

Spring 5-26-2022

Saving the Boys: Anticipating Moral Engagement in Lord of the Flies

Tanya Alfaro
tanalf53@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rio.tamui.edu/etds>



Part of the [Modern Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alfaro, Tanya, "Saving the Boys: Anticipating Moral Engagement in Lord of the Flies" (2022). *Theses and Dissertations*. 186.

<https://rio.tamui.edu/etds/186>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Research Information Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Research Information Online. For more information, please contact eva.hernandez@tamui.edu, jhatcher@tamui.edu.

SAVING THE BOYS: ANTICIPATING MORAL ENGAGEMENT IN *LORD OF THE FLIES*

A Thesis

by

TANYA ALFARO

Submitted to Texas A&M International University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2022

Major Subject: English

SAVING THE BOYS: ANTICIPATING MORAL ENGAGEMENT IN *LORD OF THE FLIES*

A Thesis

by

TANYA ALFARO

Submitted to Texas A&M International University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved as to style and content by:

Chair of Committee,	Kaitlyn M. Culliton
Committee Members,	Jonathan W. Murphy
	Paul J. Niemeyer
	Deborah L. Blackwell
Head of Department,	Kevin Lindberg

May 2022

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Saving the Boys: Anticipating Moral Engagement in *Lord of the Flies*

(May 2022)

Tanya Alfaro, B.A., University of Texas San Antonio;

Chair of Committee: Dr. Kaitlyn M. Culliton

William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954) is a paradoxical novel that highlights a constant conflict stemming from the inner-self of human nature promoted by the setting. Because adults often resemble children in many aspects and most of the time they don't know what to do or make poor decisions, Golding formed his characters to be pre-adolescent children as a means to subtly point at humanity's self-destructive traits. Therefore, if readers recognize the state of the boys' morality, if they understand that they, like people, are imperfect beings, and if they acknowledge that they are prone to immorality, could they still walk a straight moral path? The focus in this thesis is the issue of morality and the duality of humans when encountering dire situations, as is in the case of the stranded boys on a deserted island. By examining William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, humans gain insight into the crux of immorality in mankind by specifically looking at the characters' behaviors and particular scenes. Moreover, this analysis will mainly employ rationales by psychologists Philip Zimbardo and Albert Bandura to illustrate the moral consciousness of the characters in their quandary in both positive and negative ways.

In this approach, I contend that the novel's isolated killing scenes and characters' motivation show morality and the lack of it in order to not only understand and empathize with the boys' plight, but also impart reflection of people's true selves and redress their inward antagonism and antagonism toward others. Essentially, in this study, I propose to ultimately achieve a resolution that despite the cruelty evident in both our world and the world in *Lord of the Flies*, there is still an optimism that humanity can overpower evil, that there is a chance for the human species to not eradicate itself and instead create a harmonious relationships amongst ourselves and in the present time. This analysis, then, will deliberate Golding's pessimistic view of human nature, and examine Zimbardo's view of human nature to consider whether the boys on the island are indeed saved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In this challenging endeavor of writing my thesis, there was much doubt as to whether it would be finished. It took three years with a lot of thought, rewrites, and revisions. Therefore, I am deeply indebted to my two mentors, Dr. Jonathan W. Murphy, with whom I started the thesis process, and Dr. Kaitlyn M. Culliton, with whom I was able to finish my thesis. Their encouragement, guidance, patience, and time gave me the confidence to accomplish this painstaking goal. I would also like to thank Dr. Paul J. Niemeyer and Dr. Deborah L. Blackwell for agreeing to serve as committee members for my thesis, and for taking the time to read and comment on my analysis. Lastly, I am grateful for the sacrifice and patience of my daughter Athena, whom time spent away from her in order to achieve a higher degree cannot be replaced.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II THE MONSTER WITHIN.....	17
Killing of the Sow.....	27
Killing of Simon.....	31
Killing of Piggy.....	35
Attempt on Ralph.....	37
III REDEEMING THE LOST BOYS.....	40
Simon's Actions.....	43
Roger and Jack's Moral Restraint.....	46
Ralph's Acknowledgment of Murder.....	49
Atoneable Lamentation.....	52
IV CONCLUSION.....	57
REFERENCES.....	62
VITA.....	64

I. INTRODUCTION

Only by examining and understanding the causes of such evil might we be able to change it, to contain it, to transform it throughwise decisions and innovative communal action.

(Zimbardo, 2007, p.20)

Human nature is a strange and awe-inspiring thing. Many theorists have pondered such a notion as to why humans behave in certain ways and why they refrain from particular behaviors. Why do they sometimes want to hurt others? If there were no repercussions, would all humans behave cruelly? Moreover, do individuals learn to be cruel or is it inherent in them? William Golding and his novel *Lord of the Flies* (1954) lend themselves to the investigation of these issues.

The problem of evil is a conflict people encounter both internally and externally. One definitely sees portrayals of it in literature, films, and songs. