

# Construction of Otherness in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*

Master's thesis

Johanna Meuronen

University of Jyväskylä

Department of languages

English

September 2013

## JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Johanna Meuronen	
Työn nimi – Title  Construction of Otherness in William Golding's <i>Lord of the Flies</i>	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu-tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Syyskuu 2013	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 72 sivua
Tiivistelmä – Abstract  <p>Tässä pro gradu – tutkimuksessani tutkin William Goldingin tapaa kuvata ja rakentaa toiseutta romaanissa <i>Kärpästen herra</i>. Goldingin vuonna 1954 julkaisema teos kuvaa autiolle saarelle lento-onnettomuudessa haaksirikkoutuneita poikia, joiden välienselvittelyjen kautta Golding ottaa vahvasti kantaa todellisen yhteiskunnan epäkohtiin.</p> <p>Tutkielmassani selvitän kuinka Golding rakentaa teoksessaan sosiaalisten ryhmittymien muodostumista. Yhdistän tutkimuksessa kirjallisuuden- ja politiikan tutkimusta. Kiinnitän huomiota tapaan, jolla Golding kuvaa romaanin alussa luonnontilaa saarella, koska toiseus syntyy luonnontilassa. Tämän jälkeen siirryn tutkimaan kuinka toiseus alkaa rakentua poikien välillä ja kuinka poikien keskinäisestä kanssakäymisestä syntyy vahva ryhmittymien välinen vastakkainasettelu. Tähän liittyen huomioin myös kuinka toiseus muuttuu vihollisuudeksi, sillä käsitteiden ystävä ja vihollinen avustuksella vastakkainasettelu muuttuu poliittiseksi. Poliittisuus tekee henkilökohtaisesta vihamiehestä julkisen vihollisen.</p> <p>Tämän jälkeen siirryn tutkimaan toiseuden rakentumista neljän eri kategorian kautta. Nämä ovat moraalinen, poikien ulkonäkö, yhteiskunnallinen tottelevaisuus sekä päähenkilöiden Jackin ja Ralphin välinen suhde. Nämä neljä kategoriaa ovat sekä limittäisiä että toisiaan tukevia. Näitä tutkimalla saadaan tarkempi kuva siitä kuinka toiseutta rakennetaan <i>Kärpästen herrassa</i>.</p> <p>Tutkimusmateriaalina William Goldingin <i>Kärpästen herra</i> on toiseuden käsitteen kannalta hyvinkin mielenkiintoinen, sillä romaani valmistui pian toisen maailmansodan loppumisen jälkeen. Tutkimukseni tulokset Goldingin käyttämistä toiseuden rakentamisen kategorioista avaavatkin mielenkiintoisen näkymän maailman myllerryksessä eläneen kirjailijan sielunmaisemaan.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords Golding, The Lord of the Flies, Otherness, Other, Enemy, evil	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

# Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	1
2 Previous research on <i>Lord of the Flies</i> .....	4
3 Concepts and approach .....	9
3.1 The Other .....	10
3.2 The Enemy .....	11
3.3 The State of Nature .....	12
4 Reading Lord of the Flies .....	15
4.1 William Golding: a short biography .....	15
4.2 The plot .....	16
5 Constructing Otherness in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> .....	19
5.1 State of Nature in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> .....	19
5.2 Constructing Otherness in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> and the birth of the political.....	25
6 Construction of Otherness through categorical definitions in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> .....	33
5.1 Morality.....	33
6.2 The boys' appearance .....	45
6.3 Social obedience .....	53
6.4 The relationship between Ralph and Jack.....	56
7 Discussion and conclusion .....	62
8 Bibliography .....	66

## 1 Introduction

In 1983, the same year I myself was born, William Gerald Golding was awarded with the Nobel Prize in literature “for his novels which, with the perspicuity of realistic narrative art and the diversity and universality of myth, illuminate the human condition in the world of today” (William Golding: the official website 2013). This recognition came some thirty years after he had published his first novel *Lord of the Flies* in 1954, which ultimately would be the manuscript he would become known for.

*Lord of the Flies* is a novel about young English boys who are being flown away from England because of a raging war. Their plane, however, crashes on a deserted island in the Pacific, killing all the adults and some of the children. Only a handful of them survive and join together to figure out how to make the best of their situation. They are all adolescents and even the oldest ones are only twelve years old. They are completely secluded from other people and society, they are on their own. The boys start to slowly divide themselves into two different groups which become more prominent as the story progresses. As the groups become more distinct the boys also become increasingly violent. In the end of the novel the civilized English youth have become nothing but mere savages.

The negative or rather naturalistic view of the nature of man suggested in the novel has intrigued scholars through decades up to this day. There have been many studies that concentrate on the evilness of a man, and how the island and its characters are allegories of a real society (e.g. Annala 1967; Cmeciu and Cmeciu 2010). No matter if one agrees with the allegories between the novel and the society it is indisputable that the novel was written by a person who had lived through both World Wars and took active part in the second one. Golding was a naval officer in the Royal Navy (which is interesting as it is a naval officer, who stops the boys’ cruelty at the end of *Lord of the Flies*) and participated in the sinking of the German battleship *Bismarck* as well as in the invasion of Normandy (Golding’s life and works 2013).

Golding himself was appalled by the cruelty humans were capable of and by the way in which the British justified their cruel acts by arguing they were on the “right” side. The

writer came to the conclusion that human nature was savage and that even good people can become the bad ones. (BBC-GCSE Bitesize: Golding and war 2013.) It could be argued that *Lord of the Flies* is a depiction of human nature and the status of society through the eyes of one person, who has experienced the horrendous acts humans are capable of.

The present study will concentrate on the process of how the boys divide into two hostile groups in Golding's novel, and why they become so violent with each other. Hence, the main research question for the present study is: how is Otherness constructed in *Lord of the Flies*?

In addition, this study aims at finding an answer to how Golding describes the State of Nature in the novel as this affects the construction of Otherness. Otherness is never born in a vacuum; it needs social interaction to survive, and, in this particular subject, the interaction takes place on an uninhabited island. The island holds no laws and there is no society, thus, the island is in a State of Nature. It is crucial to study how Golding depicts this state because it is the basis for the growth of Otherness.

The reason for choosing this particular subject derives from the fact that the growth of Otherness in *Lord of the Flies* has not been researched before. The theme of Otherness is included in some of the previous studies, although the novel has not been examined through the concept itself. The approach in this study is a literary studies one but the fictional discourse is also looked at from the perspective of political studies. The concepts of Otherness, the Other and the Enemy are often used in political discourse (Ericson 2011; Riggins 1997; Harle 2000) but they have not been applied in the study of *Lord of the Flies*.

The concept of the Other is closely linked to the concept of self-identity, because self-knowledge needs something to compare itself to (Harle 2000: 10-11). On these same premises it is impossible to know why the boys become who they are at the end of the novel, if attention is not given to the emergence of Otherness between them. The boys mirror their own image through the Other, which causes them to act in a certain way. In addition, the subject of Otherness is important for my purposes, because of the novel's representation of the society. Golding himself lived through times when good and evil

were juxtaposed. The line between the good and evil was thin as paper and bad things happened in the name of good. Hence the novel shows how one individual sees the development of society and the political through Otherness. Furthermore, a novel is always affected by its surroundings and the point in time it was written. Even though it might not be written solely based on the real world it is still influenced by the experiences the writer has gone through.

This study will be organized so that the reader will be able to follow it, even if one has never read Golding's novel. After the introduction, in chapter 2 the focus will shift to previous studies on Golding's novel. These will give an idea of the area of research in which this thesis will also fall upon, and it familiarizes the reader with what has already been studied and why this thesis is original in its approach. Chapter 3 will present the basic concepts used in this thesis and I will explain the approach for the analysis. Chapter 4 will give a brief overview on William Golding's life and work as well as the plot of *Lord of the Flies*.

Chapter 5 will introduce how Golding views the State of Nature. After this the focus will move to study how Otherness starts to construct in *Lord of the Flies* and how the concept turns political, thus, giving birth to the political. In this chapter it will be explained how Otherness is born and how it develops. The discussion of the birth of the political will center on the Friend and Enemy theme because Schmitt (1976: 26) has said this distinction is the start of all political.

After discussing how Otherness is established, chapter 6 will concentrate on the ways how Otherness is constructed through categorical definitions. It will focus on four different aspects which are all interconnected. These are morality, the boys' appearance, social obedience and the relationship between Jack and Ralph. The morality chapter centers on the division between the good and the evil whereas the boys' appearance will address the boys' looks. The social obedience focuses on the individual's willingness to follow rules and shows how the social guidelines affect the boys. Lastly, I will discuss the relationship between Jack and Ralph and it will be shown how this relationship has had an effect on the emergence of Otherness on the island. The conclusion chapter will discuss the findings and implications of this study.

## 2 Previous research on *Lord of the Flies*

*Lord of the Flies* is a novel that has intrigued generations of readers and it has been the subject of study on many occasions. This chapter will give a brief overview on how the novel has been previously studied. As the field of study is vast, I will concentrate on themes that are similar to this particular study. Through this discussion the focal point of this study and its context will be clarified. With this I hope to show how my point of view is original and differs from the previous examinations even if it will touch on the same subjects.

There are several themes that are often the center of study when it comes to *Lord of the Flies*. The fable aspect of the novel has been studied on numerous occasions (Johnston 1980; Baker 2000; Oldsey and Weitraub 1963; Andrews Henningfeld 1998) just like the allegorical dimensions the novel has (Friedman 1993; Dickson 1990). Symbolism (Martin 1969), metaphor (Cmeciu and Cmeciu 2010) and the evilness (Hasan Al-Saidi 2012; Dalrymple 2005) of the boys have been studied as well. Likewise the stark contrast of *Coral Island* and *Lord of the Flies* (Singh 1997; Boden 2009) has intrigued certain scholars and one reason for this could be because “rhetorically and ideologically, the claim of *Lord of the Flies* over *The Coral Island* is the claim of experience over innocence, realism over romance, truth over illusion, maturity over naivete, and hardship over ease” (Singh 1997: 205-213).

*Coral Island* is not the only novel that has had been studied in relation to *Lord of the Flies*. For example, Suzanne Gulbin (1966) concentrated on the similarities found between Golding’s novel and Orwell’s *Animal Farm* (1945). These both hold strong political and sociological themes with allegories to tyranny and democracy. In both novels the characters are freed from the clutches of adults and use this freedom to explore their surroundings only to organize themselves for better survival. There is immediate disagreement between the two main characters, and both these characters get a right hand man to support them. The similarities between the novels are striking, but where Orwell wanted to show the pig’s evolvement to man, Golding took the opposite side to show men’s regression to pigs. (Gulbin 1966: 86-88.)

Piggy, a character who is fat and physically incompetent, is often seen as the voice of reason. Baker, nonetheless, argues that Piggy, with his eagerness to deny the existence of ghosts and the beast, actually understands the society less than the other boys on the island (Baker 2000: 311-327). Because of Piggy's lower social status, which comes across in the novel, Patrick Reilly (1988) is inclined to take notice that the prophet of common sense is one of the working class. Reilly continues that Piggy wishes for all the boys to act proper, the way they do in civilized society, and this way they would be saved. Furthermore, Piggy trusts that the adults do the right thing and once the boys start to act like ones, they would surely be rescued. However, the irony lies in that once Piggy begs the boys to act like adults, they do and end up killing him. (Reilly 1988: 142-145.)

Rosenfield (1961) claims that in the novel everything comes down to war. The young boys only wish to play games until their rescue but war, too, could be considered a game: a fatal game but a game nonetheless. The boys are freed from adult control, but instead of becoming completely free, they end up repeating the same patterns as adults: she argues that "but like the games played before the formation of civilization, they anticipate the ritual which reveals a developing society. The ultimate irrationality is war. Paradoxically, the children not only return to a primitive and infantile morality, but they also degenerate into adults." (Rosenfield 1961: 93-101.)

According to Spitz (1970), Golding wanted to place the boys on an island without material goods. On this island nobody would have to fight, work or steal for survival. He also wanted to keep the boys young enough so sex would not be an issue. Golding banished outside enemies so there would be no need for an army and he also kept the boys quite homogenous so that only age would differentiate the boys. If anything was to go wrong the reason for it would come from within. (Spitz 1970: 21-33.)

Spitz (1970: 21-33) argued that Golding's attempt to separate the boys from a society is impossible as they bring the memories of their upbringing and, thus, society with them on to the island. This is a justifiable claim, which will be addressed later on in this thesis when the State of Nature is presented. Cmeciu and Cmeciu (2010: 115) continued this idea and wrote "the setting of the novel's plot on an island turns *Lord of the Flies* into an attempt to return to Rousseau's Natural Man who is good because he is self-sufficient



and not subject to the vices of political society”. Rousseau (1998) felt that men were corrupted by society and thus quite good in the State of Nature, but, because of the fragments of society the boys take with them on to the island they cannot be like the Natural Man. This is also one of the reasons why Rousseau will not be drawn on in the discussion of the State of Nature later on in this study. Dickson (1990: 14) took the idea of the State of Nature to correspond to a state of mind because “the more the boys stay on the island, the more they become aware of its sinister and actively hostile elements seem to correspond to the boys’ awareness of the hostile elements the islands holds”.

Oldsey and Weitraub (1963) wanted to pay attention to the fictional aspect of the novel and argued it was no more utopist than *Gulliver’s tales*. First of all, the basis of *Lord of the Flies* is absurd starting from where the island is located and how the boys ended up there. The island’s location is left vague. It is situated somewhere far enough so that ships rarely pass it by but close enough to be the stage of aerial battles. Secondly, the boys’ plane crash is also questionable. The plane brakes in half and while the other half lands safely on the island, the other one, carrying possible adults, is whisked away to the sea. All these given elements are as realistic as the tiny people in *Gulliver’s tales*. (Oldsey and Weitraub 1963: 93.)

It has been thoroughly argued that Golding was affected by his own experiences in the war and this is shown in the novel (Oldsey 1983). Crawford (2002) tackles in his article the strong criticism that *Lord of the Flies* directs at the Nazis and, moreover, at the British society. *Lord of the Flies* shows the young boys with very similar outer appearance and dressing and even acting like Nazis and “the only ‘Beast’ on the island is the fascist group of English adolescent males who kill or attempt to kill outsiders: Simon, Piggy, and Ralph” (Crawford 2002: 51). Crawford (2002: 47) continues that the act of eating pig meat during festival time could include anti-Semitic connotations. Furthermore, Crawford (2002: 55) states that the criticism in *Lord of the Flies* is not solely directed at the Nazis but towards the English who were more than eager to distance themselves from this unpleasant history after the war.

This subject was also touched upon nearly two decades before Crawford by Davies and Saunders (1983). Davies and Saunders (1983: 35-36) argued that once Jack and his group decide to target Simon and Piggy, the “weak characters”, they are drawing

attention to the brutal and violent pattern, which underlines the class structured and bullying social order of the British society. Furthermore, they said the English class system breeds division and is eager to exclude the outsiders. Boyd (1990: 11) carried on this subject by drawing attention to Piggy's obvious lower-class whose accent is mocked and the main persecutor is Jack, who seems to be on the top of the hierarchy line with his education and previous status as a head-boy. Even Reilly (1988: 141-142) was interested in why Piggy was on the airplane with all the rest of the boys. Reilly (1988: 158-159) goes on expressing his theory that Golding does not simply depict the boys' regression to savages, but tries to show that the British society is really a sham. He continues that our so called civilization is nothing more than a habit and if people regress to savages in a State of Nature it just goes on to show that they are not ultimately good in a structured society; they act only out of reflex.

Crawford (2002: 64) explains that the English society is normative and Jack's group breaks all the rules with exceeding violence. This violence, nonetheless, marks the shift from democracy to fascism: "we witness the demise of Ralph's parliament and the ascendancy of Jack's totalitarian, primitive regime based on savagery, hunting, and primal drives" (ibid.). The political allegories have interested others as well and Andrews Henningfeld (1998) suggested that every character in *Lord of the Flies* represents some abstract idea of a government. She wrote that Ralph is the good, not very effective, leader of a democratic state and Piggy his advisor, not able to rule because of his shortcomings, but strong supporter of the democratic ruler. She, on the other hand, saw Jack representing a totalitarian dictator, who captivates his followers by addressing their emotions and Roger is Jack's henchman, who does the dictator's dirty work with pleasure.

The idea of Ralph representing democracy and Jack totalitarianism is not new (c.f. Dickson 1990) and Reilly mentioned that Jack presented "a totalitarian contract in which freedom is the price of meat" (Reilly 1988: 156-158). In the beginning of the novel Ralph and Piggy find a conch on the beach, and the role of the conch becomes prominent in the novel: once a person has the conch he is able to talk freely without others interrupting him. Things start to fall apart completely once the conch is smashed. Wood (1991: 25) proposed that the conch stands for the parliamentary democracy where as Friedman (1993: 19-32) believed it to be the symbol of law and order.

