes withstand:

The conventional double, or Doppelgänger, then, is for King not a projection of repressed desire so much as a discourse, the discourse of the Other, that is, for Lacan, the language that proceeds from castration, from the spältung (splitting) that plagues every human subject. And it is the nature of Gothic fiction in general that such doubleness comes to represent the force of evil against which the protagonist battles: in King’s case, the discourse of the Other becomes the discourse of the other, the seemingly autonomous George Stark⁶, or the Overlook Hotel which, like Danny, has the ability to read others’ minds and to absorb the emotions and discourse of the people who stay there….The Overlook, that evil other, is not only the fear of a violently castrating father, but that of a

---

⁶ George Stark is the pseudonym taken by Thaddeus Beaumont in Stephen King’s The Dark Half (1989). Thaddeus Beaumont is a writer in Castle Rock who suffers from writer's block. To overcome the problem, he tries to write under the fictitious name, George Stark.
castrating Father—of the discourses of violence that threatens one’s ability to move into a signifying order. (Bruhm 60)

What the Overlook delivers appears to be the discourse of the Other, while it is the discourse of the evil other in essence. On the one hand, the discourse of the Other delivered by the Overlook is like language, because it “proceeds from castration, from the spältung (splitting) that plagues every human subject.” Jack has to endure self-splitting so he can establish himself as a stable person. According to Dylan Evans’ definition of Lacanian Other/other, Lacan assumes that “big Other designates radical alterity,” and he “equates this radical alterity with language and the law” (133). I believe that the reason why the Overlook can profoundly affect Jack is that it impersonates the discourse of the Other. That is to say, Jack listens to the discourse of the Other/the evil other with the result that he identifies with certain deviant values, such as being the Overlook’s Boswell through staying at it, and “correcting” Wendy and Danny through homicide. Providing that the Overlook does not pretend itself as the discourse of the Other but the discourse of the other, Jack would not comply with it that blindly.

On the other hand, what the Overlook delivers is the discourse of the evil other rather than the discourse of the Other. I assume that it is the Overlook’s being “a violently castrating Father” not “a castrating father” that dooms Jack to
downfall. Faced with “a violently castrating Father,” Jack’s judgment becomes weak. That is to say, Jack perceives the Overlook as “a violently castrating Father,” so his judgment cannot help him disobey the discourse of the evil other, which the Overlook delivers. According to Dylan Evans’ definition of other/Other, “the little other is the other who is not really other, but a reflection of the EGO….The little other is thus entirely inscribed in the imaginary order” (133). Also, Evans assumes “the ego is a construction which is formed by identification with the specular image:”

It is thus the place where the subject becomes alienated from himself, transforming himself into the counterpart. This alienation on which the ego is based is structurally similar to paranoia, which is why Lacan writes that the ego has a paranoiac structure (Lacan, Ecrits, 20). The ego is thus an imaginary formation, as opposed to the SUBJECT, which is a product of the symbolic. (Evans 51)

In this way, the discourse of the evil other would strengthen Jack’s ego, because “the little other is a reflection of the ego.” Unfortunately, the discourse of the other the Overlook delivers is that of the evil other not that of the good other so that Jack is paranoid about transforming himself into the evil counterpart. Therefore, I would supplement Bruhm’s argument in that the discourse of the evil other, which the Overlook delivers, not only “threatens” Danny’s “ability to move into a signifying
order” but also causes Jack to regress from the symbolic order into the imaginary order because “a signifying order,” in Bruhm’s words, is supposed to be the symbolic order, in which “the intersubjective relationship is always ‘mediated’ by a third term, the big Other” (Evans 202). Jack’s regression from the symbolic order into the imaginary order is the main area of the discussion in this chapter.

**From College-Educated Man to Wailing Ape**

To stay at the Overlook would cause Jack to regress “from college-educated man to wailing ape in five easy seconds” (King 121):

> When you unwittingly stuck your hand into the wasp’s nest, you hadn’t made a covenant with the devil to give up your civilized self with its trappings of love and respect and honor. It just happened to you. Passively, with no say, you ceased to be a creature of the mind and became a creature of nerve endings; from college-educated man to wailing ape in five easy seconds. (King 121)

Here “the wasp’s nest” carries a symbolic connotation that ironically to stay at the Overlook [like the wasp’s nest] as a caretaker for Jack is “to make a covenant with the devil to give up” his “civilized self with its trappings of love and respect and honor.” I would employ Bruhm’s depiction of the Overlook as the spring of the
discourse of evil other to elaborate upon the reason why Jack regresses “from
college-educated man to wailing ape in five easy seconds.”

