

The Ethical Void or the Parody of Western Modernity in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*

Maurice GNING

Department of English,
Gaston BERGER University of Saint-Louis (Senegal)
maurice.gning@ugb.edu.sn

Abstract

This paper examines the issue of ethics in *Lord of the Flies* by the English Postmodern writer, Sir William Gerard Golding. The study is grounded on some ethical principles drawn from the moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). It concludes that ethics is absent in the environment where Golding's characters evolve. This absence of ethical references mainly results from Western modernity that called into question all former references that provided moral ideals. As such, *Lord of the Flies* enacts, with much irony, the ethical void in which western modernity tragically introduced humanity.

Key words: Modernity, Ethics, Morality, Irony, West

Résumé

Cet article examine la question de l'éthique dans *Lord of the Flies* de l'écrivain anglais postmoderne, Sir William Gerard Golding. Quelques principes éthiques tirés de la philosophie morale d'Emmanuel Kant (1724-1804) constituent le fondement théorique de cette étude. Celle-ci conclut que l'environnement où évoluent les personnages de Golding est dépourvu d'éthique. Cette absence de repères éthiques est la conséquence de la modernité occidentale qui a balayé le socle moral des valeurs anciennes. *Lord of the Flies* exprime ainsi, avec une pointe d'ironie, le vide éthique dans lequel la modernité occidentale a tragiquement introduit l'humanité.

Mots-clés: Modernité, Ethique, Morale, Ironie, Occident

Introduction

Also called moral philosophy, ethics is a branch of philosophy that is concerned with the question of right and wrong. Its ultimate aim is to guide human behaviour. Besides, *Cambridge International Dictionary of English* defines it as “a system of accepted beliefs which control behaviour”. The idea of good or bad conduct is understood differently depending on contexts, societies and philosophers. In consequence, there are various types of ethics with a multitude of approaches that are sometimes contradictory.¹ The Kantian ethics constitutes the theoretical foundation of this work.

The German idealist philosopher, Immanuel Kant, is one of the most outstanding intellectual figures of the 18th century. He is also remembered for his influential moral philosophy that he expounds in three different works: *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788), and *Metaphysics of Morals* (1797). On the whole, Kant conceives ethics from an exclusively rational point of view. He founds his ethical principals on the basic conviction that man is a rational and autonomous being. As such, the rules of morality must be based on reason, and not on any subjective considerations such as emotions, desires or personal interests. This code of conduct must not either be imposed on man by any form of authority. This rational and moral duty is, for Kant, the fundamental principal of morality that he refers to as the “imperative categorical”. Actions that fall within the imperative categorical are morally good. They are motivated by what Kant calls “good will” (good intention). Actions that violate this supreme moral principle are immoral and irrational.

Kant schematizes this categorical imperative, which constitutes the crux of his moral philosophy, through three famous formulations. “Act only according to that maxim where you can, at the same time, will that it should become a universal law” (E. Kant, 1993, p. 30). This first formulation means that any man’s action must be a “moral law” insofar as it is rational, objective and motivated by “good will”. This moral law must also be a universal law since it is valid for everybody and at any time. In the second formulation Kant specifies that man, as a rational being is worthy of respect and must be treated with dignity. Human beings “must be treated never as a mere means but as the supreme limiting condition in the use of all means, i.e., as an end at the same time” (E. Kant, 1969, p. 437-438). The third and last formulation is the combination of the first two. It states “that all maxims which stem from autonomous

¹ For example, the Aristotelian ethics, which is focused on the end(s) to reach (teleology), is different from the Kantian ethics concerned about the moral duty (deontology). Besides, there are three commonly mentioned categories of ethics, the normative ethics, the descriptive ethics, and the meta-ethics, and various ethical theories including deontology, utilitarianism, the theory of justice, the ethics of right, the ethics of cares, the ethics of virtues, etc. Ethics can also be considered from a historical viewpoint. In this regard, we can distinguish classical ethics, medieval ethics, modern ethics and postmodern ethics.

legislation ought to harmonize with a possible realm of ends with a realm of nature” (E. Kant, 1969, p. 436).