Otherness as a concept has not been the focus point on previous studies of *Lord of the Flies* even though it has appeared in them. Harle (2000: 10) says that the Other is different from Us, and many scholars presented in this chapter have touched upon this subject: the outsiders in the class system and the idea of anti-Semitism. Every distinction between good and evil, democracy and totalitarianism, civil and savage holds the element of Otherness. Otherness can also be considered to be something that is not present in the novel and this way the Other is something that is not on the island at all. Paula Roy concentrated on this when writing about the absence of females in *Lord of the Flies* and how everything female was linked to something unwanted (Roy 2003). Females are the Others to whom the boys can compare themselves to and at least know that they are not girls, even if they had long hair and kept it tied back.

*Lord of the Flies* has been the center of academic works on many occasions, but there was a reason I chose these particular studies for this section. As the research field around Golding's novel is vast I had to narrow down the focus point around the theme of this thesis. I found that previous studies with an emphasis on social and political studies would best to enlighten the area in which this thesis will also fall upon. Nonetheless, *Lord of the Flies* has not been studied through the concept of Otherness concentrating on the construction of Otherness. The focal point of my research is to present how Otherness is constructed between the boys, and, with this, make an original approach to the subject

### 3 Concepts and approach

This chapter will present the approach I will take in the analysis of the novel. In addition, in this chapter I will discuss the main concepts of my study. The key concepts will be the Other, the Enemy and the State of Nature. State of Nature is the starting point in the novel and the stage in which Otherness appears. The Other and the Enemy, both, are included in the concept of Otherness, but have different functions of determining the other party. The analysis will show by which means Otherness is built and upheld in the novel, and, furthermore, how the relationship between the boys turns from the Other to the Enemy.

The approach I will take for the analysis of this study lies within literary and political studies. Through the course of fiction the novel emphasizes the ways in which people act and form groups in a state where there are no laws or regulations. Through this work it becomes clear how Golding perceives Otherness, and, in addition, how Otherness is constructed. In the novel Golding presents his view on the society, and whether it is because people agree with his view or just find it interesting, the novel continues to be popular decade after decade. The novel is a work of fiction but the topic of it is a political one. As the boys on the island represent a form of society the political aspect of it should not be overlooked.

The studies of Otherness have traditionally been studies about marginals: it has been applied in studies on race and racism, gender and sexism, media representations, bureaucracy, etc. (Mchoul and Rapley 2001: 25). For example, in his research Edward Said has discussed the Orient as the Other for Westerners (Said 1994, 1995), Gary Richards has talked about the Sexual other (Richards 2005) and Talal Asad has focused on the Otherness represented by Islam (Asad 2000). As the intention of my study is to analyze Golding's way of constructing Otherness in the novel this thesis will mainly rely on Carl Schmitt (1976) and Vilho Harle (2000) and their views on the concept of Otherness as they have studied the subjects of Other, Friend and Enemy to great extent. I will discuss the birth of the political and how it is done according to Carl Schmitt in *The Concept of the Political by Carl Schmitt* (1976). I will argue that the theory Schmitt has about the categories of Friend and Enemy being the basis of politics is interconnected with the idea of the Other.

The main theme of this study is the construction of Otherness, and it will be studied through the concepts of the Enemy and the Other. As the Enemy is also the Other (Harle 2000: 13) both of these concepts will subdue under the category of Otherness. The next subchapters will present the basic concepts of the Other and the Enemy. Furthermore, I will explain the State of Nature, in which Otherness is born, and show how that concept is also relevant for this thesis.

### **3.1 The Other**

We all have a mental idea of what Us and the Other mean: we consider Us those, who we know and are associated with. The Others are what the word implies: some other people, the unknown, different from Us. Harle (2000:10) argues that the Other is essentially different from Us. He continues that already Aristotle considered the Other to be an outsider, one who did not understand the Greek language, and the word barbarian is actually derived from the Greek language “barbaros” (Harle 2000:10). Depending on the discourse, any individual may appear as the Other. As the Other is always something we ourselves are not, the concept of the Other differs for multiple different reasons. Campbell (1992: 89) wrote that at some point European and American discourse has described numerous groups e.g. women, blacks, the insane, the Third World and terrorists through acts, which hold a demeaning tone and, in fact, giving the emphasis on them being something ‘we’ are not. Nonetheless, the difference between Us and the Other is only definitional; it is simply a way to notice cultural, racial and linguistic differences (Harle 2000: 11).

Harle (2000) argues that we cannot define ourselves without knowing who we are not and where we do not belong. It is not enough to know ourselves through the positive identifications and, because of this; the contrary notion is needed as well. Thus, identity is built between the relationship of the Self and the Other, and identity, therefore, is not just a feature of ‘me’ and ‘us’ but also the relation between ‘us’ and ‘them’. It is important to know who is a part of our group to be able to make the distinction of who does not belong in it. First of all, one must have the knowledge of ‘me’ and secondly, the knowledge of ‘you’. This latter categorization is split into two; intimate you, called by first name, and the distant others, those called by title and surname. The ones, who form ‘us’, are me and the intimate you. In addition, it is impossible to truly understand

yourself if you cannot appreciate what and who you are not. For us to call something pale, we need to know what dark looks like just like we cannot say something is mild if we have never tasted hot. (Harle 2000: 10-11, 18.) In the same vein, also Ojakangas (2006: 100) enhances that we are who we are because of the difference that differentiates 'us' from 'them'.

### **3.2 The Enemy**

The special case of the Other is the Enemy representing evil with its presence (Harle 2000: 15). As already implied, the Other does not necessarily hold any enmity as it can simply be a tool for building self-identity, but the situation is different with the Enemy. The most fundamental difference between the Enemy and the Other, according to Harle (2000: 13), is that the Enemy is always the Other but the Other is not necessarily the Enemy. Harle (2000: 12) clarifies that the Enemy emerges only in situations where Us and Them are seen essentially different. Furthermore, this difference is understood to reflect the battle between good and evil and 'we' are always on the side of good and the Enemy on the side of evil.

Danger is not exclusively connected to the concept of the Enemy and it extends to all relationships. Campbell (1992: 81) argues that danger is a natural part of the differentiation between people and this differentiation is crucial for our own self identity. This leads to the fact that danger is ever present in our lives as it is part of all our relationships (ibid.). A Friend might become the Enemy, and the Other might become our Friend, but the possibility of creating our identity must include the presence of danger (Schmitt 1976: 27).

The concept of the Enemy exists in relation to the concept of the Friend and this division between them is political. Schmitt (1976: 26) says that political motives and actions can be narrowed down to a political distinction, and this distinction is the one between Friend and Enemy. Thus, the Enemy concept, in correlation to the Friend, gives birth to the political. According to Harle (2000: 154) the political aspect is important as it turns a moral foe into a public Enemy; an Enemy that must be eliminated. Humans can have moral foes, those they see as their personal enemies and whom they hate personally, but the Enemy is different as it is the public Enemy and does not need to be hated personally (ibid.).

### 3.3 The State of Nature

To explain the role of the island in William Golding's novel, and its reference to societies in their pre-institutionalized state, I will discuss the ways in which Thomas Hobbes and John Locke view the State of Nature. There are also other political philosophers, who have examined the State of Nature such as Rousseau, Hume and Aquinas. The reason for choosing Locke and Hobbes as the two political philosophers through which the State of Nature will be inspected in this particular thesis, is that their views of the State of Nature are so contradictory to one another that they will best serve my purposes in presenting the state on the island. Locke and Hobbes show how differently one can understand the State of Nature and how humans act in it.

Otherness is born in the State of Nature and this is why the subject must be included in this thesis. Nonetheless, the theme of the State of Nature is so enormous that a throughout study would leave room for nothing else. The next paragraph, however, will introduce the basic ideas of how other political philosophers have viewed the State of Nature and will emphasize the reasons for choosing Locke and Hobbes for this analysis. The reader should keep in mind that the purpose of this study is not to give a throughout portrayal of the State of Nature (for this see e.g. *State of Nature or Eden* by Thornton 2005 or *British Philosophy: From Hobbes to Hume* by Copleston 1959), but rather to present the state in which Otherness is born in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*.

Locke and Aquinas (Gasser n.d.) were both firm believers that in a State of Nature man is inclined to discover Natural Law through reason. For Aquinas this law meant doing good deeds while evil actions should have been avoided and for Locke the only form of order in the State of Nature stemmed from the Law of Nature (ibid.). Hobbes (1982: 187), on the other hand, believed humans to be so prone to passions that they could not be upheld by any sense of justice unless there was a government to require it. Rousseau's (1998) view differed from Hobbes in that he was inclined to believe it was societies that corrupted humans. Humans were neither good nor bad in the State of Nature, but bad habits were simply the product of societies. Also James Swenson (2000: 105) argued that for Rousseau the State of Nature was interconnected to class structures and claimed that it was actually the wealthy that wished to have laws to subject the poor.

Hume (2007: 202) in his *A Treatise on Human Nature Vol. 2*, on the other hand, had a different approach from all the political philosophers discussed above; his argument was that humans were social beings who always wished for the company of others as opposed to solitude. However, in his mind, the State of Nature was a savage condition, as humans' interest did not reach further than friends and families.

What is a State of Nature? It is state in which there is no power to rule over people. It is the state before societies are born (Thornton 2005: 1). As already mentioned above, Locke and Hobbes have a very different idea on how humans act in this state. Locke (1958: 95) believes men to live together peacefully and respectfully in the State of Nature as they are bounded by the Law of Nature, which could be referred to as good morals. Even though Locke trusts that humans can live peacefully without a government they, too, are keen to enter a governed society as it gives them more security (Copleston 1959: 133). In the State of Nature people live among one another governed only by the Law of Nature and it teaches everyone how to live equally and independently without threatening other's life, liberty, health or possessions. The Law of Nature is the corner stone of all human laws. Laws cannot be made up arbitrarily and should, thus, be based on something concrete: the Law of Nature. No one is born so free that the Law of Nature would not affect them and as the Law is carved into the human nature there is no possibility to abolish it. If there were no natural law there would be no vice nor virtue. No good actions would be rewarded and evil actions would not be punished. Humans would be bound only by their desires and nothing would constrain their actions. (Locke 1958: 120,121,199, 205; Locke 1960: 298.)

Contrary to Locke, Thomas Hobbes argues in *Leviathan* (1982) that in a situation where there is no common power humans are in a state of war. In this state every individual fights for themselves and everyone goes against anyone. Once humans have no other security than their own strength the situation resembles a war. The virtues that the Law of Nature stands for include justice, mercy, equity and the basic idea to treat others as one would like to be treated. These virtues, however, are so contrary to humans' natural passions, which include pride and revenge that the Law of Nature cannot function. People can only act civil with one another when there is a supreme power to enforce it. The sense of justice is not natural for humans and relates to humans only in societies, not in solitude. The existence of the Law of Nature is not to be denied, but humans are



not strong enough to resist their natural urges to follow this Law without any artificial power to enforce it. Nothing is unjust in the State of Nature. Furthermore, desires and passions are not considered sins and neither the actions followed by these desires until there is a law that forbids them. (Hobbes 1982: 185-188, 223.) According to Thorton (2005: 1), Hobbes argues that if humans were reasonable they would wish to leave the State of Nature as it fights against humans' basic aim; to preserve their own lives. This, nonetheless, is tricky as a government cannot be built without laws and no laws can be made until people agree on who makes the laws (Hobbes 1982: 187).

This chapter has introduced the basic concepts, which will be dealt with in this thesis: the Other, the Enemy and the State of Nature. Nonetheless, there will be some theoretical references later on in the text as they will be better understood in the context of the analysis rather than detached from it. The State of Nature is where everything starts. It is the basis for the growth of Otherness and, hence, will be presented first in the analysis of the novel. The Other and the Enemy form the concept of Otherness. The construction of Otherness in *Lord of the Flies* starts from the concept of the Other as the characters are somewhat divided in the beginning of the novel. They, however, are not hostile towards each other or wish to harm one another. Nonetheless, the Other starts to evolve into the Enemy and this will result in drastic changes in the characters. All this is a part of the construction of Otherness.

## 4 Reading Lord of the Flies

This section will concentrate on the creator of *Lord of the Flies* and the novel itself. I will introduce William Golding; his life and work in a nutshell. After this I will explain the overall plot of *Lord of the Flies* so even a reader who has never read the novel is able to follow the analysis section of this study.

### 4.1 William Golding: a short biography

19<sup>th</sup> of September 1911 William Gerald Golding was born in to a family of a teacher father and a suffragette mother. In 1930's he studied science, but realized that verbal arts was his interest and switched to literature. After graduating with Bachelor of Arts degree in 1935 Golding spent his time acting in a small non-West End London theatre and later teaching English and philosophy in Bishop Wordsworth's School in Salisbury. (Dick 1987: chronology.)

In the late 1930's the political climate in Europe started to decline, which had a great impact on Golding's life. From 1940's until the end of the war in 1945 Golding's civil life was put on hold as he served in the Royal Navy (William Golding Limited 2002). After the war, however, Golding returned to teaching and started to write again (Dick 1987: 4).

Golding had been writing continuously since leaving the navy, but it was not until 1954 that he got his first novel *Lord of the Flies* published (Dick 1987: 4). By the 1980's Golding had already published nine novels, including *Rite of Passage* (1980), which won a Booker McConnell prize for best novel of the year (William Golding Limited 2002). Golding's work also earned him the titles of the Honorary Fellow from Brasenose College and the Honorary Doctor of Letters from Sussex University (Dick 1987: chronology).

In 1983 William Golding was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature. The impacts of personal experiences and war on Golding's work showed also in his Nobel Prize banquet speech as he pleaded for an agreement, common sense and daring generosity between nations' leaders (William Golding- Banquet Speech 2013) In all, before his death in 1993, William Golding published twelve novels, in addition to his other works

(William Golding- Biographical 2013). He was married to Ann Golding for 53 years, and he became a writer whose works were praised for their ability to depict the human nature. However, it would be his first ever published novel *Lord of the Flies* that William Golding would be most remembered for.

## **4.2 The plot**

*Lord of the Flies* is a story about young boys, aged six to twelve who land on a deserted island during the war. They are flying away from Great Britain, but their plane is shot at and crashes on an island. Half of the plane; its passengers and crew are killed and washed away by the sea, while the rest of the boys are trapped on the island by themselves without any adults.

The first character introduced is Ralph who is soon acquainted with Piggy. The two on them wander around and find a conch from the beach. Piggy urges Ralph to blow the conch to call out other survivors. Boys start to emerge from the jungle and finally a pack of choir boys, led by Jack Merridew, wander on to the beach. Once the boys are all gathered together they decide they should be organized for things to work, and Ralph is voted the chief.

The boys decide that the holder of the conch will be able to talk freely without being interrupted. They make the choir boys into hunters and Jack will be their leader. They decide that it would be a good idea to make a signal fire on the top of a hill so that passing ships could see it and come to their rescue. They climb up to the mountain where all the boys gather wood and use Piggy's glasses to light the fire. However, the fire quickly spreads uncontrollably and one of the small boys is lost in the fire.

Because of this incident, fire-watchers are appointed. On one particular day the twins, Sam and Eric, are on watching duty, but called out by Jack for a hunting trip. Jack has been eager to kill a pig since the beginning and finally disguises himself with mud for a hunt. However, during this hunt the signal fire dies down while there is a ship on the horizon. Ralph sees the ship as well as the lack of smoke and runs up to the mountain. After the hunters arrive Ralph makes Jack apologize, and the hunters build a new fire and start roasting the pig.

That night, while the boys are sleeping, there is an aerial battle over the island and a dead parachutist lands on the island. Sam and Eric, who are watching over the fire, wake up and see the tangled parachutist. They are certain they have witnessed the beast and run down to the beach. The bigger boys go over to the mountain to investigate the matter, and after returning Jack tries to convince the boys that Ralph is a coward who was afraid of the beast and should not be the chief anymore. This, however, changes nothing and Jack rushes off to the jungle. As he goes he shouts that he's going to make up his own tribe and anyone who wants to have fun can join in. Most of the boys do.

Jack has a feast to celebrate his new tribe. He and the hunters have killed a sow and left its head as an offering to the beast. Simon, hiding inside the creepers, sees this offering taking place. He gets delusional and hears the head, Lord of the Flies, speaking to him about how Simon cannot run from him as he lives in each man's soul. Simon realizes that there is no beast and starts to run towards the beach to tell the others.