I argue that Jack is not sober enough to tell if the discourse the Overlook
delivers is of the Other or of the evil other. It is because of the Overlook’s having an
essence of the evil other that causes Jack to commit homicide. As Burton Hartlen puts
it, the Overlook “represents the macrostructure of an exploitative society” (Davis 83).
Jack’s crime, according to Davis, is his complicity in the exploitative capitalism: “In
tune with capitalist ideology, Jack is wiling to sacrifice all in pursuit to better himself”
(82). Stephen Davenport assumes that “he makes, in other words, the worst of
shortsighted deals: he sells his soul to the devil.” (319). Jack’s motivation for starting
a new job both as a caretaker and a playwright is not evil. The job as a hotel caretaker
for Jack is his last hope: “‘Without this job we’re done,’ he said simply. ‘You know
that’” (King 144). The desperation manifests itself within the idea that the job as
caretaker of the Overlook is his last hope. Sharon A. Russell argues that “the
Overlook Hotel became the real source of the action in the novel [The Shining]:”

The evil forces come alive when they are exposed to Jack’s personality
and Danny’s powers. The hotel is the “bad place,” an echo of Jack’s
drinking, which Danny calls the “Bad Thing.”… he [King] suggests that
capitalism, the constant need to make money from the hotel, serves as a
magnet for the evil the place attracts. Money brings the gangsters to the hotel and causes the gang war in which they are killed. A woman commits suicide because she learns she can’t buy love. Grady is forced to isolate himself and his family because, like Jack, he needs money. (55)

As Russell suggests, the hotel’s former residents, such as the gangsters, the woman who committed suicide (Delores Vickery), and Grady Delbert, are all victims under the “the macrostructure of an exploitative society” (Davis). The pursuit of money causes all of these characters to deceive themselves into doing the immoral thing, and their wrongdoings allow the Overlook to “become a symbol of the abuse which comes with money” (Russell 55). Normally, these characters would be considered as counterexamples of capitalism. However, in Jack’s eyes, they, in fact, exemplify capitalism. Were it not for his poor judgment, these characters would serve as the counterexamples that he could bear in mind. He is so devoted to establishing a new career that he is “in tune with capitalist ideology” (Davis). I think that his complicity is due to the fact that the Overlook masquerades as the discourse of the Other; thus, Jack obeys the discourse of the evil other that the Overlook undoubtedly delivers. In Davenport’s words, Jack is so shortsighted that he makes a covenant with the devil (the Overlook). Even though the Overlook desires for him to sacrifice himself and his family, Jack still identifies with the discourse of the evil other that it delivers.
To cause Jack to lose his temper is one of the ways in which the Overlook puts him into a state of hypnosis, that is, to make him believe what the Overlook delivers is the discourse of the Other not the discourse of the evil other. The big Other’s radical alterity is equated with language and the law (Evans 133) so it is no wonder that Jack would mistake the evil thoughts for the law. Once he has lost his temper, his judgment would also be out of control. Consequently, on condition that Jack’s judgment is poor, Jack would have difficulty distinguishing between the discourse of the Other and the discourse of the evil other. In addition, Jack’s alcoholic hallucination has disturbed him for a long time and numbs his feelings of guilt:

And yet, through it all, he hadn’t felt like a son of bitch. He hadn’t felt mean. He had always regarded himself as Jack Torrance, a really nice guy who was just going to have to learn how to cope with his temper someday before it got him in trouble. The same way he was going to learn how to cope with his drinking. But he had been an emotional alcoholic just as he had been a physical one—the two of them were no doubt tied together somewhere deep inside him, where you’d just as soon not look….Then the exultation was simply buried in shame, and he felt the way he had after he had broken Danny’s arm.