Despite its paramount importance, Kant’s moral philosophy did not stand the test of time and reality. Its validity was denied, among other things, by the extreme acts of violence² committed in the 20th century by man, that rational being of which Kant spoke highly. Beyond Kant’s ethical thought, the 20th century witnessed the dissolution of almost all certainties established by western modernity. This ushered in a new era commonly known as the postmodern age. Writers and thinkers reacted differently to the general disillusion and deep cultural crisis. But most of them, particularly those who are dubbed “postmodern”, cast an ironic look at the pretensions of modernity.

Lord of the Flies (1954) by William Golding (1911-1993), an English postmodern novelist, playwright, essayist, and poet, is one these numerous literary works that ironically portray the too ambitious project of modernity. Written in the aftermath of World War II in which Golding took part as an officer in the British Royal Navy, the novel raises a variety of upsetting issues. One of them, and probably the most important, is human nature. Actually, the “awful things that happened” in the war led Golding to have a keen awareness of the extremely inhumane nature of man. This is what he particularly exemplifies in this novel under a caricature form.

Through the lens of ethical tenets drawn from Kant’s moral philosophy, this study probes into the barbaric attitude of the children in *Lord of the Flies*. It examines how this violence is bred by the absence of true ethical references. The survey also makes the point that this ethical void is intrinsically connected to the western ideology of modernity. Behind the dark atmosphere of the novel, it is the absurd and unethical ambitions of modernity that are brought to the surface. Finally, the work strives to demonstrate how *Lord of the Flies* is both an expression of the ethical void of our time and a caricature of western modernity.

1. A crash into the ethical void and the reasons for an impossible rescue

Lord of the Flies is about English schoolboys between the ages of 6 and 12 evacuated by plane in a context of a nuclear war. The aircraft, probably attacked, crashes on an uninhabited island. Without any adult supervision, the surviving boys attempt to organize themselves in their new environment, while waiting for the arrival of possible rescuers. They organize their society around the elected leader Ralph and his closest supporters Piggy and Simon. However, it gradually crumbles and descends into savagery, as the boys grow extremely violent under the influence

² World war I & II, the Nazi holocaust, the expansion of totalitarian and violent regimes that caused millions of deaths in the world, the development of mass destructive weapons, the threat of a nuclear war, etc.

of Jack Merridew, a cynical and bloodthirsty boy who has never accepted Ralph's leadership.

The direct cause of the marooned children society is paradoxically a plane crash. This tragic event occurs in a larger and much more tragic context, that is the nuclear war in England. In addition to reminding us of the violent backdrop against which the novel is written, this painful reality (the war and the crash) announces the dark atmosphere that will prevail throughout the narration. More importantly, it is indicative of the disillusionment resulting from the failure of western modernity to keep its promises of a better world. The tragedies of the twentieth-century, specifically the two world wars, the Nazi holocaust, the widespread tyrannical regimes with their massive killings, displayed a horrible face of man and revealed mankind's inability to safeguard the basic human values. They also invalidated the discourse of modernity. The major tenets such as rationality, perfectibility, progress, among others, make no more sense. In this regard, the plane crash in *Lord of the Flies* can be read as the crash of modernity and all the values it conveyed.

The idea of God, which used to be the ethical foundation of Western society in the Middle Ages, is discarded by the rationalist discourse of modernity. The latter that provides the new base of ethics has proved unreliable and unveiled all its limits. Mankind has then entered a period of ethical and moral deadlock that Han Jonas (1990) expresses as follows: "The new land of collective practice we have got into with the latest technology is still a virgin land in terms of ethical theory" (p. 13) (author's translation)³. The deserted setting of Golding's novel is symptomatic of this new world devoid of ethics and morality. This is why we find on the island no institutions and no adults.

In a context where "no traditional ethics [...] teaches us the norms of good and evil" (H. Jonas, 1990, p. 13), how can man organize their society? How can they establish codes of conduct in order to regulate social relations? This is the puzzle that Golding's kids are confronted to. Yet, as the oldest boys all assume, they are obliged to "create rules" in order to survive. It is paradoxically in their very attempt at laying down rules that the ethical void that they want to compensate for is much apparent, as will be demonstrated later.

Faced with the ethical void, the only points of reference in the light of which the boys intend to set codes of conduct and preserve their society are the boys themselves. This is implied by Jack's reaction after he learns that there is no adult on the island: "Then we'll have to look after ourselves" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 22). "To look after themselves", means to take charge of their own destiny, to define their own moral rules without resorting to any modal that pre-exist it or to any external force. Kant insists on the autonomy of the rational agent to determine freely its own

³ La terre nouvelle de la pratique collective, dans laquelle nous sommes entrés avec la technologie de pointe, est encore une terre vierge de la théorie éthique.

guiding principles irrespective of any external authority. Golding's boys are rightly in this situation where they must decide by themselves. They are their own moral legislators.