The feast is taking place at the beach. Ralph and Piggy are also at Castle Rock, which is the name Jack has given to his fortress, as they wanted to see why the rest of the boys followed Jack. The hunters have a need to re-enact their hunting trip and start chanting their hunting song: "Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!" The frenzy starts going until all the boys are in on the hypnotic dance. The rain starts pouring down and thunder strikes. As Simon arrives from the jungle the dancers see him as prey, grab him and kill him with their bare hands.

Next morning Ralph is gripped by guilt and seeks help from Piggy. After a while the two boys are joined by the twins, but all the others have joined Jack's camp. Jack needs fire but is unable to make it without Piggy's glasses. That is why they raid Ralph's camp at night and steal the glasses. Ralph, Piggy and the twins head off to Jack's camp to demand back the glasses. However, the hunters capture Sam and Eric while Jack battles with Ralph. During this battle Roger rolls down a huge rock, which kills Piggy and shatters the conch. Ralph is startled and runs away before he himself is hurt.

Ralph hides in the jungle. Few hours later he goes back to Castle Rock. The twins warn Ralph that Roger and Jack want to hunt him down like a pig. Ralph hides in the bushes near Castle Rock and hopes that nobody realizes to search there. Next morning,

however, the twins reveal Ralph's hiding place and he needs to run. The other boys start to go after him and in the midst of all this a fire breaks loose again. Ralph runs to the beach and is certain of his death. When Ralph raises his eyes up from the sand, a naval officer is standing in front of him. The fire in the jungle had captured his crew's attention. Ralph is relieved and as the other boys reach the beach they are all met by the same awe of an adult. The boys are saved.

## **5 Constructing Otherness in *Lord of the Flies***

In this chapter I will discuss how Golding constructs the boys' formation into groups and how this is a way of building Otherness. This chapter is divided into two parts which will outline how Otherness starts to construct in the novel. I will introduce the state where Otherness starts to build up and study how the Otherness turns political. This chapter will show how Golding portrays the formation of social groups on the island and what consequences it has to the boys' survival.

Part 5.1 will focus on the island as a metaphor for the State of Nature. I argue that the situation in which Golding places the boys in the beginning of his novel enables him to represent the animalistic side of man the way he does later on. For this, I argue, it is important first to review the situation in which the stranded boys have been dropped into. The beginning of the novel is important because in that time and place the future developments of the plot can already be seen to be put into action. In chapter 4.2 I will focus on the formation of social groups. I will show how the relationship between the boys grows from the Other to the Enemy, and how this development gives birth to the political sphere.

### **5.1 State of Nature in *Lord of the Flies***

The purpose of this chapter is to show what the State of Nature is like in *Lord of the Flies*. The State of Nature is the state before societies are formed. The State of Nature comes down to human nature and how humans act in a situation where there are no laws or restrictions to guide them. The aim here is to study how the boys act on the island and, through this, what the State of Nature is like in the novel according to Golding. It is important to pay attention to this as it is the basis for the construction of societies. Otherness is born through social interaction and thus this chapter will give the stage in which actors can come into contact with one another.

It has been argued that the novel is set like the biblical Eden (Reilly 1988: 145-153). It would appear so with the luscious vegetation, tangling fruits and the clear waters on the island. Golding has placed the boys in the "beginning", so to speak. A perfectly staged set with room to grow to whatever direction the boys wish. This stage is the State of Nature and it is a state in which there are no social constructions to shape the nature and

conduct of the boys. The boys are free to form their own society in a manner they see fit.

#### Example 1

The boy with fair hair lowered himself down the last few feet of rock and began to pick his way toward the lagoon. Though he had taken off his school sweater and trailed it now from one hand, his grey shirt stuck to him and his hair was plastered to his forehead. All round him the long scar smashed into the jungle was a bath of heat. (LotF: 1)

This is how the story of *Lord of the Flies* starts. It presents Ralph who is soon followed to the scene by Piggy. In the first half of the beginning chapter these two boys are the only ones introduced. However, there are hints that there might be other survivors from the plane crash but nothing more. The interaction between Ralph and Piggy is nonchalant as Ralph shows little interest in anything Piggy says or does. Piggy is a bit flustered by all that has happened, but Ralph is on an adventure and feels irritated that Piggy is such a tag-along. Piggy, who feels lost without adults, tries seeking comfort from Ralph. They seem like siblings, where the older one teases the younger one but they get along on their quest amongst the jungle's creepers.

What we see in the beginning of the novel is peaceful interactions between two boys who act playfully even in this stressful situation. They go through the jungle and end up on the beach where they decide to play in the sea. Here they find a conch, which they use to call out other boys from the jungle. One by one the boys start to arrive on to the beach and they settle down in the area around Ralph, happy that someone is doing something. The boys are gathered together and enjoy each other's company peacefully. The boys are happily letting Ralph take charge, as he is the one with the conch, and are patiently sitting and waiting for the rest of the boys to arrive. In the novel all the boys believe that Ralph has a plan, and, even though they do not know what it is, they are ready to follow his lead. He, after all, called them all to the beach.

In times like this, according to Locke (1958: 163), when there is no government or laws, all people are friends with one another and bound together by a common goal. He (ibid.) continues that this is because they are governed by the Law of Nature. Simply put in Piggy's words: "You got to...because what's right's right" (LotF: 240). It is significant that it is Piggy who says this. He is one of the two characters in the beginning of the novel when things are still peaceful and civil. It could be argued that even though things progress towards violence in the novel and the State of Nature is not what Locke had in

mind, Piggy still holds the idea of the Law of Nature. Piggy's character has been seen as an allegory for human reason (Annala 1967) and this could be seen to underline what Locke (1960: 289) has argued about how people will get to know the Law of Nature through reason. Indeed, Piggy might be seen as a strong advocate for the Law of Nature as he wishes everybody to act the right way, and as he shuns away from violence. He tries to reason why they should all work together for their rescue and how irresponsibility will only harm them. Furthermore, the violence and madness starts to escalate once Piggy is killed

It must be understood that the State of Nature is a hypothetical situation before a society is constructed and as such, it should not be affected by any given society or its norms. In this case the island itself is uninhabited, but the boys have all grown up in a society, and thus come to the island with their knowledge on how to act in a society. They have been taught by their parents and teachers on how to act in that given society and have been punished for unsuitable behavior. The boys have not lived in a vacuum and Spitz (1970) targeted his criticism to the impossible idea of disintegrating the boys from a society meaning that a complete utopist state cannot exist if the people placed there have a real past. However, it might not be so much that the boys have learned the patterns of social conduct simply because it is required, but that they have learned the Law of Nature. Locke (1958: 97) argued that a baby will learn the Law of Nature by nurture, observation and reasoning. Hence the parents and teachers would have taught the boys the Law of Nature instead of human laws and morals.

The reason for concentrating on the Law of Nature is that if it truly is the guiding force behind the boys' actions it does not matter whether they were a part of a society before arriving to the island. If they have been subjected to the Law of Nature, through the teachings of this Law they should act in a manner it acquires even in isolation. They would feel obliged to follow proper conduct because it is the Law of Nature that governs them, not human laws and moral teachings. However, there does not seem to be a Law of Nature governing Golding's boys. The time spent on the island and the fading memory of social norms seems to be comparable to the indifference and savagery the boys start to display. There is only Piggy, the dull voice of reason, who begs people to do the right thing.



As briefly mentioned above the State of Nature in *Lord of the Flies* is not a good place even though it does seem to be in the beginning. The peaceful and calm gathering on the beach starts to change once Jack and his choir arrive to the scene. It is easy to keep the group organized and united when the number of participants is low. The more there are people, the more there are differing opinions. Once the choir boys enter the scene they nearly double the amount of boys already present. Their leader, Jack, wants to know who called upon them and who is in charge. As he sees it is a boy of his own age, he quickly volunteers to be the chief, and sees it only natural that he would get the position. He, after all, is the chapter chorister, head boy and he can sing a C-sharp. What devastation it is once things do not go his way.

#### Example 2

“All Right. Who wants Jack for chief?”

With dreary obedience the choir raised their hands.

“Who wants me?”

Every hand outside the choir except Piggy’s was raised immediately. The Piggy, toot, raised his hand grudgingly into the air.

Ralph counted.

“I’m chief then.”

The circle of boys broke into applause. Even the choir applauded; and the freckles on Jack’s face disappeared under the blush of mortification. (LotF: 23)

According to Hobbes (1982: 184), when two people desire the same thing, which only the other one can enjoy, they become enemies, and finally they will try to destroy or subdue one another. Humans are greedy creatures who desire only their own benefit. Also Spinoza (1981: 131) addressed this subject and argued that if someone desires the same thing as the one next to them, they want to attain the thing no matter what, because they do not want the other person to have the satisfaction of attaining it. Jack truly felt he was the rightful chief, and as much as he wanted to be the chief, he did not want to give the position to anyone else. It might seem that these mean the exact same thing, but, nevertheless, the idea behind them is different. Jack wants to be the chief and he hates the fact he is not voted as one. As much as he hates the fact he was not made the chief, he hates the idea that Ralph gets to enjoy the position even more. The envy and shame Jack feels from not getting voted the chief will shape the whole balance of the novel.

Once Jack is not made the chief by popular vote he is, however, made the head of the hunters. The hunters are made up from the choir boys and their main mission is to keep

an eye on the signal fire and to hunt. As the story progresses, this division between the hunters and the rest of the boys becomes more apparent. The hunters start to look different and they start to act different from the rest. They become savages who embrace the fact that there are no rules controlling them. They can simply have fun.

About half way into the novel Jack questions all the boys about the chief matter once again and is eager to overthrow Ralph. This does not go as planned, and Ralph gets to hold his chief's seat. This gives Jack no other choice than to go off on his own. Soon all the hunters follow him and Jack founds his own tribe. Once they have formed their own tribe, they become distinctly violent, rude and egotistical. It is almost like they let loose of all rules and regulations. Even Roger, who felt restricted and unable to follow his passions before, can now execute his sadistic tendencies. It could even be that Ralph's group was controlled by the Law of Nature. If there were no choir boys on the island, the situation could have resembled *Coral Island* with the boys living peacefully together and enjoying the adventure.

### Example 3

“I’m going to him with this conch in my hands. I’m going to hold it out. Look, I’m goin’ to say, you’re stronger than I am and you haven’t got asthma. You can see, I’m goin’ to say, and with both eyes. But I don’t ask for my glasses back, not as a favor. I don’t ask you to be a sport, I’ll say, not because you’re strong, but because what’s right’s right. Give me my glasses, I’m going to say – you got to!” (LotF: 240)

Once Jack has formed his own tribe he comes to the realization that he has no means to make fire. And if he has no means to make fire, he cannot offer his followers meat. The fires have always been lit by Piggy’s glasses and this is why Jack needs to steal them. He sees nothing wrong with his actions, and follows the principle argued by Hobbes (1982: 188) according to which in war people can acquire things by any means possible and keep them as long as they can. This is to say that the State of Nature, in Hobbes (1982: 186) mind, is always in a state of war and Jack simply plays by the rules of the survival of the fittest. If the island were a State of Nature governed by the Law of Nature, Piggy would not need to ask for his glasses back, because they would not have been stolen in the first place. Jack, on the other hand, has realized that no one will punish him for his “bad” actions and he is taking every advantage of the world where the strongest and fastest rule. There is no possibility to be bad as there is no one to determine what is bad. For all Jack cares he is the chief now, he makes the rules. Jack is

ruthless, determined and forceful and basically ready to do everything that will help him survive and get him to his goals.

#### Example 4

Ralph screamed, a scream of fright and anger and desperation. His legs straightened, the screams became continuous and foaming. He shot forward, burst the thicket, was in the open, screaming, snarling, bloody. He swung the stake and the savage tumbled over; but there were others coming toward him, crying out. [--] They were all running, all crying out madly. He could hear them crashing in the undergrowth and on the left was the hot, bright thunder of the fire. He forgot his wounds, his hunger and thirst, and became fear; hopeless fear of flying feet, rushing through the forest toward the open beach. (LotF: 280-81)

According to Schmitt (1976: 59) love and hate are considered basic human emotions but in the end it is animality, which is the most basic characteristic of human nature. He continues that passions and drives are so strong that they rule over basic feelings of love and hate. This will lead to the fact that humans are very keen on sliding from passion to evil if not bounded with laws or some other sort of restrictions. When the boys arrive to the island they act in a way which is suitable in a society. Nonetheless, the longer the boys stay on the island the more they become animalistic and in the end of the novel they are driven solely by their urges. Ralph has the urge to survive by any means necessary, even if this means harming another fellow boy and the rest of the boys have the urge to kill Ralph. They boys regress to the state in which they are driven only by their passions and, thus, the State of Nature they are in resembles one that Hobbes (1982) has thought. Their animalistic passion that reflects their souls is like the fire that is burning down the island. The island, seen as a metaphor for human society, is ruined by the greed and passions of humans.

Golding depicts an island that looks like a blissful place, but, once the boys are placed there, they “regress to what might be called a state of nature, but the experience of this is not of an earthly paradise but a hell on earth” (Boyd 1990: 6). The boys start off in a somewhat civil manner, but slowly start to give into their animalistic instincts and needs at the cost of civil behavior. Jack goes and forms his own group because he cannot be in the same one with Ralph, whom he sees as an obstacle against his desires. The situation does not progress to the point where every boy would fight each other, rather, they form groups. Kavka (1986: 108) mentions that in a State of Nature people can form defensive groups as to get safety from others, but in the end these groups are unreliable and members can turn against one another. In a world, where Law of Nature would govern,

there would be no need to form groups or fight enemies because people would want to work for the common good and act in the right fashion. Otherness would have no real presence there: Otherness and especially the Enemy relish in the discord.

This chapter has dealt with what the State of Nature is like in Golding's novel. As mentioned above, there would be no Otherness if the Law of Nature would govern the boys, because they would all live peacefully together working for a common goal. They would form one large group, which would function through kindness towards one another. This is what first happens in the novel but things shift once the choir boys join in. The power battle between Jack and Ralph brings tension to the group and slowly the boys start to drift away from one single goal and group unity. This will result into two distinct groups and the acts of violence. The boys seem to give birth to chaos and savagery even in the most serene surroundings, and this is why the State of Nature on the island seems to reflect the ideas Hobbes.

## **5.2 Constructing Otherness in *Lord of the Flies* and the birth of the political**

Now that it has been established what the State of Nature is like in *Lord of the Flies*, the focus will shift to the construction of Otherness and to the ways this gives birth to the political. There will be a shift from the categories of Us and Other to Friend and Enemy, which will give birth to the political. This will, thus, turn the concept of Otherness political. The boys on the island cease to be just different from each other; the animosity between the groups turns personal hatred or jealousy into a political Enemy. It is through the political that the concept of Otherness becomes stable enough as to give the possibility to concentrate on the categorical definitions that Otherness beholds.

From the first moment the choir boys are mentioned in the novel they are made to seem like something different from the rest of the boys. They bring Otherness with their entrance. This, however, is not a bad thing, and the boys are able to work together towards a single goal: keeping the signal fire going so that passing ships would notice it. Otherness also defines all the boys. By marking the difference between the choir boys and the rest of the boys, each person becomes more aware of their existence. This Other, nonetheless, turns hostile and violent. The disliked, but harmless Other will turn into the public Enemy who has to be eliminated. This chapter will give light to how Otherness

starts to show in the interaction of the boys and why they change from Others to Enemies. This theme is continued more thoroughly in chapter 6, where I will concentrate more closely on categorical definitions of Otherness once in this chapter it has been established how Otherness is born.

#### Example 5

Within the diamond haze of the beach something dark was fumbling along. Ralph saw it first, and watched till the intentness of his gaze drew all eyes that way. Then the creature stepped from mirage on to clear sand, and they saw that the darkness was not all shadow but mostly clothing. The creature was a party of boys, marching approximately in step in two parallel lines and dressed in strangely eccentric clothing. (LotF: 18)

Even before Jack and his group have uttered a single word they have been presented as something different from the rest of the boys. Because of the torching sun the boys on the beach are all more or less naked and they are scattered around the assembly place in no particular order. The choirboys, on the other hand, march in orderly fashion and the pace is led by Jack. They are all dressed in similar outfits as to keep unity even though they have disregarded some other pieces of clothing. By their appearance and manner they set themselves apart from the rest of the boys on the beach.

The boys on the beach clearly get the feeling that the arriving choir is something different from them. We use the Other to form our own identity as well as the identity of those who are a part of Us, our group (Harle 2000: 10). The choir boys are already a made-up group whose leader is Jack. They are a group who are already familiar with one another whereas the rest of the boys have come together only after the plane crash. The choir boys are one group and the second group is made of the boys on the beach. The boys on the beach have not known each other for long, but they can understand they are not a part of the choir boys; hence, they must belong to another group. Even though the boys integrate into a one big group, there are still underlying group distinctions. There seems to be one group led by Ralph, but the choir boys are still following and loyal to Jack.