*Dear God, I am not a son of bitch. Please.* (King120-125)
Jack carries on a frantic struggle over whether he is “a son of bitch” or not. That is to say, Jack ostensibly avoids being “a person regarded as thoroughly mean or disagreeable” (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition), while he unconsciously speaks out his condition of being “a son of bitch,” which is “used as an exclamation of impatience, irritation, astonishment, etc.” ((Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)). In fact, his beating his student, George Hartfield, and breaking of Danny’s arm is out of his irritation at their offense. George Hartfield stabs at the tire; Danny stains his paper. Jack’s “irritation” and “impatience” have explained why he is in fact “mean” and “a son of bitch.” However, the discourse of the evil other delivered by the Overlook tells him that he is not a transgressor by rationalization. He assumes that he is just to learn how to cope with his temper and drinking. He even thinks he is an emotional alcoholic and a physical one at the same time. To be “emotional” means Jack has to be human, because an emotional person is one who is “readily affected with or stirred by emotion” (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition). Yet, I would rather argue that Jack spares no efforts to convince himself into believing that he is “human.” Needless to say, “a physical alcoholic” is less human, because he is “of or relating to the body as distinguished from the mind or spirit” (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition) As Jack professes, “the two of them were no doubt
tied together somewhere deep inside him,” there is a fine line between an emotional alcoholic and a physical one. Losing his temper would make his being an emotional alcoholic tantamount to his being a physical one. He loses his temper as the Overlook summons him:

One thought played over and over in his mind, echoing with

(You lost your temper. You lost your temper. You lost your temper.)

an almost superstitious dread. They had come back. He had killed the wasps but they had come back. (King 151)

“They” here can also be referred to as the symbol of the lingering evil thoughts. “The wasps,” which are considered to be killed by him, do “come back.” That is to say, the Overlook’s strength of will to mesmerize Jack is as great as the tenacity of the wasps.

The Breadth of His Responsibility to the Overlook

Having been suspended from the duty of a teacher at a prep school, Jack hopes that he can rebuild himself through taking on certain literary works. He considers himself a writer of elite fiction. He “had once published in Esquire” and “had harbored dreams—not at all unreasonable dreams, he felt—of becoming a major American writer during the next decade” (King 299). He yearns for being “the Eugene
O’Neill of his generation, the American Shakespeare” (129). However, as Stephen Davenport suggests:

His [Jack’s] authenticity as an artist is at stake during their proposed winter at the Overlook. He must write something that will allow him not only to maintain his status as sole breadwinner but also to fulfill his early promise as the kind of writer who attracts the attention of the literati. In Jack’s eyes, he is a suffering artist, beset by writer’s block, economic hardship….(Davenport 312-313)

Under such a cruel circumstance Jack is so fragile that he is mesmerized by “capitalism, the constant need to make money from the hotel” (Russell), which the Overlook represents. The more urgently he desires for money and success, the more deeply he becomes immersed in the quagmire of the Overlook.

Finding and then browsing through the scrapbook of the Overlook, he expects to and feels expected by the Overlook to write its history while staying at it:

The hotel had been closed for the rest of the decade. There was a story about it, a Sunday feature headlined FORMER GRAND HOTEL SINKING INTO DECAY. The accompanying photos wrenched at Jack’s heart: the paint on the front porch peeling, the lawn a bald and scabrous mess, windows broken by storms and stones. This would be a part of the
book, if he actually wrote it, too—the phoenix going down into the ashes to be reborn. He promised himself he would take care of the place, very good care. It seemed that before today he had never really understood the breadth of his responsibility to the Overlook. It was almost like having a responsibility to history. (King 177)

Jack’s original intention is to employ these stories of the scrapbook as the subject matter of his novel, but he is not clear-headed enough to perceive the Overlook’s trap, which is set for him. The Overlook’s trap is to deliver the discourse of the evil other, which Jack mistakes for the discourse of the Other. The subject matter for Jack’s writing is the scene of a gang war in which the gangsters are killed. Undoubtedly to empathize with the gangsters is part of the process of creation, but Jack forgets to take a detached view of these deviant values, in this case, greed for money, which brings them to the Overlook. In order to cause “the phoenix going down into the ashes to be reborn,” he is unaware of his high probability of also being one “going down into the ashes.” That is to say, he is not conscious of his being “in tune with capitalist ideology” (Davis 82); in this case, the gang war has provided a graphic illustration by way of “the paint on the front porch peeling, the lawn a bald and scabrous mess, windows broken by storms and stones.” Jack follows the discourse of the evil other delivered by the Overlook, so he follows the little other, “a reflection of the ego” and
in “the place” of the ego Jack “the subject becomes alienated from himself, transforming himself into the counterpart” (Evans 51). Here the counterpart is the gang war, which represents “the constant need to make money from the hotel” (Russell), capitalism in microcosm.