However, in a context where all certainties have collapsed, and everything relative, such a freedom proves to be both meaningless and perilous. Actions can no longer be judged morally because values are emptied of all universality, objectivity, and rationality. Something is true or good according to the individual who freely appreciates it, for "man is the measure of everything"⁴.

Since the boys do not share the same values or concerns, and interpret things differently, it becomes clear that they cannot socially be brought together. No rule can either bound or bind them; hence the impossibility of any salvation. The moral order they endeavour to set is likely to be prematurely disrupted. This is besides what accounts for Piggy's growing fear: "we ought to be more careful", he confesses, "I'm scared" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 49). Piggy is, alongside Ralph, much concerned about rules, order and civilization. Like Simon, a naturally good and intelligent boy who suffers from a kind of hallucination that sets him apart from the rest of the group, Piggy also shows a protective attitude towards the younger boys of the group called the "littluns". Perhaps more than any other one, Piggy embodies ethics and morality. Though Ralph and Simon are both dedicated to the building of an ethically sound society, Piggy shows more determination in this perspective. He makes relevant proposals and keeps expressing actual worries concerning the possible violation of the established rules.

Piggy's worries are grounded on the fact that without any clear ethical references, man is unable to set up a lasting society. Like Hobbes in *The Leviathan*, he does not believe in the natural goodness of man, in their ability to choose the right path without being forced to. Piggy, in this regard, holds an anti-Kantian view of ethics. This is also the conviction of Golding who states: "without a system of values, without an adherence to some, one might almost call it, codified morality, right and wrong, you are like a creature in space, tumbling, eternally tumbling, no up, no now..." (W. Golding & T. Baker, 1982, p. 133)

We can only give credit to Piggy's concerns since the schoolboys have not completed their socialization process in England that might have allowed them to 'adhere to a codified morality', to distinguish right from wrong and to possibly build an ethically strong society. Except Piggy and Ralph, and to a certain extent Simon whose kindness seems more innate than cultural, the boys are free from any social grip. The social umbilical cord that links them to England is unexpectedly severed as the result of the air crash. This explains their failure to instinctively copy the social pattern of their mother country.

⁴ This is the famous maxim of the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, Protagoras. The relativist dimension of this assertion was theorized by Empiricus.

On the other hand, the impossibility for the boys to build a proper civilization cannot only be attributed to the abrupt interruption of their socialization process in England. Being the seeds of the larger society that has begot them, the boys unsurprisingly develop the same reflex that has led to the breakdown of the mother country. They perpetuate the world vision of the adult world that has no ethics at its basis. Consequently, the evil in the boys is more social than natural; it is begotten by society. This is the final conclusion of Levitt, L. (1969) about *Lord of the Flies*. He declares:

Frequent rereading of the book and some adjunct knowledge and logic impel me to think otherwise. The fact is that *Lord of the Flies*, fascinating though it is, admirably programmed though it may be, make so such case, on the contrary, clearly confirms the premise that it is Western society, Western culture, Western values, Western traditions wherein the evil lurks, not primordially in the hearts of men [...]. We all know the book; we all know, therefore, that the boys come to the island *already acculturated*. And what do they bring? They bring a tradition of carnivorous, blood-lust human violence, tribalism, ingenuity in warfare (it is a truism that the technological progress of the Western world has consistently been the direct consequence of a struggle for supremacy in weaponry), anti-intellectualism, and the vivid memory they were trying to escape [...]. Without civilization temptation, they would have survived in such a paradise – at last, to invoke Darwin, the fittest would have survived disease and the elements with a little luck...Free of traditions, uniforms, memories, language, perhaps never to develop a language beyond the most rudimentary, would have those children and nature have manifested Golding's beast." [...]. "They (children) have just acted out, unencumbered by English etiquette, episodes they will relive a decade or so hence in the sophistication of modern warfare. But it is not their "nature" they have failed to escape; on the contrary, innocence of their nature never had a chance – it was not even in the chase (pp. 522-523).