In *Lord of the Flies* most of the boys are introduced by their first names. The exceptions to this are Piggy, Jack and the littluns. Piggy is introduced with a nickname (even though it is a name that Piggy himself is not pleased with) and his real name is actually never revealed in the novel. Piggy, as his name already indicates, is not a threat to anyone and he grows to be an inevitable part of Ralph's group. Jack, on the other

hand, introduces himself as Merridew. In his mind there is no reason why the rest of the boys should know his given name. His own group, Us, knows it and that is enough. Jack also likes to emphasize his title as the chapter chorister and a head boy. Jack is the complete opposite of Piggy. Some of the littluns are named but as a mass they are nothing more than nameless children, and this could be because “the children are too young to have individual characters” (Dalrymple 2005: 25). Naming as an activity is effective as it has an impact on the reader as well. Bullied Piggy, presented with a nickname, is brought closer to the reader than the over-confident Merridew. It is natural that both groups of boys have their own Us, but with the different ways in which the boys are presented, the reader is lured to include oneself with Ralph’s group and this naturally has an effect on the reading experience.

#### Example 6

Jack had too many things to tell Ralph at once. Instead, he danced a step or two, then remembered his dignity and stood still, grinning. He noticed blood on his hands and grimaced distastefully, looked for something on which to clean them, then wiped them on his shorts and laughed.

Ralph spoke.

“You let the fire go out.” (LotF: 91)

What seems to be a breaking point between the two groups is when Jack and his hunters make their first kill. Jack needs the firewatchers for the hunt, which makes the fire die down at the same time as there is a ship on the horizon. Jack is excited from the kill and once he meets Ralph he continues that Ralph should have been with them. No matter what the relationship Ralph and Jack seem to have, Jack is still eager to get Ralph’s approval. Jack sees Ralph as his equal and respects him to some extent so he wants to share his thrill with Ralph. Ralph, nonetheless, is furious. Ralph’s only goal was to keep the fire up so that they could be rescued and he thought everyone shared this same goal. Jack’s goal, nonetheless, changed to hunting. Their goals have become different and they cannot truly understand the other’s point of view.

#### Example 7

So Ralph asserted his chieftainship and could not have chosen a better way if he had thought for days. Against his weapon, so indefinable and so effective, Jack was powerless and raged without knowing why. By the time the pile was built, they were on different sides of a high barrier. [--] Not even Ralph knew how a link between him and Jack had been snapped and fastened elsewhere. (LotF: 96)

After this incident there is no possible way to reconstruct the relationship between Jack and Ralph, and this will evidently lead to Jack’s departure from Ralph’s group. Most of

the boys follow Jack and Ralph is left only with Simon, Piggy and the twins. The choir boys were the Other, but still there are more boys joining Jack's tribe than just the choir boys and they become part of Jack's hunters. Before the two groups become distinct, Piggy, the odd one out, is often the object of ridicule. On several occasions the others twist Piggy's words and actions to cause storms of laughter. Laughing at Piggy often unites the other boys, and for a moment makes them one group with Piggy left out alone. Piggy is frequently humiliated, and with the wish to make him even more uncomfortable, the others laugh at him.

Nonetheless, laughter can be a uniting force between two or more characters as it marks the boundaries of social groups. After Jack has formed his own group and is having a feast, Ralph and Piggy want to join in the meat eating with the others. They march over to Castle Rock where the feast takes place and where they are not expected. Once they arrive, it is made clear that Ralph and Piggy do not belong there:

#### Example 8

Piggy and Ralph came to the edge of the grassy platform; and the boys, as they noticed them, fell silent one by one till only the boy next to Jack was talking. Then the silence intruded even there and Jack turned where he sat. For a time he looked at them and the crackle of the fire was the loudest noise over the over the droning of the reef. Ralph looked away; and Sam, thinking that Ralph had turned to him accusingly, put down his gnawed bone with a nervous giggle. (LotF: 208-209)

Ralph and Piggy have come to the feast but it takes the silence to mark the difference between them and the rest of the boys, they are not one with the group even though they came. This makes Ralph uncomfortable and he looks away. His gaze hits Sam, who thinks it is deliberate and starts to giggle nervously. Ralph tells something inaudible to Piggy, which makes both of them giggle just like Sam. Ralph and Piggy are very aware of their situation of being outsiders in this place and time. Laughter is their way of coping with the embarrassment. No one knows what Ralph whispers to Piggy but it does not matter. The act itself is to show unity in front of all the other boys. Ralph and Piggy share something that none of the other boys is a part of, just like the two boys are not a part of that big group.

What appears to make Jack's group tighter is the death of Simon during the feast. Jack knows what the boys need to hear and makes their unity stronger by claiming Simon was actually the beast in disguise. This might actually have double meaning as all the

boys knew Simon was a part of Ralph's group thus the indication would mean that Ralph and his group is the beast.

#### Example 9

"It was dark. There was that – that bloody dance- There was lightning and thunder and rain. We was scared!"  
 "I wasn't scared," said Ralph slowly, "I was – I don't know what I was."  
 "We was scared!" said Piggy excitedly. "Anything might have happened. It wasn't – what you said." [--]  
 Piggy's voice trailed off at the sight of Ralph's face.  
 "You were on the outside. Outside the circle. You never really came in. Didn't you see what we – what they did?"  
 There was loathing, and at the same time a kind of feverish excitement, in his voice.  
 "Didn't you see, Piggy?" (LotF: 219-220)

Piggy is trying his hardest to convince Ralph and himself that they are not like the Others, while Ralph is overcome by guilt of the death of Simon. Piggy tries to reason that surely they were scared that it was the beast. Ralph is trying to rationalize with Piggy, trying to make him understand. Ralph wants someone to reprimand him on his actions and Piggy, who is wise and most adultlike, could be a good candidate, or more accurately, the only candidate. Ralph pleads with Piggy to understand what a horrendous deed they did and Piggy is still trying to plead that maybe Simon is alive or he is just pretending. Ralph continues to push the subject and says that as Piggy was on the outside of the circle surely he should have seen what really happened. It is important to note how Ralph first includes himself in the people who killed Simon but quickly excludes himself from the group. Ralph knows that killing Simon was wrong and as one's self is always on the side of good (Harle 2000: 15) Ralph needs to detach him from those who do wrong.

#### Example 10

"And look, Ralph"- Piggy glanced round quickly, then leaned close – "don't let on we was in that dance. Not to Samneric."  
 "But we were! All of us!"  
 Piggy shook his head.  
 "Not us till last. They never noticed in the dark. Anyway you said I was only on the outside."  
 "So was I," muttered Ralph. "I was on the outside too."  
 Piggy nodded eagerly.  
 "That's right. We was on the outside. We never done nothing, we never seen nothing."  
 (LotF: 220-221)

It is important to remember that Otherness is not bred only from one side but is a two way street. Just as much as Ralph perceives Jack's group to be the Other the same goes for Jack. The Other is the name for an outsider or the opposition, who refuses, or is



unwilling, to adapt (Kuhlampi 1994: 62). The Other refuses to follow the norms which the rest have made up. Jack, and with him his hunters, are not able to adapt to the biddings of Ralph. Most of the boys follow Jack and Ralph's group shrinks. However, Ralph, Piggy and the twins refuse to change their ways to please Jack, and they become the outcast living outside Castle Rock. In the end there is no one but Ralph and even if he would want to join Jack's tribe it would be impossible as he is no longer the Other, he has become the Enemy.

#### Example 11

He argued unconvincingly that they would let him alone, perhaps even make an outlaw of him. But then the fatal unreasoning knowledge came to him again. The breaking of the conch and the deaths of Piggy and Simon lay over the island like a vapor. These painted savages would go further and further. Then there was that indefinable connection between himself and Jack; who therefore would never let him alone; never. (LotF: 259)

Ralph has lost his tribe; Piggy, Simon and the twins. Piggy and Simon have been killed and Jack's tribe has captured the twins. It is impossible for Ralph to become a follower of Jack; there is no possibility for Ralph to be a part of Jack's group because they have become Enemies. Jack and Ralph desire the same thing. Jack needs to crush Ralph, to show his tribe and himself that he is more powerful than Ralph. As long as they are on the island Jack will hunt Ralph like he is the most delicious prey he ever got his eyes on. An Enemy loses its status as a human being and the Enemy must be killed simply because he is the Enemy (Harle 2000: 12-13). Ralph has become something to be hunted, not even a human anymore. So it is only fitting a stake has been sharpened from both ends to capture him. Piggy and Simon have already been eliminated and now it is just Ralph left.

Before Jack runs off to form his own tribe the two groups live side by side on the beach. There is the feeling of Otherness between the boys, but it does not prevent their co-habitation. It is not until the separation happens that the two groups start slowly to become Enemies. What differs with simply being the Other is the fact that these two groups can never be put back together, and it is impossible for them to work for the same goal, which in this case would be rescue. What makes the boys turn to Friends and Enemies? Jack wants to be the chief and as the time on the island lengthens Jack's desire grows too, and this will evidently lead to the rupture of the group. Jack forms his own group and here he is the chief. But that is not enough; Ralph is still on the island and holds the position of the original chief. Jack desires something he can never have;

to turn back time and be elected the chief first. He must direct his anger towards something concrete and this is Ralph's group. It could be argued that the choir boys and Jack are the Other, but once Jack forms his own tribe and becomes the chief, the chief and his hunters are the Enemy.

The Enemy is stripped from its humanity (Harle 2000: 12-13) and Golding changes his way of referring to the choir-turned-hunters and Jack. Near the end of the novel this is shown by the way the hunters are referred to as one of the hunters and Jack is referred to as the chief. The paint plastered on the faces of the hunters gives them anonymity but makes them more united as a group. Humans have names, and by stripping the hunters and the chief from their names is a way to dehumanize them. The potential of an Enemy emerges only when one group of people come across another group of people (Schmitt 1976: 28). An Enemy is not present when there is only one group and this is why there are no Enemies in *Lord of the Flies* before Jack goes to Castle Rock and forms his own tribe. It is not until this rupture that the potential for the distinction between Friend and Enemy is able to surface.

To politicize the relationship between the two groups is crucial. There is a difference between a personal foe and a public Enemy. Jack and Ralph might not like each other that much and they have a personal battle concerning leadership, but that is not enough to make things turn as ugly as they do in the end. Simple dislike and aversion towards someone is not enough for them to become one's Enemies. The Enemy is public; it is not simple antipathy on an individual level (Harle 2000: 154). In *Lord of the Flies* Jack and Ralph could be considered moral foes, but Jack's and Ralph's groups are Enemies. Schmitt (1976: 33-34) claims that the real possibility of physical killing gives the concepts Friend and Enemy their true meaning. He continues that war is the total elimination of the Enemy and the enmity between Friend and Enemy creates war. A personal foe can be hated and even violence can be used when very angry, but the life of another is still sacred. The life of another is not taken after petty fights or plain anger. If Ralph had not become the Enemy of Jack's group he would not have ended hunted through the jungle. It needs the dehumanization of the Enemy to be able to kill it. Once the Enemy is not seen as a human anymore it is not morally wrong to eliminate it.

A saying goes that a friend in need is a friend indeed and this would suggest that the true form of friends is revealed when things get hard. Ojakangas (2006: 87) also claimed that most genuine friendships are revealed when there is someone threatening your friend – the Enemy. In the beginning of the novel it is obvious that Piggy is not one of Ralph's favorite persons, rather, Ralph is quite annoyed with him. He finds Piggy irritating and is less than happy to be stuck with him. However, as the story evolves the two boys become more like comrades fighting the same evil and their bond seems to tighten when the fragile linkage between Jack and Ralph starts to falter. Jack becomes the common Enemy, which makes them turn to each other. However, if there had not been a common Enemy most likely these two would not have become friends.

This chapter has shown the basic idea how Otherness is constructed in *Lord of the Flies* and given an overlook on how this Otherness turns political. The Other is not a bad thing; it has an important function for forming self-identity. To know what you are means to know what you are not. At the beginning when the choir boys enter the beach they are the Other and everyone can feel it. Piggy's lower class is accentuated in comparison to Jack's prestige upbringing and Ralph's kind looks work for his advantage compared to Jack's pale and bony appearance. By comparing ourselves to the Other we will know who we ourselves are. This difference, Otherness, exists between the choir and the rest of the boys. There is no threat from either group as they still work together for the common goal. The Other, however, turns into the Enemy once Jack goes off to form his own tribe and other boys follow him. This marks the point when one group is clearly separated and there is no chance of uniting them. These groups have different goals and means to get to them. The chief and the hunters have become the Enemies of Ralph's group and this distinction has made Otherness political. The enmity between Ralph and Jack could have been personal but the Friend and Enemy concepts involve both groups. The Enemy is something one wishes to eliminate.

The next chapter will center on the four categorical differences that work as an essential part in the construction of Otherness. This will give the possibility to focus on each category more profoundly and dive more deeply into each subject. The categories, which will be dealt with are: morality; appearance, social obedience, and the relationship between Jack and Ralph. Each category is a powerful tool in building Otherness, and furthermore, upholding it.

## **6 Construction of Otherness through categorical definitions in *Lord of the Flies***

This chapter is divided into four different sections: morality, the boys' appearance, social obedience and the relationship between Jack and Ralph. These four categories were chosen because Golding uses these to create and upkeep Otherness in the novel. The idea is to study how the boys are represented and this can be narrowed down into how they think, act and look. The four different categories will be based on these aspects. Morality chapter will focus on the evilness of the characters while the next chapter centers on the appearance of the boys. Social obedience will concentrate on the boys' willingness to follow rules. Lastly, the focus will turn towards the relationship between the two main characters that control their own groups.

These four categories have a function in the construction of Otherness. By organizing the chapters this way I will be able to point out the different ways in which William Golding uses various dichotomies in order to divide the boys into two groups. It should also be noted that the four categories I present in this chapter are not separate constructions of Otherness, but intervene with each other and work together to form the representation of Otherness.

### **5.1 Morality**

The aim of this sub-chapter is to study how Golding uses morality to construct Otherness in *Lord of the Flies*. This means focusing on the evilness of the characters and how it appears in the novel. Evilness exists in relation to goodness and this is how the moral category works as a way of constructing Otherness.

Harle (2000:147) argues that the Friend and Enemy categories are often related to the battle between good and evil, and this cultural tradition is fundamental for the Friend and Enemy distinction. Harle (2000: 135) also claims that it is only natural for us to relate the Friend with the good and the Enemy with the evil. This is the way they make sense in our minds. We each have a mental idea of what we consider to be good and evil, but this chapter will also introduce some broader concepts concerning evilness. Evilness can be seen as something philosophical or psychological. This is why the analysis will rely on Baruch Spinoza (1981), a philosopher who studied human ethics.

Spinoza was chosen because he thought that human's wish for self-preservation is so strong that it motivates all of their actions (The European Graduate School website 2013). This study centers on young adolescent whose actions are fuelled by nothing less than self-preservation, and for this I thought it was adequate to choose Spinoza. In addition, the psychological evilness will be looked at with the help of Roy Baumeister (1997), an American social psychologist who has studied evilness and human cruelty. These theorists will be used emphasize the difference that grows between the boys.

Spinoza writes in *The Ethics* (1981: 173) that the knowledge of good and evil lies in whether it provokes pleasurable or painful feeling. So if a thing affects us with pleasure we call it good and vice versa. The reading of *Lord of the Flies* provokes strong emotions and whether a character evokes pleasurable or painful feelings will affect how the reader perceives that particular character. Golding depicts Jack as a boy, who is very keen to spill blood. Jack also abuses his social status and uses his power to torture one of the boys just because he can. Jack's right hand, Roger, is even more sadistic and he relishes the anguish of others. These two could be seen as the evil characters, but are they so only because they evoke painful emotions from the reader? This might be a part of it but I would argue, contrary to Spinoza, that the characters evoke painful emotions because Golding has deliberately wanted to make them evil. In this sense, the aim of the novel is to show how evilness is innate to humans, which includes the reader as well.

#### Example 12

Ralph sighed, sensing the rising antagonism, understanding that this was how Jack felt as soon as he ceased to lead.

"I was thinking of the light. We'll be stumbling about."

"We were going to look for the beast."

"There won't be enough light."

"I don't mind going," said Jack hotly. "I'll go when we get there. Won't you? Would you rather go back to the shelters and tell Piggy?"

Now it was Ralph's turn to flush but he spoke despairingly, out of the new understanding that Piggy had given him.

"Why do you hate me?"