In this manner, in pursuit of money without giving any thought to the highly perilous aftermath, he makes a covenant with the Overlook in terms of promising “himself he would take care of the place, very good care.” I assume Jack takes care of the Overlook to such an extent that he is willing to sacrifice himself and his family to it. “The breadth of his responsibility to the Overlook” is the tool with which the Overlook exercises points de caption to mesmerize Jack to be its pawn. Originally the signified of “the breadth of his responsibility to the Overlook” should be limited to being a caretaker. However, the Overlook presents the signified of “the breadth of his responsibility to the Overlook” as “having a responsibility to history.” Having identified with the evil other, Jack is mistaken about making a signification between the signifier, “the breadth of his responsibility to the Overlook” and the signified, “having a responsibility to history.” Although in the present situation Jack only desires to write the Overlook’s history, an inkling about his latter regression from the symbolic order into the imaginary order is perceivable. “The accompanying photos wrenched at Jack’s heart” should be the subject matter of Jack’s literary work. That is
to say, Jack has to not only comprehend but also articulate the subject matter. The images should be written down so that they could be the content of Jack’s novel. Yet, actually what Jack can only type is “All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy” over and over again. His desire for writing a history of the Overlook fails.

In the section, “The Snowmobile” in Part Four of “Snowbound,” “the breadth of his responsibility to the Overlook” becomes so powerful that it makes Jack compliant with the prospect of the demise of his writing career at the expense of himself and his family:

The Overlook didn’t want them [Wendy and Danny] to go and he [Jack] didn’t want them to go either. Not even Danny. Maybe he was a part of it, now. Perhaps the Overlook, large and rambling Samuel Johnson that it was, had picked him to be its Boswell. You say the new caretaker writes?

Very good, sign him on. Time we told our side. Let’s get rid of the woman and his snot-nosed kid first, however. We don’t want him to be distracted. We don’t—(King 315)

James Boswell is best known as the biographer of Samuel Johnson. In the “Preface” to The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D, John Wilson Croker says that “The life of Dr. Johnson” is “a most curious chapter in the history of man.” Jack is so complacent about his duty as a biographer of the Overlook’s history that he considers himself
being “picked to be its [the Overlooks’s] Boswell” by the Overlook’s, “large and rambling Samuel Johnson.” For Boswell, it is an arduous task of being Dr. Johnson’s biographer because “the latter portion of Dr. Johnson's life was, as Mrs. Piozzi observes, nothing but conversation, and that conversation was watched and recorded from night to night and from hour to hour with zealous attention and unceasing diligence” (Croker par.3). Jack is the same as Boswell in that both of them have to “watch and record” the discourse of the one who/which is to be written down.

On the one hand, I believe that for Boswell the discourse (the conversation) of Dr. Johnson is the discourse of the Other because Boswell himself undergoes the radical alterity, “the state or quality of being other” (Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary), to produce the work that demonstrates that “human life is a series of inconsistencies”—he admires Dr. Johnson’s for his erudition but he does not avoid taking account of “Johnson's early misfortunes, his protracted poverty, his strong passions, his violent prejudices, and, above all, his mental infirmities.” For Lacan, “the big Other designates radical alterity,” and he “equates this radical alterity with language and the law” (Evans 133). Only when Boswell complies with not the discourse of the other but the discourse of the Other can he write down the masterpiece of Dr. Johnson’s biography—“for certainly there is no instance of the life of any other human being having been exhibited in so much detail, or with so much
fidelity.” (Croker par.4). On the other hand, the way in which Jack treats his task of being the Overlook’s biographer is different in that he devotes himself to the writing of the discourse of the Overlook so much that he cannot distinguish between the discourse of the Other and the discourse of the other. In this way, Jack’s being chosen as the biographer of the Overlook is an adversity because the Overlook deliberately means to “trick” Jack into being its pawn: “It [The Overlook] wants all of us. It’s tricking Daddy [Jack], it’s fooling him, trying to make him think it wants him the most. It wants me [Danny] most, but it will take all of us” (King 364). The Overlook’s intention to “trick” Jack into being a pawn and “taking all of” his family members translates the discourse that it delivers into the discourse of the evil other. Jack cannot come through the radical alterity from the Overlook so that he is doomed to comply with the littler other, which is “entirely inscribed in the imaginary order” (Evans 133). Thus, he is in a dreadful plight of insanity—he follows the commands issued by the discourse of the evil other so that he is willing to “get rid of the woman and his snot-nosed kid first” for the purpose of not being “distracted.”