For Levitt then, the origin of the evil that is given full expression through the boys in *Lord of the Flies* is to be found in no human nature, but in western civilization itself. It is that deeply corrupt civilization that has rubbed off on the behavior of the adventurous kids. This unethical western culture is nevertheless underpinned by a world vision known as modernity, the root cause of the social and metaphysical unease that pervades Golding's novel.

2. The modernist project: the road to the crash

The Rousseauist idea according to which man is naturally good and that it is society that corrupts them is illustrated in *Lord of the Flies* by a certain number of facts. One of them is the often-mentioned natural goodness of Simon. He is instinctively protective towards both the smaller boys and the environment. Another

example is offered by Jack. He is first presented as a rather innocent boy, unable to bear the sight of blood (W. Golding, 1954, p. 34), before “getting transformed into a killer who doesn’t hesitate to kill other children” (P. Chavan, 2013, p. 1521). Jack’s extreme violence results from a combination of present factors, but is essentially a legacy of the violent society he originates from. His violence is learned from a society that makes of the quest of power its chief ideal; an ideal incarnated by the ideology of modernity.

By reducing life to the pursuit of the ideal of development and by making of rationality the only legitimating discourse, modernity has discredited and then destroyed the values derived from Christianity, the dominating ideology of the Middle Ages that it succeeded. Moreover, it has put an end to the Christian moral foundation, while paradoxically it has not proposed any viable alternative, apart from certain philosophical precepts, the most famous of which are probably those derived from Kant’s moral philosophy.

The absence of a genuine ethical base in the modern project inevitably led to the catastrophic ideologies and wars that engendered chaos. *Lord of the Flies* strives to picture this general disintegration by tracing it back to its other origin. It is “a sharp criticism on celebrated enlightenment rationality” (S. Sathyaseelan, 2016, p. 99). Because it does not consider much traditional ethical values, modernity or the rationalist discourse proves to be “useless to achieve lasting happiness or even to secure one’s health and survival” (J. Carballido, 2015, p. 27). The neglect or lack of ethics, which is behind the degeneration of the world of the adults, is quite observable in the boys’ attempt to form a micro society. It is as if Golding makes them perform the history of the corruption of civilization (by the modernist ideology) and makes his reader see why things went wrong in the true world.

After their meeting and the election of the chief, the boys’ first major decision is, “to go on an expedition and find out” (Golding, W., 1954, p. 25) the reality of the island. Ralph, the leader, decides that this thrilling mission is to be carried out by him and Jack, his direct challenger. He hesitantly and symbolically adds the naturally good Simon to the group before rejoicing in these terms: “we’re explorers” (Golding, W., 1954, p. 27). The pride and joy of the boys, particularly of Ralph and Jack, indicate that the decision of the boys is not motivated by the Kantian good will. The boys are concerned about fulfilling a personal aim, which is unethical in a Kantian point of view. The consciousness of their possibility to freely take their own decisions, to be the ‘masters’ of their destiny is much relieving. This can be read as an ironic allusion to the modernist project that basically consisted in making of man “master and owner” of themselves and of the world. Such a project implies the rejection of all institutions, all structures that curbed man’s freedom of thought and action.

The absurd nature of this ambition is satirically brought to the surface through the image of Golding's innocent and weak boys. In fact, though conscious that their presence on the island results from an accident, they do as if they were involved "in real exploring" of a world "nobody's been [...] before" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 29). They are very excited to know more about their surrounding and assert their power.

It is significant that Piggy, who embodies wisdom, intelligence, ethics and morality, is systematically refused the right to be part of the group of "explorers". "You're no good on a job like this" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 26), says Ralph to him, as the latter expresses the wish to go with them. Jack reinforces this viewpoint by sharply adding: "we don't want you" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 26). Piggy is excluded from the boys' project because he still sticks to old social values. He is a sort of conservative. He prefers the preservation of communal life to any other initiative which he considers a risky adventure. As such, he constitutes a major hindrance to the carrying out of the boys' mission.

Piggy stands for traditional ethics reduced to nothing by the emancipating discourse of modernity. This ideology favoured new ethical values like earthly happiness, progress that constituted both its driving force and the praxis of individualism. Indeed, the total liberty of the individual is the necessary condition for the fulfillment of the ideals of modernity. Piggy has the intuition of the anarchy to which such freedom, synonym of individualism and ethical void, can lead their fragile society. The boys need no moralist, no authority, nothing or nobody to hinder their freedom to daringly create their own history. They are determined to follow, not their reason as modernity and Kantian ethics advocate, but, most ironically, their instincts by trying to own the island at any cost.