The boys stirred uneasily, as though something indecent had been said. The silence lengthened. (LotF: 164)

Spinoza (1981: 184, 195) has argued that once things are naturally in harmony they agree in power and not in the want of it. Furthermore, he continues, that humans can never be naturally in harmony as they are victims of passion, and for this, hatred can never be good because when we hate someone we wish to destroy them. Jack has wished to be the chief from the very first day and he is the one to suggest they should

decide on a chief. Nonetheless, Jack does not really feel he will get any opponents for the job. Ralph, however, has gained the trust of the boys and is handed the position. Frustrated over the result of the vote Jack starts to slowly downplay the chief's position, and it comes evident that he did not wish for there to be a chief, but he wanted to be the chief. The antagonism Jack feels towards Ralph grows stronger and hate is something that rises from this conflict of wanting and not having. Jack wanted to be the chief. As he loses this place he slowly starts to succumb to his jealous desires and passions. This leads him to hate Ralph, which in Spinoza's (1981: 195) mind can never be a good thing.

According to Baumeister (1997: 72) an evil character can be identified firstly on whether they wish to deliberately cause harm on other people. He continues that everyone understands evil in their own way and this is why it is said that everyone experiences evil in their own way. Moreover, Baumeister (1997: 73) claims that an important part of evilness is that the main harm caused to other people is done primarily, because it is pleasurable and an evil person causes violence because it makes them feel good.

Roger and Jack both enjoy inflicting pain on others. Roger is eager to hurt the littluns right from the beginning and even though, at first, he is unable to harm them physically he gets a thrill from making the littluns cry. As time goes on, the violence Roger shows becomes more sadistic and he is the one to kill Piggy. At the end of the novel Roger has sharpened a stick from both ends for Ralph, meaning if Ralph is caught he will suffer the same faith as a hunted pig. This indication leaves no room for questions on what Roger aims to do. Jack, too, is very enthusiastic about hunting and killing animals, but once he becomes the chief of his own tribe he starts to show a violent side. Robert and Roger are talking at Castle Rock and Robert says that:

#### Example 13

“He is going to beat Wilfred”,

“What for?”

“I don't know. He didn't say. He got angry and made us tie Wilfred up. He's been” – he giggled excitedly – “he's been tied for hours, waiting –“

“But didn't the chief say why?”

“I never heard him.”(LotF: 223)

Jack has become sadistic and violent, and he does not need a reason for using violence. Maybe the incident with Simon was a breaking point from which there is no return anymore. They already killed someone so what could they possibly do that would be worse? It is argued by Baumeister (1997: 73) that the suffering of others brings joy to the evil individual, while the victim seems to be good. He continues that “evil does not exist by itself but only in relation to the good”. Thus, the relation between the good and the evil is quite similar to the relation between Us and Other. One cannot exist without the other. Because of this, the battle between Us and the Other can often be seen as a battle between good and evil.

#### Example 14

At last the immediacy of the kill subsided. The boys drew back, and Jack stood up, holding out his hands.

“Look!”

He giggled and flicked them while the boys laughed at his reeking palms. Then Jack grappled Maurice and rubbed the stuff over his cheeks. Roger began to withdraw his spear and boys noticed it for the first time. Robert stabilized the thing in a phrase which was received uproariously.

“Right up her ass!”(LotF: 189)

All the victims, who are tormented or killed by Jack and his hunters, are good and innocent starting from the sodomized sow. It is not enough to kill it but the hunters get a thrill from the disgraceful means in which it is put down. Simon and Piggy are innocent characters, who meet their end in the hands of the hunters. In addition, the littluns are by their young age innocent children. The evilness of Jack and Roger survives in relation to Ralph and his group.

Baumeister states in his study (1997: 212) that laughter is linked to evil because of the Devil who laughs at the suffering people. The idea of the Devil as the most evil being is based on the Christianity, but it does not diminish the fact that laughter at other people’s suffering is linked to evilness. Once the hunters sodomize the sow and Robert says out loud the crude word, a storm of laughter follows. The laughter is stimulated by the killing of the animal, but also by the embarrassment the words cause. They laugh at the total disgrace of the animal.

However, it is not only pure evilness, which may cause the boys’ behavior. Baumeister (1997: 220) has studied the sadistic tendencies of children and concluded that children are overcome by curiosity. Furthermore, Baumeister (ibid.) states that the spirit of play,

which causes children to act sadistically, differs from the pure pleasure of enjoying other people suffering. In comparison to Jack and Roger, who deliberately wish to cause harm on others, the rest of the boys might be just enjoying the spirit of play. To get to hunt and to use inappropriate language is something they were not allowed to do back home, and it is all very new and thrilling for them.

Researchers have tried to study human aggression for centuries, but according to Baumeister (1997: 382), it is unlikely that they will ever be able to pinpoint the specific reasons that cause aggression. However, he continues that it is certain that all people have some sort of tendencies that can provoke them to act aggressively. Baumeister (1997: 263) argues that most people possess evil tendencies, but these tendencies are met by strong restraining forces that we call our own self-control. Thus, according to Baumeister (*ibid.*), ambition and greed may trigger evil in people but humans still possess inner restraints that are equal to these passions. Nonetheless, once the self restraints collapse violent actions ensue.

Roger is a character who shows his sadistic tendencies early on in the novel. He, however, is unable to act on them as he is bound by the social rules he knew in the past and his inner restraints are still strong. Roger's aggressive nature was already present back in England but it is not until on the island that he can truly be free to express himself. The line between the right and the wrong becomes hazier as time goes on, and at the end of the novel Roger is free to relish his true nature. Jack, too, is able to keep his ambitions in check at the beginning. Nonetheless, Jack, too, becomes greedier and is not content with being just the leader of the hunters. Jack wants to be the chief and enjoy the rights the position would give him. Here, the time spent on the island correlates with the rising violent habits the boys show. The characters have harbored their evil tendencies in secret and probably had never acted upon their passion if they had not been stranded on the island.

There is evilness inside all the characters of the novel, including Ralph, Piggy and the twins. Simon is the one to realize the evilness of a human heart, when Lord of the Flies, the head of the dead sow placed on a stick, speaks to him. No matter if they grow up someday and become adults, the world would not become a better place. For them there is no salvation in the real world as humans are animals. This is what Simon realizes: the



only beast is the boys themselves. As he comes to this realization he wants to tell the others of his findings. Nonetheless, he will never get to tell this to anyone, as he stumbles on to the beach while the other boys are deeply entranced in their hunting dance, and Simon becomes the beast to be killed. All the boys are included in the death of Simon, but it seems that Ralph is the only one who wants to take responsibility over their doings. However, to be clear, Golding rarely lets the reader to know the hunters' thoughts. Naturally, this is his tool to help the reader to identify with the main character of the story who is Ralph, and to distance the reader from the hunters.

There is a difference between Ralph's and Jack's reactions to the death of Simon. While Ralph discusses the matter with his confidant Piggy, Jack is the chief and he talks to his tribe.

#### Example 15

At last Ralph stopped. He was shivering.  
 "Piggy."  
 "Uh?"  
 "That was Simon."  
 "You said that before."  
 "Piggy."  
 "Uh?"  
 "That was murder." (LotF: 219)

#### Example 16

The chief paused. They saw a triangle of startling pink dart out, pass along his lips and vanish again.  
 "- and then, the beast might try to come in. You remember how he crawled –"  
 The semicircle shuddered and muttered in agreement.  
 "He came – disguised. He may come again even though we gave him the head of our kill to eat. So watch; and be careful." (LotF: 224-225)

After Simon is killed, Ralph says that he is frightened of all the boys on the island including himself with the boys he is scared of. He is frightened of the savagery they are capable of. Ralph is coming to the same conclusion as Simon that they themselves are the source of evil. There is no outside source of evil, and there is no beast in the forest or in the sea. Evilness lies inside all the boys, even Ralph himself, and it has just waited for the right moment to conjure up to the surface. Even though Ralph separated himself from the others before, now he clearly includes himself as part of the bad people. Ralph is aware of what they did and wants to take the blame for it. Maybe it is still Piggy who is the most adultlike by saying there is absolutely no reason for Ralph to think about the

subject anymore. It does no good. Nonetheless, these two boys are discussing the difficult subject and they are acknowledging their wrongdoings.

#### Example 17

“After the feast,” said Sam in a stifled voice. Eric nodded.

“Yes, after the feast.”

“We left early,” said Piggy quickly, “because we were tired.”

“So did we –“

“-very early-“

“- we were very tired.”

Sam touched a scratch on his forehead and then hurriedly took his hand away. Eric fingered his split lip.

“Yes. We were very tired,” repeated Sam, “so we left early. Was it a good –“

The air was heavy with unspoken knowledge. Sam twisted and the obscene word shot out of him. “-dance?”

Memory on the dance that none of them had attended shook all four boys convulsively.

“We left early.” (LotF: 222)

Once Sam and Eric come to the scene all the four boys are abashed and try their hardest to forget what they did the previous night. Even though the marks on the twins’ faces are telling a different story than their words, they try to convince themselves that they were not a part of the fatal dance. More than trying to convince the others, they have to convince themselves. How are they to live with what they have done? Now they are just like the hunters, just as savage and brutal. However, for the twins there has to be something that makes them different from the hunters – the Others.

The reason for Simon’s death could be explained by the hypnotic power of a group. Parker (1997: 34-35) wrote that compared to an individual, a group can share hallucinations and actually demand illusions. He continues that chants can get a hold over a crowd and maintain the situation. He concludes that the more there are people in a group, the stronger the feeling of hypnotic power will become. Baumeister (1997: 325) also studied why groups can be responsible for much more brutal things than what one individual would ever do. He came to the conclusion that an important part of human behavior is self-scrutiny, but people tend to lose their individuality once they blend into a group.

#### Example 18

*“Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!”*

The blue- white scar was constant, the noise unendurable. Simon was crying out something about a dead man on a hill.

*“Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood! Do him in!”*

The sticks fell and the mouth of the new circle crunched and screamed. The beast was on its knees in the center, its arms folded over its face. It was crying out against the abominable noise something about a body on the hill. The steep edge of the rock to the sand by the water. At once the crowd surged after it, poured down the rock, leapt on to the beast, screamed, struck, bit, tore. There were no words, and no movements but the tearing of teeth and claws. (LotF: 214)

Simon is brutally killed and there is no doubt that this is done because of the hypnotic power of a group. They all chant the hunting song, which rises to the skies and wraps them inside it. Simon is turned into the beast and this is how the dancers see him, or at least want to see him. Cooley (1964: 28) mentions that the “instinct of the herd” is used to explain phenomena like mob excitement, the readiness to follow trends and leaders. It is usually said that stupidity grows in numbers. In mob excitement the voice of reason is easily lost and numerous acts can seem justifiable once there are enough people in on it. The hunters are the first “victims” after they kill their first pig. They have the afterglow and the memory of how scary the hunt was. To enjoy the memory they come up with a hunting song and the re-enactment dance of the hunt. Nonetheless, as the novel advances, and Jack’s group grows in numbers, the hunting dance becomes a little more violent each time. There is nothing wrong with mob excitement; it is what makes the boys form their group in the beginning of the novel. This group excitement makes the boys organize themselves over how things are to be structured and through this they get a sense of purpose.

When the parachutist lands on the island, and is mistaken for a beast, the bigger boys go up the mountain to search for the beast. As the boys make their way towards the mountain they suddenly come across a pig track and a huge boar comes towards them with its tusks gleaming. Ralph sees Jack fall to the ground and finds himself able to measure the distance between himself and the boar as he takes aim with his spear. With confidence, he throws his spear towards the boar and the spear sticks to the animal for a moment. Jack gathers himself up from the undergrowth and tries to race the wild boar but is unable to catch it.

#### Example 19

“I hit him! The spear stuck in –“  
 “I hit him,” said Ralph again, “and the spear stuck in a bit.” He felt the need of witnesses.  
 “I hit him all right. The spear stuck in. I wounded him!” He sunned himself in their new respect and felt that hunting was good after all. (LotF: 157)

Ralph is overcome by the huge emotion of wounding the animal. He is crazed over his ability to aim and throw a spear, crazed over his ability to hunt. With this ability he is not a lesser person compared to Jack; to Jack, who was on the ground while Ralph himself wounded the boar. Ralph gets completely excited about the hunt and as he gets the taste of blood he finds himself wanting for more. This makes Ralph just like Jack, not at all better or more civilized. Ralph clings to the fact that he hit the animal and wants desperately for the others to notice his excellence. Once Jack shows the boys that the boar wounded him, not much but enough to make the skin bloody, he gets an excuse on why he could not stick his spear to the boar. Young boys, in general, are often than not fascinated by blood and so it is in this instance as well. All the boys, who were anxious to hear Ralph's story, shift their focus on Jack and Jack's bloody war scar. Ralph becomes desperate to gain their attention, once again. He is not ready to let Jack get any glory as it was him who wounded the boar.

While Ralph is talking about his remarkable throw, Robert snarls and starts to imitate the boar. Ralph, quick to catch up, joins the play. Soon enough all the boys are jabbing Robert. The boys form a ring on Jack's demand with Robert in the middle, squealing in mock terror at first and soon later in real pain. This makes the boys even more excited and they hold Robert with his arms and legs. Ralph, who is completely carried away by this sudden excitement, jabs Robert with Eric's spear while the other boys shout "kill him!" All at once, Robert is screaming and struggling with the strength of frenzy. Jack has him by the hair and is brandishing his knife. Behind him is Roger, fighting to get close. The chant rises ritually, as the last moment of dance or a hunt. "*Kill the pig! Cut his throat! Kill the pig! Bash him in!*" Ralph, too, is fighting to get near, to get a handful of that brown, vulnerable flesh. The desire to squeeze and hurt is over-mastering.

Being in a crowd can summon false sense of invincibility so that even the most sophisticated person can turn into a barbarian because the mind of the group is "impulsive, changeable and irritable and it knows no doubt or uncertainty" (Parker 1997: 34). Even Ralph, who could have been seen as the reasonable character until now, is overcome by the frenzy. The boys can probably envision the boar in front of their eyes, while Robert's silhouette gradually disappears. They are not holding down Robert, but a wild animal. The game ends once Jack's hand comes down to the final blow and the circle makes pig-dying noises. After this, all the boys are wiped out, panting to catch

their breath and quiet down their heart beats. They felt the excitement with their whole bodies, not only with their minds. Robert is unharmed but his sniffles give away that he was most certainly scared. Maurice comments that they ought to get a drum so that they could do the play properly. Ralph questions him on how properly it needs to be done. Maybe this is the moment when “the good” Ralph comes back as one can almost hear the tone on that phrase “how properly?” It indicates that how much more real would Maurice like to make that game; was it not frightening enough as it was? Maurice continues that there should be fire and a drum, so that they could keep time to the drum. Roger continues that there should also be a pig in which Jack exclaims that someone could pretend to be the pig. Roger is not satisfied with this because they have to kill it; it has to be a real pig. Jack says that they could always use one of the littluns, which causes all the boys to laugh. The remark about the littluns is meant as a joke but there is always some truth to all jokes.

#### Example 20

Roger stooped, picked up a stone, aimed, and threw it at Henry – threw it to miss. The stone, token of preposterous time, bounced five yards to Henry’s right and fell in the water. Roger gathered a handful of stones and began to throw them. Yet there was a space round Henry, perhaps six yards in diameter, into which he dare not throw. Here, invisible yet strong, was the taboo of the old life. Round the squatting child was the protection of parents and school and the law. Roger’s arm was conditions by civilization that knew nothing of him and was in ruins. (LotF: 81)

Cooley (1964: 48-49) argues that it is not possible to separate an individual from the society. Even on a deserted island one’s mind is formed by the society and one naturally keeps the social intercourse alive by ones memory and imagination. This intercourse is the only thing that keeps the humanity alive and if it falters, one’s mind will decay. The boys on the island are not kept in check by any regulations or rules. There are no adults to lay down rules or teachers to scold on wrongful actions. Upon their arrival to the island the memories of a civil society are still very much in their memory and the patterns of conduct are taken from those memories.

#### Example 21

“Never mind about the chief –“  
 “-you got to go for your own good.”  
 “The chief and Roger –“  
 “-yes, Roger-”  
 “They hate you, Ralph. They’re going to do you.”  
 “They’re going to hunt you tomorrow.” (LotF: 265)

When Ralph, Piggy and the twins go to Castle Rock to call an assembly, Roger feels the urge to do something while Ralph is talking. He throws a small stone towards the twins, aiming to miss, but, once Sam almost loses his footing, some sort of power begins to pulse in Roger's body and he gets excited. Roger had thrown rocks to miss before. He wanted to throw rocks at Henry, but because of the restraints of the old way of living, he was only able to throw to miss. After the pulsing feeling Roger gathers more stamina and a few moments later he lunges a huge boulder down, which kills Piggy. Roger has lost the little restraints that connected him to the civilized world. Roger would not aim with rocks to miss anymore; he would try to hit his target. At this point Jack is no longer the most evil thing on the island, if he ever was. The twins clearly state that Jack and Roger hate Ralph and they will hunt him. There is no more play left and it is not a game. Ralph is the Enemy who needs to be eliminated. The twins tell Ralph how they are doing the hunting the next day and show him what kind of sound they need to do once they find him. Ralph becomes frightened and whispers that he has done nothing! That he just wanted to keep the fire going. However, the Enemy is hated for what it is, not what he has done. Ralph is now the Enemy and one must get rid of the Enemy.