**Have to be Punished**

The ghost of Delbert Grady is the emissary sent by the Overlook to persuade Jack into committing homicide. Grady takes advantage of Jack’s impotency to egg him into maintaining his masculinity in terms of strengthening his role as a provider
and a father. “What appears to be a haunted house history,” Jonathan P. Davis (1994) writes, “is really much, much more: it is about the disintegration due to a man’s internal struggle brought on by the expectations of a patriarchal society that preaches the importance of success in both his chosen trade and in his role as provider” (24). Davenport depicts Jack’s desperation of maintaining his self-worth of being a father and a writer at the same time:

> At the heart of both concerns is work, which, if properly conducted, will not only feed his family but shore up his sense of his own masculinity.

The Overlook represents his last hope. There, he might protect his family through a harsh winter in the Rocky Mountains and regain his position as a writer who produces something important, a product he can exchange for money and esteem in the marketplace, which might, in turn, secure his position at the head of his household. (319)

However, although the work Grady entrances Jack “shores up his sense of his own masculinity” somehow, it absolutely does not “secure his position at the head of his household.” I argue that Grady’s misbehavior is the evil counterpart, the specular image as the reflection of the ego, which the Overlook wants Jack to identify with. Grady has to justify his committing homicide first so he can abet Jack in the same crime:
“They [Grady’s wife and two daughters] didn’t love the Overlook as I
[Grady] did,” Grady said,… “Just as your son and wife don’t love it…not
at present, anyway. But they will come to love it. You must show them
the error of their ways, Mr. Torrance. Do you agree?”

“Yes. I [Jack] do.” (King 394)

Both Grady and Jack are “hired by the same manager,” “the hotel” (393). Here Grady
personifies the Overlook as the manager who “did believe in punishment” (394). In
fact, the Overlook Hotel is organic somehow: “Around him [Jack], he could hear the
Overlook Hotel coming to life” (381). Jack’s being unable to distinguish between the
discourse of the Other and the discourse of the evil other is much in evidence. Were it
not for Jack’s lack of sense of radical alterity from the Overlook, Jack would not
accept such “punishments” of “correcting” Danny and Wendy as allowable ones.

Grady passes certain deviant values off as the discourse of the Other so that Jack
regards the commands given by the manager [the Overlook] as “certain
responsibilities” “husbands and fathers did have” (394). Jack misperceives the
discourse of the evil other as the discourse of the Other. In this manner, Jack
transforms himself into the counterpart in the mirror, by identification with which [his
specular image] the ego is constructed; the reflection of ego is the little other
(Evans 51). Thus, it is no wonder that committing homicide for Jack is acceptable because in his eyes the ones he punishes are “against the things he [the Overlook] knew were best for them” (King 394).

Ironically, Jack does not “regain his position as a writer who produces something important,” but he aspires to be one who produces “a product he can exchange for money and esteem in the marketplace” (Davenport) in terms of not being a biographer of the Overlook but being the executor of its [the Overlook’s] or his [the manager’s] commands:

“And the manager puts no strings in his largess,” Grady went on. “Not at all. Look at me, a tenth-grade dropout. Think how much further you yourself could go in the Overlook’s organizational structure. Perhaps…in time…to the very top.”…”Let us say that your future is contingent upon how you decide to deal with your son’s waywardness.”

“I make my own decisions,” Jack whispered.

“But you must deal with him.”

“I will.”

“Firmly.”

“I will.” (King 396)
Therefore, Jack is no longer the biographer of the Overlook but a pawn executing its commands; however, it appears as though Jack cannot differentiate between these two roles. In other words, he does not have a sense of the radical alterity of the counterpart in the mirror; thus, he identifies with what he sees without regard for the consequences. I believe that it is “capitalism, the constant need to make money from the hotel” (Russell) that confuses the discourse of the Other with the discourse of the evil other. He is so desperate for money that he is misled into misperceiving the evil other as the Other. He does not call the act of “dealing with your son’s waywardness” into question because he intends to ingratiate himself with “the manager,” who “puts no strings in his largess.” Until he devotes himself to going “to the very top” “in the Overlook’s organizational structure,” he has been so insane that he is willing to sacrifice all his family members’ life to the Overlook. Having a sense of radical alterity from the discourse of the evil other, Jack should question these acts. However, he is blind to the wrongness of these commands issued by the Overlook, so this dooms him to downfall in the end. Frozen to death near the Overlook, he does become part of the Overlook forever.