The so praised rational nature of man in the modernity discourse is here called into question. In a Freudian perspective, man is less a rational being than a being of irrational desires. The island is a form of literary laboratory where this idea about human being is tested and established. Piggy, "the embodiment of intellect and rationalism" (X. Ly & W. Wu, 2009, p. 120), is therefore unfit for this world. The narration makes it clear: "Piggy was an outsider, not only by accent, which did not matter, but by fat, and ass-mar, and specs, and a certain disinclination of manual labour" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 70). It is no accident that he finds it difficult to physically and morally adapt himself to the new society. He is described as a fat boy suffering from asthma and shortsightedness and who, unlike the majority of the kids, is much concerned about issues of social justice. He is the laughing stock of this micro society, of his fellows who constantly humiliate him.

Piggy's disgrace is all the more difficult to accept, for him and for the reader, as he is, with Ralph, the major craftsman of the young society. He plaintively reminds the group of this reality: "I was with him (Ralph) when he found the conch. I was with him before anyone else" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 26). Piggy is reminiscent of

all past values that man made use of to create their society before modernity discarded them for their supposed ineffectiveness. He also recalls Greek Classical philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Epicurus and the Stoic thinkers that laid the foundation of an ethical thought in a time marked by wars, disorder and anxiety so as to guide people's conduct and help them live in peace with themselves and their environment. It is in a similar context of chaos that Piggy struggles to define lines of conduct to save his society. In keeping ethics, morality and even common sense, embodied mostly by Piggy, away from their plans, Ralph and Jack inexorably lead the young society to disorder, just as western modernity introduced the world into chaos after calling into questions all its founding structures.

After multiple efforts, the three teenagers seem to overcome the hostility of nature. They reach the top of the mountain. From this summit, they have a panoramic view of the island and know more about it now. Consequently, they can take possession of it and assert their power. Ralph, the chief, can then triumphantly declare: "this is our island" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 38). Here is the modern man who, having reached the height of scientific knowledge thanks to their common sense and courage, claims to be master and possessor of nature. This privileged position gives man a feeling of pride that the "valiant" explorers in Golding's novel experience: "eyes shining, mouths open, triumphant, they savoured the right domination". They were lifted up (W. Golding, 1954, p. 32).

After the euphoria, they note, still through the chief's voice, that the place is uninhabited: "There's no village smoke, and no boats" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 32). Like the first European explorers and missionaries in Africa, Ralph gives a report on their exploratory mission for the rest of the group: "we're on an island. We've been on the mountain-top and seen water all around. We saw no houses, no smoke, no footprints, no boats, no people. We're on an unusual island with no other people on it" (W. Golding, 1954, p. 35). Beyond the ethical vacuum, these words echo the nihilist discourse of the modernist European explorer on the Africa continent with the famous theory of *tabula rasa* according to which Africa would be a total void, a place without civilization, culture or history. This racist idea of western rationality is an obvious violation of the Kantian ethical principal according to which man, as a rational being, must be treated with dignity. They must be treated as an end and not as a means. This held opinion was a means to better achieve the Europeans' selfish goal of domination. The colonization of Africa by modern and rationalist Europe was then quite unethical, and irrational if seen from the Kantian ethics.

Modern Europe's false speech about Africa resulted, among other reasons, from its ignorance of this continent. Besides, modern westerners often mistakenly think that Africa is a country and not a continent, and that one finds there the ugliest and most dangerous things of the world. Ralph's following words are symptomatic of this mistake and prejudice about Africa: "You couldn't have a beastie, a snake-

thing, on an island this size, you only get them in big countries, like Africa, or India” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 39). The same idea is repeated later by Jack: “You don’t get animals on small islands. Only pigs. You only get lions and tigers in big countries like Africa and India” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 90). Ralph’s and Jack’s words are uttered in order to dispel the fear of the smaller of the group who believe that a terrifying beast in the form of a snake would prowl about on the island.