In his study, Harle (2000: 189) discusses the conceptual connection of the Devil and the Enemy. He states: "here we encounter the major dilemma of the Enemy: dealing with the Devil leads "us" to ruthlessly and totally eliminate the Enemy. It suggests that evil is out there and that by eliminating the Enemy we can get rid of evil." (Harle 2000: 189.) Devil is omnipresent in this world and it is culminated as the Enemy. An abstract vision of the devil is far too scary and an abstract cannot be destroyed. When the devil gets a concrete character as the Enemy, there is a sense of fulfillment as there is now a target and this way the devil can be destroyed. When the Enemy suffers so will the devil, and at the same time as the Enemy is killed the devil will be demolished as well.

The concept of the Enemy becomes problematic, because it is a category constructed in social processes. Thus, we all have different ideas on what is included within the abstract concept. Consequently, as we try to eliminate the devil, our Enemy, our counterpart will most likely try to eliminate us as from their point of view we are the devil. This can be seen in the novel as from Ralph's point of view Jack is the essence of evil, almost as if possessed by the devil; the devil, who disguises himself with dirt and blood so that he is nothing more than a mere reflection of a human being. Then again,

Jack sees Ralph as the Enemy, whose whole existence is a threat to his way life on the island.

The beast, which for the boys is the common Other, is presented quite early on, and it affects many settings in the novel. It is the littluns that first present the idea of the beast and mention that they are afraid of it. Even if the older boys quickly deny the existence of a beast, the thought of it still lingers in the boys' minds. Percival mentions that the beast comes from the sea and once again the rest of the boys call this bullock. It is the sea that separates the island from the rest of the world and leaves them stranded. The sea has two sides to it. The bay side is calm and it is protected from the harshness of the real ocean. The other side of the ocean is ruthless and intimidating. It is at the bay side where the boys first come together and they are all as mellow as the bay. On the other side of the island, the sea is brutally abusing the shores and this other side is the real face of the ocean. The bay side, where the boys are, is just an illusion. It gives the illusion of safety and calmness even though, not far from the beach, the real ocean is waiting for unsuspecting preys. The sea seems to represent the nature of the boys: first calm and friendly but later on brutal and deadly. As the only beast on the island lives inside the boys the sea metaphor is even more apparent. The statement of the beast coming from the sea would show early on that the beast comes from inside the boys. This is also a way of constructing Otherness as Ralph's group stays on the bay side, the good side, whereas Castle Rock is situated on the other side. Even nature is made to underline the differences inside the boys.

In this chapter I have concentrated on how Golding constructs Otherness through morality in his novel. This part touched upon the goodness and evilness of the characters. The basic idea could be that the hunters and Jack are seen as the evil characters and Ralph's group are the good ones. Nonetheless, things are rarely black and white as people who do bad things are not necessarily evil by nature. Jack and Roger might have more violent tendencies than the others, but whether it is innate or born on the island is unclear. I also touched on the subject of mob excitement and how it affects the boys to act differently from their normal character.

Because evilness is often linked to aesthetics where evil is seen ugly and good beautiful, this theme is connected to the next chapter as well. It will concentrate on the appearance of the boys and study how that is a way building Otherness between them.

## 6.2 The boys' appearance

This chapter will discuss the aesthetical appearance and its impact on marking the differences between the boys. It will be shown how Otherness is constructed through the characters' appearance. Attention is given to the way in which Jack and Ralph are first introduced and what implications this might have. Focus will also be given to the stark difference between the choir and the rest of the boys. Jack's character changes during the course of the novel, therefore, the correlation of this change and his darkening appearance is studied. Schmitt (1976: 27) claimed that the Enemy is often seen as ugly and the aim is to show how the darkening appearance of Jack's group is closely connected to the gap it grows between his and Ralph's groups. In *Lord of the Flies* the savagery presented corresponds to the amount of dirt the characters are painted with, and the boys' appearances are used to mark the difference between the two groups.

Ralph and Jack are presented in different ways. Ralph is a fair boy, who has already lost the chubbiness of childhood. His shoulders are broad and he would probably make a good boxer if he had even an inch of evilness in his face. Jack, on the other hand, is tall, thin, and bony. He has red hair and his face is crumpled, freckled and ugly.

Furthermore, his eyes are ready to turn to anger. George (2008: 36) mentions that *Lord of the Flies* deliberately parodies *Coral Island* (1857) and this is quite clear while taking a closer look at the depictions of *Coral Island's* Jack Martin, who was tall with broad shoulders and had a handsome face (Ballantyne 1977: 22). So why did Golding make the difference between Merridew and Martin so distinct? One reason could be to accentuate the difference between Jack and Ralph, and what they represent. Ralph proclaims no devil to the extent that he might not make a boxer because he does not wish to harm others while Jack has a short temper with red hair. The color red is generally associated with the devil as it is the color of fire and thus Hell. Even if the allegory does not stretch that far, there is no doubt Ralph is made more likeable through his appearance and it is one of the reasons he is voted the chief. The difference between



Jack and Ralph is made obvious, but so is the difference between the choir boys and the rest of the boys.

#### Example 22

The creature was a party of boys, marching approximately in step in two parallel lines and dressed in strangely eccentric clothing. Shorts, shirts, and different garments they carried in their hands; but each boy wore a square black cap with a silver badge on it. Their bodies, from throat to ankle, were hidden by black cloaks which bore a long silver cross on the left breast and each neck was finished off with a hambone frill. (LotF: 18-19)

The choir boys are made to seem ominous, something different. Their whole demeanor differs from the boys on the beach, who are ruffled and more or less naked. Their demeanor combined with the orderly fashion in which they move together and their matching outfits shows the similarity they have with the Nazi soldiers. The choir boys carry a silver cross on the left breast, just like the SS- officers wore the Iron Cross on the left breast (SSrelics website 2013). Considering the time frame in which the novel was written, the similarities between the choir boys and the Nazis should not be ignored. Golding uses this as a mean to clearly show off the difference between the boys and takes a stance in how he wishes the reader to relate to the characters. This action of likening the choir boys with the Nazis is deliberately made.

Even though the choir boys differ from the rest of the boys, it is still Piggy whose looks sets him aside from all the other boys. Piggy is fat in a group where others are not. This alone is enough to mark him different. Furthermore, he has glasses and asthma. Piggy is bullied and his discomfort often becomes a uniting thing for the rest of the boys. Piggy is the general laughing stock and he can be made fun of when there is need for fellowship. At first Piggy is the Other, the only one left out of the group of boys. Nonetheless, slowly a shift is starting. Piggy's appearance does not change but the choir boys' appearance does. Jack and his choir-turned-hunters are forming the Other and Piggy is getting a place in Ralph's group.

So how does Piggy become Piggy rather than just one of the boys? Piggy's name is not revealed in the entire novel. He only tells Ralph the one name he does not wanted be called with and that is Fatty. After the choir boys have joined the other boys on the beach and the boys are discussion matters, Jack lashes out to Piggy calling him Fatty. It is Ralph who comes to rescue and tells them that the boy's name is actually Piggy. This revelation of Piggy's name causes a storm of laughter and even the tiniest child joins in.

For a moment the boys are a closed circuit with Piggy on the outside. If the situation had been kept that way, meaning Piggy would have been the outcast, always ridiculed by the other boys, things might not have shifted in the direction they later on went.

Once the delicate bond between Jack and Ralph starts to falter, a new alliance is formed between Piggy and Ralph. This, nonetheless, angers Jack as he hates Piggy and he is jealous of Ralph, no matter their disagreements. Jack does not like the fact that Piggy and Ralph are close, and because of this his dislike of Piggy increases. Jack does not want to let Piggy in on their group so for Ralph to befriend Piggy means breaking up the group. Piggy is not aesthetically beautiful and he is lazy, but his redeeming quality is his intelligence. Piggy is smarter than Ralph, actually smarter than all the boys. If he only had been thinner with perfect eyesight and health, he might have been elected the chief (Dick 1987: 14).

Appearance vice, Jack's transformation is the most evident one. Jack is the head boy, very proper and prim at the beginning. He is not physically beautiful but his clothing and demeanor are like nothing else on the island. Jack has realized that something is restraining him from killing an animal. In his previous life killing was completely forbidden and he should refrain from doing it. However, on this island hunting has become his goal and he dreams of the day when his knife stabs the flesh of a pig. His hunting attempts are futile as he is still constrained by his previous life. The only way to become a successful hunter is to become someone else entirely. By covering his face with paint he also covers his old self. The paint gives him a new identity, the identity of a hunter. Behind the mask he is safe from shame and self-consciousness. The paint frees him from the sins he is about to commit because it is not Jack Merridew anymore. He is somebody else entirely. This comes clear when Golding writes about Jack's transformation as follows:

### Example 23

Jack planned his new face. He made one cheek and one eye-socket white, then he rubbed red over the other half of his face and slashed a black bar of charcoal across from right ear to left jaw. He looked in the pool for his reflection, but his breathing troubled the mirror.

“Samneric. Get me a coconut. An empty one.”

He knelt, holding the shell of water. A rounded patch of sunlight fell on his face and brightness appeared in the depths of the water. He looked in astonishment, no longer at himself but an awesome stranger. He spilt the water and leapt to his feet, laughing excitedly. Beside the pool his sinewy body held up a mask that drew their eyes and appalled them. He began to dance and his laughter became a bloodthirsty snarling. He capered toward Bill, and

the mask was a think on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness.” (LotF: 82-83)

Jack first disguises himself because he wants to catch a pig, but after time goes on the paint becomes a more prominent feature in his appearance. As the chief of his own tribe Jack is naked to the waist and his face is painted in white and red. Jack is no longer Jack or Merridew. He is the chief, and like a chief he acts. He has painted his face with white and red and there is no trace of Jack Merridew, the head boy, left in him. The change from Jack to the chief happens after Simon is killed.

#### Example 24

Before the party had started a great log had been dragged into the center of the lawn and Jack, painted and garlanded, sat there like an idol. (LotF: 208)

Even though Jack has formed his own place in Castle Rock, he is still Jack before the feast. It is during the feast when he questions the boys’ willingness to join his tribe and have fun. He also promises his hunters will protect the boys from the beast. Hands rise up and by popular vote Jack becomes the chief. Simon, the only one who knows that there is no beast to be protected from, is brutally killed. Ojakangas says (2006: 71) that an Enemy holds a threat to your way of life. If Simon had lived and told everyone about the beast, there would be no reasons for the hunters to protect the boys, thus less reason for Jack to be the chief. The death of Simon is a marking point from which on Jack is mainly referred to as the chief.

#### Example 25

The chief was sitting there, naked to the waist, his face blocked out in white and red. The tribe lay in semicircle before him. The newly beaten and untied Wilfred was sniffing noisily in the background. [-] The chief led them, trotting steadily, exulting in his achievement. He was a chief now in truth; and he made stabbing motions with his spear. From his left hand dangled Piggy’s broken glasses. (LotF: 224, 236)

Even if Jack painted himself for a hunt, the chief is painted all the time. The appearance of the chief is dirty and crude, and the outer appearance seems to represent the savage nature within. After the death of Simon Jack is referred to as Jack only when Ralph, Piggy and the twins go to Castle Rock to confront him about the stolen glasses. Jack and his choir boys have been the Other but the chief and his hunters have become the Enemy of Ralph’s group. It is the chief and the hunters, not Jack and the choir boys, who kill Piggy, capture the twins and honestly wish to harm Ralph.

## Example 26

“I’m chief!”

Viciously, with full intention, he hurled his spear at Ralph. The point tore the skin and flesh over Ralph’s ribs, then sheared off and fell in the water. Ralph stumbled, feeling not pain but panic, and the tribe, screaming now like the chief, began to advance. (LotF: 254)

The chief rules with violence and fear. Once someone is tortured for no apparent reason all the other tribe members must be on their best behavior as they do not want to be the object of the chief’s anger and sadism. The chief commands that some need to go hunting with him, but the others must stay behind and guard Castle Rock from those who will try to sneak in. Then one of the tribe, a savage, questions why someone would try to sneak in. The chief’s answer is earnest “They will. They’ll try to spoil things we do” (LotF: 224). Even though there is no apparent reason for the Enemy to harm you, you think they will as it is their duty. The chief presses on the subject that they must be alert if the beast will come back. “He came – disguised. He may come again even though we gave him the head of our kill to eat. So watch; and be careful” (LotF: 224-225). It was not Simon they killed; it was the beast in a disguise. If the chief says it was the beast then it surely was the beast. Perhaps the beast even took Simon’s form to fool them and try to get to them like that.

Boyd (1990: 7) wrote that “man seems to be a natural producer of filth as well as evil, and the one is a symbol of the other”. Filth and dirt are used as outside elements to represent the evilness inside the boys and as the time goes by on the island the boys care less about cleanliness.

## Example 27

They were dirty, not with the spectacular dirt of boys who have fallen into mud or been brought down hard on a rainy day. Not one of them was on obvious subject for a shower, and yet – hair, much too long, tangled here and there, knotted round a dead leaf or a twig; faces cleaned fairly well by the process of eating and sweating but marked in the less accessible angles with a kind of shadow; clothes, worn away, stiff like his own with sweat, put on, not for decorum or comfort but out of custom; the skin of the body, scurfy with brine. (LotF: 152)

Before Ralph notes the obvious dirtiness of the boys he is awakened by the thought of how much he would like to wash his dirty shirt. At the same time he would like to have scissors to cut his hair with and a warm bath in which to scrub himself clean would be quite nice too. Ralph notes that his nails have also become dirty and bitten even though

he cannot remember biting them. He is quite certain his lack of living in a civilized society will surely deteriorate him.

There seems to be a difference in how dirtiness is represented in the characters. The two good characters, Simon and Piggy who are killed in the course of the novel, are not pictured to be dirty or unclean as much as the other characters. Noted, Ralph does mention that all the boys are starting to get dirty, but there is no bigger emphasis on these two characters. They neither take part in hunting where they would paint their faces. It could be because Piggy is already depicted as fat and pig-eyed, which differs him from the rest of the boys. However, Simon, the Christ like character (Friedman 1993: 19-32), is shown with his face covered in blood and he is dirty from passing out on the ground after his talk with the Lord of the Flies. The realization that the beast is actually inside the boys would include Simon, and dirtiness would imply that he is not completely innocent either. Ralph is not all pure and good as he is involved in the dance that results in Simon's death. The next morning he is dirty, limping and dead leaves are hanging from his hair. Ralph has become dirty, an outer mark that he was involved in evil. However, his redeeming quality is that he realizes their dirtiness. Before anything happens to Simon he is certain the lack of civilization deteriorates him. As the novel advances he is seen suggesting bathing to his group which correlates with cleanliness.

Rantonen (1994: 137) claims that goodness is often linked with purity, cleanliness and white while dirt and darkness is more than often associated with evilness. When Jack is first introduced he is extremely pale and he comes across very strict and mannerly. He is a white, somewhat innocent boy. This boy is unable to hunt and unable to kill. The urge to do those things is immensely strong but so are the restrictions that forbid him. To get past those restrictions Jack disguises himself with mud and by covering his innocent milky skin he is freed from the clutches his white appearance demands. With mud and dark appearance his whole soul seems to gradually darken. His inner animal is released with the cover up. Jack's dark appearance is accentuated in the comparison of the still white Ralph. Dirt is not only something on the outside; it seems to creep inside the characters. This could be because of causality; one precedes the other. Is Jack acting the way he is does because he is painted black or did he paint himself black because he wanted to act that way? All the boys are becoming more or less dirty and the distinct color of black seem to suggest the willingness for savagery. Jack and the hunters

deliberately mask themselves because they wish to kill an animal but these masks are washed away after a hunt. This changes once Jack gets to form his own group and the hunters can wear their masks all the time.

Jack has a strong hold of his underlings and one sign of this is that just like Jack's appearance changes so does his group's. The difference between Ralph's group and Jack's group is becoming more obvious. In the middle of the book Jack becomes so frustrated with Ralph that he runs off to form his own group and his choir follows him. But Jack wants more, thus they need to get more people. The boys make a sudden appearance on Ralph's camp: "The forest near them burst into uproar. Demonic figures with faces of white and red and green rushed out howling, so that the littluns fled screaming" (LotF: 195). The boys are disguised into something not human. They are naked and painted. Jack shouts for all to hear that they hunt, feast and have fun. If anyone would like to join him they should come to where he is. Nonetheless, he says cryptically that he may or may not let them join his group. This last part is most definitely directed at Piggy and Ralph. Jack continues his speech and, once he is done, Maurice and Robert raise their spears together and announce that the chief has spoken. With this the boys trot off and Samneric start to whisper that they thought it was the beast. What is interesting here is that it was the beast, the beast that lives inside all the boys, but not the one they thought they were afraid of.

One thing that Jack does not have is the means to make fire. The only way for the boys to make fire is by using Piggy's glasses, which are naturally with Piggy and Piggy is with Ralph. Jack has promised his followers food, and, even though he is able to get food he is unable to prepare it without fire. Piggy is the only one with eyeglasses and, thus, the only one able to make fire on the island. For the raid Jack and the hunters disguise themselves as they sneak up on the others. They need the masks in order to make themselves different and to make them forget that they are like the Others. By transforming their appearance, Jack and the boys accentuate the difference between themselves and Ralph's group. They are not the same.

Once Jack has acquired Piggy's glasses, Piggy is left helpless, blind as a bat, and the boys try to think of a way as to how to get the spectacles back. Ralph thinks that perhaps they should retrieve them by grooming up: by brushing their hair and by

washing themselves. After all, they are not savages and want to be rescued. In this way the difference between the two groups can be emphasized. With their appearance he wants to show that they are nothing like the Others, they are better.

#### Example 28

“We’ll be like we were. We’ll wash –“  
 Sam gulped down a mouthful and protested.  
 “But we bathe every day!”  
 Ralph looked at the filthy objects before him and sighed.  
 “We ought to comb our hair. Only it’s too long.”  
 “I’ve got both socks left in the shelter,” said Eric, “so we could pull them over our heads like caps, sort of.”  
 “We could find some stuff,” said Piggy, “and tie your hair back.”  
 “Like a girl!”  
 “No. ‘Course not.”  
 Then we must go as we are,” said Ralph, “and they won’t be any better.”  
 Eric made a detaining gesture.  
 “But they’ll be painted! You know how it is.”  
 The others nodded. They understood only too well the liberation into savagery that the concealing paint brought.  
 “Well, we won’t be painted,” said Ralph, “because we aren’t savages.” (LotF: 241-242)

Ralph is fixed on his decision of not wearing paint but once he goes to Castle Rock and gazes at the savages intently, he feels a flicker of regret. Freed by the paint, the savages have tied their hair back and are more comfortable than he is. Ralph makes a resolution to tie his own hair back afterwards. Indeed he feels like telling them to wait and doing it there and then; but that is impossible. The savages snigger a bit and one gestures at Ralph with his spear. The reason why Ralph and his group decided to leave their hair hanging open was because tying hair back was a girly thing to do. However, the hunters have their hair tied back and Ralph feels a twinge of regret. The difference between the two groups is accentuated but the one who feels out of place is Ralph and his group.

In the end of the novel Ralph is the only one who is not painted. He is also the object of a deadly hunt, which ends once the boys stumble across a naval officer on the beach. The officer sees:

#### Example 29

A semicircle of little boys, their bodies streaked with colored clay, sharp sticks in their hands, were standing on the beach making no noise at all. (LotF: 282)

If there were no officer around the vision would seem different. The boys would be crouching savages, naked and painted to hide their true selves. Spears sharpened at both

ends to do the most harm and they are closing in on Ralph. Baumeister (1997: 220) mentions that adults often end the children's sadistic experiments, and this deadly game comes to a halt because of the naval officer.

This chapter discussed how the boys are divided on the basis of their outer appearance. The first one to have the position of being different is Piggy because he is fat, asthmatic and wears glasses. Even though the choir boys as a group are different from the rest of them, it is still Piggy who could be considered the Other to all the rest of the boys. As Otherness is not limited to only one subject, the choir boys are the Others to the non-choir boys. Jack and his hunters disguise themselves with paint while they go hunting, but once Jack becomes the chief he starts to wear paint all the time. The more paint the boys wear seems to relate to the savage nature inside them or to the willingness to act on their primitive urges. There is strong emphasis on the different appearance of Ralph and Jack's group and it is a way to build difference between them. In the next part the focus will be the influence of the society and how the boys relate to following of rules, which were produced by that society.

### **6.3 Social obedience**

In this chapter I will have a look at the society's influence on the boys, and moreover the patterns of conduct it has given the boys. Because the English society and social classes have been studied in relation to this novel (Davies & Saunders 1983, Boyd 1990, Reilly 1998), the focus of this chapter will be on the willingness to follow rules. Laws are enforced rules and laws are something in which societies are built on. Therefore it is only natural that the boys wish to have rules once they discuss the subject. This is familiar to them and they do not know a world without rules. However, the boys quickly realize that nobody will reprimand them for breaking the rules and start to rebel against them. Harle (2000: 10) writes that the Other has an important social function in telling the difference between those who follow the law and those that do not. The willingness to follow rules becomes a natural dividing factor between the boys.

On a deserted island the boys are still a part of the English society; the memory of it lives in them exceptionally strong. Consequently, it is only natural that the boys would follow a path that is familiar to them and try to organize themselves. Jack is the first one



to suggest they should have a chief and offers himself for the job. Jack feels that it is his given right to be chief as he is the chapter chorister and a head boy. In addition, he can sing C sharp. There is no doubt in Jack's mind that he should be the chief as he feels he is most qualified for the job. It is most likely because of this arrogance that he is never voted for chief.

#### Example 30

"I agree with Ralph. We've got to have rules and obey them. After all, we're not savages. We're English and the English are best at everything. So we've got to do the right things".  
(LotF: 52-53)

Jack also wants rules, but, more importantly, he is interested in the aftermath of what happens when one breaks these rules. Jack wishes for someone to make a wrong move so he can reprimand them. Nonetheless, it is Jack who starts breaking the rules first.

#### Example 31

"The rules!" shouted Ralph. "You're breaking the rules!"  
"Who cares?"  
Ralph summoned his wits.  
"Because the rules are the only thing we've got!"  
But Jack was shouting against him.  
"Bollocks to the rules! We're strong – we hunt! If there's a beast, we'll hunt it down! We'll close in and beat and beat and beat –"(LotF: 123)

Once Jack realizes the rules are actually no fun, as he does not get to punish anyone, he no longer wants to follow them. Nonetheless, according to Hobbes (1982: 185-186) there has to be rules for people to live peacefully, otherwise it will result in everyone's war against everyone. Ralph realizes that things cannot be fully solved without rules. Without rules everyone will speak over everyone, people use whatever places as the lavatory, no shelters are built and no signal fire can be upheld if there are no rules. Rules are their link to their old way of living, their link to civilization.

In an assembly where they are discussing the matter of the beast, Piggy, holding the conch, tries to reason that there absolutely cannot be a beast or a ghost. Jack quickly interrupts Piggy, as he does not care what the Fatty has to say. Jack has no respect for the conch even though he was the first one to wish for rules and to punish anyone who would go against them. One rule being that anyone with the conch would get to speak out, uninterrupted. Once one person has ignored the conch others join in as well. There

is no reason for them to be quiet once someone else can talk while not holding the conch. Ralph, as the chief, interrupts them and reminds everyone that there is no way they can hold proper assemblies if they do not stick to the rules. Rules are important and without them there is nothing left.

#### Example 32

“Who thinks there may be ghosts?”

For a long time there was silence and no apparent movement. Then Ralph peered into the gloom and made out the hands. He spoke flatly.

“I see.”

The world, that understandable and lawful world, was slipping away. Once there was this and that; and now- and the ship had gone. (LotF: 122)

The actual ship was their way back home and back to civilization. They are not part of the old world with laws and organized units anymore. They have become people who believe in imaginary things. Piggy starts to question the boys whether they are humans, animals or savages. And what would the adults think of them after they have been acting the way they have. By this Piggy means the fact that most of the boys raised their hands when the subject of believing in ghosts came at hand. Piggy questions whether the boys are truly human anymore. Piggy sees them drifting further away from humanity as the bonds of civilization are breaking up.

#### Example 33

“I got this to say. You’re acting like a crowd of kids.”

The booing rose and died again as Piggy lifted the white, magic shell.

“Which is better – to be a pack of painted Indians like you are, or to be sensible like Ralph is?”

A great clamor rose among the savages. Piggy shouted again.

“Which is better – to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?” (LotF: 252-253)

Just before Piggy is killed he calls out to the hunters that they are acting like children. This gets the savages booing, which does not stop Piggy. He questions whether it is better to be a pack of painted Indians like they are or to be sensible like Ralph. In Piggy’s mind having rules is the same as to agree. For Piggy, hunting means the same as breaking up things, while he thinks rescue can be achieved through law and order. It was because of hunting that the signal fire died down when there was possible rescue on the horizon. If everyone had stick to the rules, they would have been seen by that ship. Order and law are the beginning of a road back to civilization.

Even after a period of time on the island the remnants of civilization has a tight grip over the boys. The boys hold an assembly to discuss the matter of the beast and during this meeting one of the littluns has to introduce himself. He is frightened to be the center of attention and holds on to something he knows to be true. He starts to list his full name and address: "Percival Wemys Madison. The Vicarage, Hartcourt St. Anthony, Hants, telephone, telephone, tele-" (LotF: 116). He is unable to recall his telephone number but all the rest he can remember by heart. There is something soothing in knowing where one comes from and belongs to, but at the same time it just shows how far the boys have come from their old life. This is the feeling Percival gets as he is unable to continue his list and starts crying for the realization of what has been lost. At the end of the novel Percival approaches the naval officer ready to give out his name and address only to find out that he cannot remember them anymore. Little Percival, who was ready to introduce himself with his full name and address, has forgotten this introduction which was so normal to him. The time on the island playing savage has taken its toll. The officer only comments that he would have expected a better show than this from a pack of British boys.

The society has norms and ideas that do not necessarily uphold in solitude. Nonetheless, as I have shown, the willingness to follow society's given norms becomes a dividing factor between the boys. Golding uses obedience to follow given rules as a tool to build the characters and the difference between them. Combined with morality and appearance, Golding has already constructed a very solid version of Otherness. Otherness, in this case, is immoral, inhumane, dirty and disobedient.

#### **6.4 The relationship between Ralph and Jack**

Otherness is something that is built in *Lord of the Flies* all through the novel by different methods. I have already concentrated on three of them, but one more category is yet to be explored and this is the relationship between Jack and Ralph. Girard (1977: 146) states that we tend to link sameness and similarity with harmony. According to him, people are fated to get along if they enjoy the same things, but the bigger question is what is to happen once desires are mutual as well. He sees that this will lead to rivalry. Jack and Ralph could have had a chance of becoming friends but their similar desires turns their relationship to rivalry. I do speak of the relationship of Jack and Ralph but as they are the representatives of their groups this all affects the whole group

of boys. This builds enmity between the two groups, but the main trigger lies in the relationship between Jack and Ralph.

Jack and Ralph are not immediate enemies and there are times when they actually seem to get along. One instance is when they first go and explore the island with Simon.

#### Example 34

A kind of glamour was spread over them and the scene and they were conscious of the glamour and made happy by it. They turned to each other, laughing excitedly, talking, not listening. (LotF: 27)

Jack and Ralph enjoy each other's company because they are nearly the same age and they enjoy being explorers. However, the feelings they share are conflicting. They want to like each other but they simply cannot get along in the long run.

#### Example 35

They looked at each other, baffled, in love and hate. All the warm salt water of the bathing pool and the shouting and splashing and laughing were only just sufficient to bring them together again. (LotF: 71)

The first instance that starts to grow a gap between the two boys is when Ralph is voted chief over Jack. The blow is immediate, but it does not stop them from acting somewhat friendly with one another as Jack is made the leader of the hunters after all.

Nonetheless, the sense of defeat starts to increase slowly and takes a more bitter side as time goes by.

Jack and Ralph are two powerful characters who do not match well together. They both have characteristics the other would like to have, and this jealousy affects the way they act. Spinoza (1981: 131-132) wrote that the wish to acquire something the other wants is correlated with the feeling of not wanting the other to enjoy the thing. In the beginning both Ralph and Jack are candidates for the chief's position but only one of them can acquire the place. Ralph is not that keen on becoming the chief, but, as the novel advances, he becomes more attached to his title and will not give it to Jack. Ralph knows how much joy the position would bring to Jack. Jack, on the other hand, is extremely jealous of Ralph. As much as he wishes to be the chief, he also wishes Ralph was not one.

Ralph has something Jack wants, but Ralph, too, is envious of Jack because he is walking his own path and getting the other boys' respect by doing that. Jack could probably have been able to get the boys to build huts, which Ralph was unsuccessful in doing. Piggy, too, has something Ralph wants. This is the ability to think rationally and objectively. However, Piggy is Ralph's inferior in every other way and Piggy is not a threat. Jack and Ralph are competitors. Each of them lacks some qualities, which they make up in others. There is an ongoing rivalry between them, which does not extend to other characters on the island.

Ojakangas (2006: 75) argues that once people wish to possess an intangible thing they create an Enemy for themselves. He continues that it is impossible to acquire an abstract idea, but by inventing an Enemy who stands in the way impossible suddenly becomes possible. I could argue that both Jack and Ralph are trying to possess something they can never have. Jack and Ralph both wish to be the chief, but the difference lies in how they want to be recognized as the chief. In the first assembly Ralph is voted the chief by the majority. This is what Jack wants or better yet, wanted. Jack wants something that has already happened and can never be retrieved. Even after this assembly Jack wants to be the chief but he can never get back the very first time that the chief was voted, the real vote of confidence on one's leadership skills. Ralph was the one voted chief and in Jack's mind Ralph is always the one who took that opportunity away from him. Ralph, on the other hand, was voted the chief, but he has never been a true leader. Cooley (1964: 334) claims that a person's authority is tested in public speaking: if others find the speaker likeable they are drawn in and trust the words spoken are true and worth listening. The reason why Ralph is voted the chief is because he is holding the conch and took control in calling all the boys together. Furthermore, his appearance is pleasant and he is likeable. Compared to Jack's charisma Ralph only has the conch, and once it shatters to millions of pieces there is no possibility for Ralph to gain his status as the leader of the boys.

### Example 36

“Jack spoke.

“Give me a drink.”

Henry brought him a shell and he drank, watching Piggy and Ralph over the jagged rim.

Power lay in the brown swell of his forearms: authority sat on his shoulder and chattered in his ear like an ape. (LotF: 210)

Jack does not ask, he demands. There is no please or thank you, which one might automatically link with Jack and his upper upbringing. With Ralph present Jack wants to make it clear who the real chief is, and in this same situation questions the boys who wants to join his tribe. He gives them a promise that he will feed them and keep them safe from the beast. He promises the boys things that they desperately want. Ralph tries to reason that he is the rightful chief as he was chosen to do the job. This, however, is no democracy. Ralph tries to reason with the one thing that differs him from Jack, the conch. Jack, however, points out the obvious that Ralph does not have the conch with him, and, even if he did, the conch does not count at Jack's side of the island. Jack is like a child, which he actually is, who decides to make own rules during a play.

Jack is a natural leader compared to Ralph. Jack takes control and his rule is absolute. It does not matter that most of his power lies in that others are afraid of him; he still holds that absolute authority so no one will rise against him. In Cooley's (1964: 331) view a natural leader holds his own beliefs so high that it draws others to believe in them too. He continues that a natural leader will accomplish superiority, even if it means using violent methods. Jack is strong-willed, confident and vicious. He gets the boys to follow him even though he uses brutal methods to mark his position. Ralph is different. He was reluctant to be the chief and is never the one to hold strong authority over others.

Another crucial moment that marks their relationship is when Jack makes his first kill. Jack has evaluated the whole thing thoroughly and takes the fire-watchers with him for the hunt. He has made calculations and if the fire-watchers join the hunt they will be able to capture the pig. His plan is perfect, and the hunters get their first prey. Jack is over the moon. Ralph, on the other hand, is furious because the fire has died down. Jack, as the leader of the hunters, made the right assessment on how to catch a pig and as the plan was successful he sees he is wrongfully accused. In Jack's mind he did nothing wrong, and Ralph is being unreasonable. Cooley (1964: 281) is certain that once somebody approaches his peers with an idea and faces refusal, the first feeling is just plain anger. He continues that after a while the plain anger changes into a more personal and bitter side.

#### Example 37

“That was a dirty trick.”

Jack broke out of his gyration and stood facing Ralph. His words came in a shout.

“All right, all right!”