The reference to Africa and India has another significance. Africa experienced colonial rule as did India, the largest colony of the powerful British Empire from 1858 till its independence in 1947. The boys intend to subject the virgin island to the same fate as Africa and the Indian subcontinent whose economic resources were systematically plundered by the European settler. This imperialist economic project is betrayed by Jack’s cry of joy after the success of their exploration: “we’ll have food” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 32). Jack does not think about preserving the beautiful island, and even less about the means to return to the motherland. On the contrary, it is a question for him, as did westerners in Africa and in Asia during colonial time, to take unfair advantage of the natural riches of the ‘discovered’ island that Ralph proudly calls “the “Treasure Island”, the “Swallows and Amazons, the “Coral Island” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 38). Thus, the little ones in the group stuff themselves with the island’s fruits to the point of having diarrhea, while Jack and his gang supply the society with meat by hunting wild pigs. This hunt is particularly violent and devastating. It is an opportunity for Jack and his companions to express, unhindered, their natural violence which ends up creating chaos on the gorgeous island.

Jack relentlessly pursues his interests without scruples. All means are good, including humiliating, stealing, torturing and killing to achieve his goal. Unlike him, Ralph is an idealist. He naively believes in their ability to perpetuate the principles of English civilization and in the idea that they will be saved. Ralph symbolizes in this regard the humanist side of the discourse of modernity, namely the great ideals of progress, human perfectibility, freedom, justice and happiness; while Jack represents its cruel face. He is symbol of the capitalist spirit which is the very essence of the discourse of western modernity, meaning the domination of man by man, the selfish power that engenders anarchy and chaos. It is this capitalist spirit which, according to Marxists in particular those of the Frankfurt School like Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer, is the cause of the extreme ideologies and deadly wars across the world, beyond the horrors of colonization. Jack embodies European worst dictators like Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Pétain, to name but a few, in a time when Europe, with its rationalist ideology, prided itself on being the civilized continent. The extreme violence of these dictators, the traumatic wars of the 20th century and the horrors of Auschwitz swept away all the beautiful ideals of modernity before turning the world upside down. So we understand why Jack succeeds in dethroning Ralph by having

almost all the boys rally to his support, imposing then his anarchist law on the whole island. Jack is therefore, as the narrator specifies, “the most obvious leader” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 24), namely the one who embodies the soul of capitalism better than anyone, while Ralph is the façade of this discourse, in other words the beautiful speech that hides the malevolent purpose.

Like the all-powerful West that dictates the march of history through the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund created in a post-war context, the boys decide to establish the regulatory principles of life. This is made possible thanks to their “successful” exploration that elevates them to the rank of “masters” of their space. They believe to be the “elected people”, the “best at everything”, as Jack confesses: “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 the best at everything” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 47). This can also be an ironic allusion to old ideas held by English people at a time when English economic and political supremacy was accepted on a worldwide scale, specifically in the Victorian period.

The disciplinary measures of Ralph and his group reflect the principles dictated by the international decision-making bodies cited above and which apply to all peoples of the world. Their limits in terms of fairness are well known. They are unfair and unethical because they serve to maintain the domination of the “elected people”⁵, the West, over the others who are silenced. Jack’s following words addressed to Piggy tell us much about this rampant dictatorship and injustice: “it’s time some people knew they’ve got to keep quiet and leave deciding things to the rest of us” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 111). Jack only repeats here the well-known thesis of the modern West making of Europe the civilized centre and of the other societies, especially in Asia and Africa, the savage periphery that needs to be taught the basic principles of civilization. That such a remark be put in the mouth of a savage and bloodthirsty boy, who abhors any form of social order, highlights all the fallacy and absurdity of this Eurocentric view. Jonathan Swift, before Golding, underlined this fact with a much more biting irony in his novel *Gulliver’s Travels*. It is much disturbing and ironic that the anarchist Jack is at the heart of the establishment of the rules on which the survival of the society depends. This does not bode well, as Piggy senses it. The rules are like those who define them. They have no ethical basis.

The ethic free rules of the boys’ community are fully expressed by the entity on which these very rules are based. Indeed, the children’s society is entirely regulated by a conch shell. Their first meeting is made possible thanks to the conch. Ralph is elected leader of the group partly because he holds it at the moment of the voting. All the boys agree that whoever holds the conch has the right to speak and

⁵ For more detail about this point, read my online article: Gning, M. (2018). «Modernité, Postmodernité et Impérialisme Occidental». *European Scientific Journal*, 14(5), 386-409. <https://www.researchgate.net/deref/http%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.19044%2Fesj.2018.v14n5p386>

nobody is allowed to interrupt them. One has just to raise their hand to be given it. Anytime Ralph the leader thinks it is necessary to summon the boys, he simply blows into the “precious” thing.

The conch shell is symbol of freedom of speech, democracy, order and of civilization. What is striking, however, is its great power that contrasts with its insignificant nature. Indeed, the shell is a fragile object. It is an empty thing that can no longer fulfill its original role. It is separated from the body of the animal it protected. As such, it is totally useless and can be easily broken both in the literal and in the symbolic sense.

The contrast between the important normative role of the conch and its trivial nature is pregnant with significance. Among other things, it expresses the pressing need for the boys to found an ethical horizon in a universe that offers nothing in this perspective. Through the conch, the boys helplessly attempt to give a social meaning to their accidental presence in a world where there is nothing to lean on to sustain one’s humanity. The emptiness of the shell mirrors the ethical void the boys are helplessly caught in. its fragility heralds the moral chaos they are inevitably heading for.

The rules established thanks to the conch rather reveal a desire for domination. The smaller boys are often denied the right to speak, like the so-called underdeveloped countries which are almost not entitled to the chapter concerning decisions taken in the framework of international bodies: “the small boy held out his hands for the conch and the assembly shouted with laughter; at once he snatched back his hands and started to cry” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 39). In addition, Piggy is sometimes refused the floor, even though he has the shell. “The conch doesn’t count on top of the mountain [...] so you shut up” (W. Golding, 1954, p. 46), violently retorts Jack when Piggy insists that he should be let to speak since he holds the conch. These examples sufficiently demonstrate that the rules are only a semblance of democracy. In fact, they are empty shells.

Like the rules, the most important decisions that Ralph takes, generally under Jack's dictation, have no ethical basis and prove to be somehow dangerous for the survival of the group. This is particularly the case of the choice of Jack to lead the group of hunters. The motivation behind such a decision has nothing rational and objective. It is conditioned by Ralph’s desire to please Jack (who has just lost the election) with the hope of keeping him at his side. The result of this decision is morally drastic. Jack uses the hunters to rebel against Ralph and introduces chaos on the island. Because of him, Simon is accidentally killed, Piggy assassinated, the conch smashed, Ralph deposed and chased like a pig, all other kids transformed into savages, the biodiversity and the beauty of the island definitively disrupted.

Nevertheless, some of the boys' decisions seem to be founded on good will, but they finally go wrong and disrupt the set order, as if to prove the paradox⁶ of the Kantian "good will". One example is the idea of lighting a fire to attract a probable rescuer passing ship. This well motivated and seemingly rational idea proves to be catastrophic. The fire gets out of control and almost destroys the island. If given complete freedom, people can become irresponsible and irrational. The final images of *Lord of the Flies* illustrate this point that contrasts Kant's ethical view. Irrationality and savagery have engulfed the kids' society. This is the disturbing result of conquering western modernity that fostered the total freedom of the individual and made of the quest of power its ultimate purpose.

Conclusion

With very few exceptions, the characters depicted in *Lord of the Flies* are evil-producers. In choosing innocent kids as perpetrators of such horrible actions in such a naturally beautiful and deserted place that they have literally devastated, Golding implies that the evil in man is natural rather than learned. The traumatic events of the past century that he truly experienced certainly account for Golding's impression.

In the light of Kant's moral philosophy, the actions of Golding's boys are generally immoral and irrational. They violate all Kantian ethical principles. However, the boys cannot be held responsible for their unethical attitudes. They are trapped in an environment that drastically lacks ethical references. What at first sight looks like a natural propensity is in fact a social product. Actually, the children in *Lord of the Flies* instinctively perpetuate the values system of the adult world, England, where they come from. Freedom, individualism, competition, thirst for power, leisure, and injustice are in short the various ingredients with which they attempt to form a new society. These unethical principles, that have led to the destruction of the boys' society, constitute the core of a world vision inherited from the adults' world and known as modernity which the boys seem to be literally performing. The ethical void highlighted in the fictitious world of the children is the literary portrayal of the ethical void prevailing in the true western world that is corrupted by the modernist ideology. The latter erased all traditional ethics. It rejected religion as the guarantee of moral conduct, refused all form of authority in the name of the sacred principle that 'man is a rational and autonomous being', capable of deciding the right thing to do by themselves.