He looked at Piggy, at the hunters, at Ralph.  
 “I’m sorry. About the fire, I mean. There. I—“  
 He drew himself up.  
 “—I apologize.” (LotF: 95)

The moment Ralph embarrasses Jack in front of his hunters is a breaking point. Jack makes a spectacle of his apology, which is his way of saving face. This makes the hunters admire him and believe Ralph is in the wrong. In spite of this act Jack has lost his face in front of his hunters and he feels he is wrongfully rebuked. After this the gap between the two groups increases and boils down to the point when Jack finally goes off to officially form his own tribe.

There is still one more incident that shapes the relationship of the two boys. This is when Jack steals Piggy’s glasses and Ralph’s group goes over to Castle Rock to retrieve them.

#### Example 38

“You could have had fire whenever you wanted. But you didn’t. You came sneaking up like a thief and stole piggy’s glasses!”  
 “Say that again!”  
 “Thief! Thief!”  
 Piggy screamed.  
 “Ralph! Mind me!”  
 Jack made a rush and stabbed at Ralph’s chest with his spear. Ralph sensed the position of the weapon from the glimpse he caught of Jack’s arm and put the thrust aside with his own butt. Then he brought the end round and caught Jack a stinger across the ear. They were chest to chest, breathing fiercely, pushing and glaring.  
 “Who’s a thief?”  
 “You are!” (LotF: 248)

Ralph accuses Jack of being a thief. Jack, whose pride is on the line, dares Ralph to say that again and Ralph shouts his insults. This angers Jack to the extent that he charges towards Ralph with his spear and the two boys end up in physical battle. Ralph has come to Castle Rock, to Jack’s home, and calls him a thief in front of his tribe. Even though Jack’s tribe is on his side, Ralph’s accusations are made to humiliate Jack, and, thus, dismiss his position as the chief. This is something that cannot be forgiven.

The relationship between Jack and Ralph plays a big part in the growth of Otherness. These three incidents all happen in a group situation, where all the boys are present. Nonetheless, the moments are personal between Jack and Ralph. The words and actions used in these situations are directed at the most vulnerable part of Jack, his pride. Each

incident breeds Jack's antipathy towards Ralph stronger, and as these boys are the front men of their groups, the antipathy they experience is shared with the group.

This chapter has elaborated the ways how Golding constructs Otherness in *Lord of the Flies* through four different categories. These were morality, the boys' appearance, social obedience and the relationship between Ralph and Jack. It has also become apparent that the categories are not distinctly separate from each other and often overlap. The characters change through the course of the novel and their changes are marked by these four categories. This chapter has shown the means how the difference between the boys is maintained as well as amplified.



## 7 Discussion and conclusion

In this study I have discussed the ways in which William Golding represents the construction of Otherness in his novel *Lord of the Flies*. I have approached the question by first studying the beginnings of the novel – an empty island on which the boys are stranded, then by focusing on the birth of the social and political groups between the boys, and finally concentrating solely on the categorical connotations that Golding uses to divide the boys. The approach for this was to combine literary studies with political studies.

I set to study the ways in which Otherness is constructed in *Lord of the Flies*, and moreover, how the boys end up in the barbaric situation as they do. In chapter 5.1 I have argued that the State of Nature in the beginning of the novel is a fragile state of peace. In fact, the State of Nature could be interpreted only as a brief moment where the boys find themselves alone and separated from their learned social norms. However, it does not take long for politics to come into play, and the groups begin to form up.

Golding clearly divides the boys into two groups, one led by Ralph and the other led by Jack. There are differences in Golding's representations of these two boys, but they both act as front men for their groups. Golding also often uses these two figures to represent their fractions. From the beginning Ralph and Jack start to compete, dragging everyone else with them into a dangerous venture. According to Annila (1967) all of the boys represent different human conditions. For example; Jack and the hunters represent evilness, Ralph rationalism, Piggy represents common sense, etc. (Annila 1967). However, I argue that even though Golding might have used allegories as such to criticize the different aspects of society, the focal point of his criticism is in the animalistic tendencies of all men that may cause the world around us to go up in turmoil.

The Other, as Golding also depicts in *Lord of the Flies*, is important to the construction of one's self-identity or rather what one wishes not to be. However, as I have stated in chapter 5.2 it is crucial for the novel's dramaturgy that the Other turns into an Enemy. When the boys become public Enemies they de-humanize each other. In the representation of Jack, for example, this is depicted with strong tendency for violence and inhumanity.

In chapter 6 I discussed the different categorical definitions Golding uses to construct Otherness in *Lord of the Flies*. I talked about the categories of morality, the boys' appearance, and the social obedience that are used to divide the boys. In addition, I have argued that the relationship between Ralph and Jack is important for the growth of Otherness, as these two are the representatives of their groups.

Golding uses the category of morality to divide the boys' actions into good and evil. In some cases even Ralph participates in wrongdoings, but, still, Ralph and Jack are on the opposite sides of the moral scale in Golding's plot. Appearances also play a part in the construction of Otherness. As I have shown, clothing, cleanliness and physical appearance can all be used to create an idea of the Other, and furthermore, the Enemy. Once social obedience is added to this list, Golding already has quite enough means to depict the boys in a manner he wishes, and to represent them as one of the good guys – Us – or as unwanted and frightening – The Enemy.

I started this thesis in search of how Otherness is constructed in *Lord of the Flies* and found out that there are several ways in which it is built and upheld in the novel. The interesting thing is that building Otherness is not limited to the characters of the novel, but it extends to the reader as well. With different methods the reader is lured to include themselves with the 'us' group – Ralph's group. With various means Golding distances Jack and the hunters from the reader while, at the same time, makes Ralph more approachable. Ralph is the only character whose thoughts are ever prevailed and that act alone is a powerful way to get sympathy for the character. Nonetheless, Otherness is built in the novel through the characters, and even if the construction is sometimes presented as one sided, it is not. Ralph's and Jack's group, both, perceive the other group as the Other, and later on as the Enemy.

*Lord of the Flies* has not been previously studied through the concept of Otherness. By combining fictional elements with the study of politics I am able to present a fresh take on the subject. Nonetheless, Peter Fosl wrote a paper in 2007 which also combined fictional story with the study of politics, and as the subject matter resembles this thesis I would suggest reading this interesting piece of work. Fosl's (2007) paper is called *Friends and Enemies in the State of Nature: the Absence of Hobbes and the Presence of*

*Schmitt*. The premises' of *Lost* is quite similar to *Lord of the Flies* as it starts with an airplane crash on an island. The island, however, is not deserted and the ones living there are called the Others. Furthermore, many characters are named after philosophers, who studied the State of Nature; Hume, Locke, Rousseau. The premises of these studies are slightly different as *Lost* already has the opposing Other on the island, whereas, in *Lord of the Flies* the Otherness is born within the group. Moreover, Fosl (2007) does not concentrate on the construction of Otherness.

This thesis, as mentioned, is original in its approach. This is why it finds its place amongst the many studies made from *Lord of the Flies*. Through the use of political studies and the concept of Otherness I bring a new outlook on how political is bread on the island. Furthermore, it gives an ordinary reader a new point of view as they are able notice the stands which Golding makes to illuminate his views on the society.

The field of language studies will benefit from this study as it stretches out from the normal study of linguistics. I concentrated on written language, but looked at the fictional aspect of the novel and its presentations from the political point of view. It was relevant to take notice of Golding's own experiences with war as they have had an impact on how he sees and constructs Otherness. Moreover, with this I was able to show how language is used to produce Otherness.

If I were to continue further with this study there would definitely be a more comprehensive section of the State of Nature. In this thesis it did not get much attention, even though it has an extremely important function in the growth of Otherness. Once the State of Nature could be presented through different philosophers and explained in detail, it would give a more precise answer to where Otherness stems from. The State of Nature is important as it reflects Golding's idea of how he pictures human nature. Furthermore, it underlies the vision of how Golding views the boys in a no-rules-environment and the human condition as a whole.

The merit of this kind of a study is the insight it gives into the mind of a writer. At the same time, they are not just insights of the author, but of his audience's who have welcomed the novel with great enthusiasm. It is not a coincidence that so many have found Golding's novel intriguing. For this, I argue, it is important to understand the

foundations and methods through which Golding has been able to produce such a fascinating story.

## 8 Bibliography

Andrews Henningfeld , D. (1998). An overview of Lord of the Flies. *An essay for exploring novels* [online], n. pag.

<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1420005076&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>. (3 June, 2013).

Annala, M. (1967). *Pahan allegoriset ilmenemismuodot William Goldingin romaanissa Lord of the Flies*. University of Helsinki.

Asad, T. (2000). Muslims and European identity: Europe represent Islam?. In E. Hallam and B. V. Street (eds.), *Cultural encounters: presenting otherness*. London: Routledge, 11-28.

Baker, J.R. (2000). Golding and Huxley: The fables of demonic possession. *Twentieth Century Literature: A scholarly and critical journal* [online] 46 (3), 311-327.  
doi: 10.2307/441940.

Ballantyne, R.M. (1977). *The coral island*. Paulton (Bristol) and London: Purnell and Sons Limited.

Baumeister, R.F. (1997). *Evil: inside human cruelty and violence*. New York: Freeman, cop.

BBC-GCSE Bitesize: Golding and war.

[http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/english\\_literature/proselordflies/0prose\\_lord\\_flies\\_contrev2.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/english_literature/proselordflies/0prose_lord_flies_contrev2.shtml). (23 May, 2013).

Boden, A. (2009). *Savage realities: a contrastive study of the Coral Island (1857) and Lord of the Flies (1954)*. University of Jyväskylä.

Boyd, S.J. (1990). *The novels of William Golding*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cmeci, C-M. and Cmeci, D. (2010). Beyond literary texts: a semiotic approach to a fictional (ritual) game of real (dis)order in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* [online] 182, 115.

Doi: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.1515/semi.2010.054>.

Cooley, C.H. (1964). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Schocken Books, Inc.

Copleston, F. (1959/2003). *British philosophy: Hobbes to Hume*. New York: Continuum.

Crawford, P. (2002). *Politics and history in William Golding: the world turned upside down*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press.

Dalrymple, T. (2005). Desert-island reading. *New Criterion* [online] 23 (6), 21-27. <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=41f3460d-b9b4-4c59-9063-38b320c326d9%40sessionmgr112&vid=2&hid=103>. (30 May, 2013).

Davies, A. and Saunders, P. (1983). Literature, politics and society. In A. Sinfield (ed.), *Society and Literature: 1945 – 1970*. London: Methuen, 13-50.

Dick, B.F. (1987). *William Golding*. Boston, Mass.: Twayne.

Dickson, L.L. (1990). *Modern allegories of William Golding*. Tampa, Fl.: University of South Florida.

Ericson, D. (2011). *The politics of inclusion and exclusion: identity politics in twenty-first century America*. New York: Routledge.

The European Graduate School. <http://www.egs.edu/library/benedict-baruch-spinoza/biography/>. (11 September, 2013).

Fosl, P. (2007). Friends and enemies in the state of nature: the absence of Hobbes and the presence of Schmitt. [online]  
[http://www.academia.edu/882083/Friends\\_and\\_Enemies\\_in\\_the\\_State\\_of\\_Nature\\_The\\_Absence\\_of\\_Hobbes\\_and\\_the\\_Presence\\_of\\_Schmitt](http://www.academia.edu/882083/Friends_and_Enemies_in_the_State_of_Nature_The_Absence_of_Hobbes_and_the_Presence_of_Schmitt). (1 June, 2013).

Friedman, L.S. (1993). *William Golding*. New York: Continuum.

Gasser, S.A. (n.d). Aquinas and Locke on politics. [online]  
[http://rebirthofreason.com/Articles/gasser/Aquinas\\_and\\_Locke\\_on\\_Politics.shtml](http://rebirthofreason.com/Articles/gasser/Aquinas_and_Locke_on_Politics.shtml). (11 June, 2013).

George, U. (2008). *William Golding: a critical study*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors Ltd.

Girard, R. (1977). *Violence and the sacred*. Baltimore (Md.): Johns Hopkins University Press.

Golding's life and works.

<http://faculty.txwes.edu/ebattles/LordoftheFlies/1GoldingBiography.htm>. (23 May, 2013).

Golding, W. (1954/2006). *Lord of the flies*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Gulbin, S. (1966). Parallels and contrasts in Lord of the Flies and Animal Farm. *English Journal* [online] 55, 86-88, 92. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/stable/811152>. (30 May, 2013).

Harle, V. (2000). *The enemy with a thousand faces – the tradition of the other in Western political thought and history*. Westport (Conn.): Praeger.

Hasan Al-Saidi, A.A. (2012). Savagery and the heart of darkness in William Golding's Lord of the Flies. *Studies in Literature and Language* [online] 4.1, 129  
 doi: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320120401.2009>.

Hobbes, T. (1982). *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Hume, D. (2007). *A treatise on human nature, vol. 2*. Maryland: Wildside Press.

Johnston, A. (1980). *Of earth and darkness: the novels of William Golding*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press.

Kavka, G.S. (1986). *Hobbesian moral and political theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kuhalampi, A. (1994). Muiden kapina – toiseus Christer Kihlmanin tuotannossa. In M. Kylmänen (ed.), *Me ja muut*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 57–67.

Locke, J. (1958). *Essays on the law of nature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Locke, J. (1960). *Two treatises of government*. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press.

Martin, J. (1969). Symbol hunting Golding's Lord of the Flies. *English Journal* [online] 58.3, 408-413.

<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1420055383&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>. (30 May, 2013).

McHoul, A. and Rapley, M. (2001). *How to analyze talk in institutional settings: a casebook of methods*. London & New York: Continuum.

Ojakangas, M. (2006). *Ystävistä ja vihollisesta*. Helsinki: Kirjapaja Oy.

Oldsey, B. (1983). William Golding. In B. Oldsey (ed.), *British dictionary of literary biography: British novelists, 1930-59 v. 15*. Detroit: Gale Research [online]

<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1200002891&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>. (30 May, 2013).

Oldsey, B. and Weintraub, S. (1963). Lord of the Flies: Beelzebub revisited. *College English* [online] 25(2), 90-99. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/stable/373397>. (30 May, 2013).



- Parker, I. (1997). *Psychoanalytic culture: psychoanalytic discourse in Western society*. London: SAGE.
- Rantonen, E. (1994). Länsimaisen estetiikan rasismi. In M. Kylmänen (ed.), *Me ja muut*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 131-154.
- Reilly, P. (1988). *The literature of guilt: from 'Gulliver' to Golding*. Iowa: University of Iowa Press.
- Richards, G. (2005). *Lovers and beloveds: sexual otherness in Southern fiction, 1936-1961*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Riggins, S.H. (1997). *The language and politics of exclusion: others in discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rosenfield, C. (1961). 'Men of a smaller growth': A psychological analysis of William Golding's 'Lord of the Flies'. *Literature and Psychology* [online], 11.4, 93-101.  
<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1420009370&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>. (30 May, 2013).
- Rousseau, J-J. (1998). *The social contract*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Roy, P.A. (2003). Boys' club – no girls allowed: absence as presence in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. In J.Fisher and E.S.Silber (eds.), *Women in literature: reading through the lens of gender*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 175-177.
- Said, E. (1994). *Culture and imperialism*. London: Vintage.
- Said, E. (1995). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the Orient*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Schmitt, C. (1976). *Concept of the political*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Singh, M. (1997). The government of boys: Golding's *Lord of the Flies* and Ballantyne's *Coral Island*. *Children's literature: annual of the modern language association division on children's literature and the children's literature association* [online] 25, 205-13.

[http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.jyu.fi/journals/childrens\\_literature/v025/25.singh.html](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.jyu.fi/journals/childrens_literature/v025/25.singh.html). (30 May, 2013).

Spinoza, B. (1981). *The ethics*. Malibu, California: Joseph Simon Publisher.

Spitz, D. (1970). Power and authority: an interpretation of Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. *The Antioch Review* [online] 30.1, 21-33.

<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1100001303&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>. (30 May, 2013).

SS relics website. <http://ssrelics.net/ss-uniforms.htm>. (5 May, 2013).

Swenson, J. (2000). *On Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thornton, H. (2005). *State of nature or Eden?: Thomas Hobbes and his contemporaries on the natural condition of human beings*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

William Golding- Banquet Speech.

[http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/1983/golding-speech.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1983/golding-speech.html). (12 September, 2013).

William Golding – Biographical.

[http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/1983/golding-bio.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1983/golding-bio.html). (12 September, 2013).

William Golding: the official website of the author of *Lord of the Flies*.

<http://www.william-golding.co.uk/life.aspx>. (5 June, 2013).

William Golding Limited. (2002). [online]

[http://www.william-golding.co.uk/media/22919/p\\_biog.pdf](http://www.william-golding.co.uk/media/22919/p_biog.pdf). (12 September, 2013).

Wood, J. (1991). Religious insights of a man apart. *Manchester Guardian Weekly* [online] sept. 29, 25.

<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1100001306&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>. (30 May, 2013).