⁶ Kant was more concerned with the motivation of an action than with its consequence(s). He admitted that an action based on good will could produce a bad result. The paradox here is that the well motivated action is about to put an end to the life of the children. Its consequences terribly affect the course of things and give the action an irrational (not well thought) dimension.

A close examination of this modernity, through both the English boys' acts and the ethical thought of Kant, allows to realize, ironically, that there was no true ethics at its basis. It was fundamentally motivated by selfish considerations, the quest for power. Evil can only produce evil. The symbolic way in which Golding mockingly reveals this truth in *Lord of the Flies* is one of the reasons that explain the major success of his novel.

References

AL-SAIDI Afaf Ahmed, 2012, "Savagery and the Heart of Darkness in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*". *Studies in Literature and Language*, 4 (1), p. 129-134.

AL-ZAMILI Adnan Al, 2015, "Instinct or Society? A Rousseauist Analysis of Corruption in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*". *International Letters of Social & Humanistic Sciences*, 58 (1), p. 155-158.

ANOOSHEH Sayed Mohamed & OROSKHAN Muhammad Hussein, 2018, "William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*: A Satirical Analysis of Fantasized Dystopia", *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 6 (2), p. 163-171.

BERNSTEIN Richard, 2002, *Radical Evil : A Philosophical Interrogation*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

BOYD Stephen, 1988, *The Novels of William Gold*, Brighton & New York, Harvester Press & St. Martin's Press.

CARBALLIDO Jesus, 2015, *Golding's Metaphysics : William Golding's novels in the light of Arthur Schopenhauer's Philosophy*, PhD Thesis defended at USC (Universidade de Santiago de Compostela) under the supervision of José Manuel Barbeito Varela at the Departamento de Filología Inglesa e Alema Facultad de Filología.

CHAVAN Panditrao, 2013, "Subversion of Civilization in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*", *European Academic Research*, 1 (7), p. 1516-1526.

DEMIR Ayse, 2019, "Violence Surpassing Innocence in *Lord of the Flies* by William Golding and *The Blood Chamber* by Angela Carter", *The Literacy Trek*, 5 (1), p. 49-58.

ECKERT Kenneth, 2019, "From *Whizzoh* to *Bollocks*: The Exclamatory Language of Moral Collapse in *Lord of the Flies*", *English Language and Literature*, 65N(1), p. 3-18.

GNING Maurice, 2017, "Nihilisme identaire dans *Lord of the Flies* de William Golding et *A Slight Ache* de Harold Pinter", *European Scientific Journal*, 13 (32), p. 109-129.

-----, 2018, « Modernité, Postmodernité et Impérialisme Occidental », *European Scientific Journal*, 14 (5), p. 386-409.

-----, 2016, "Swift's Prophetic Vision of the Postmodern Age: the Example of *Gulliver's Travels*", *International Journal of Language & Literature*, 4 (2), p. 101-111.

GOLDING William, 1954, *Lord of the Flies*, London, Boston, Faber and Faber.

GOLDING William & BAKER James, 1982, "An Interview with William Golding", *Twentieth Century Literature*, 28 (2), p. 130-170.

HOFFMAN Gerhard & ALFRED Hornung, eds., 1996, *Ethics and Aesthetics: The Moral Turn of Postmodernism*, Heidelberg, Winter.

HOWARD S. Babb, 1970, *The Novels of William Golding*, Columbus, Ohio State University Press.

JONAS Hans, 1990 [1979], *Le Principe responsabilité*, Ed. du Cerf.

KANT Immanuel, 1993, *Groundworks of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Indianapolis, Heackett.

-----, 1969, *Foundation of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Trans: Lewis White Beck, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Murrill.

-----, 1999, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Trans: Guyer, Paul, Wood, Allen W, Cambridge, CUP.

LEVITT Leon, 1969, "Trust the Tale: A Second Reading of *Lord of the Flies*", *The English Journal*, 58 (4), 521, p. 522 et 533.

LI Xiaofang & WU Weihua, 2009, "On Symbolic Significance of Characters in *Lord of the Flies*", *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), p. 119-122.

RUSS Jacqueline, 1995, *La Marche des idées contemporaines : un panorama de la modernité*, Paris, Armand Colin.

SATHYASEELAN Salini, 2016, "*Lord of the Flies* an Allegory", *Journal of English Language & Literature*, 3(2), p. 99-103.

TIGER Virginia, 1974, *William Golding: The Dark Fields of Discovery*, London, Calder & Boyars.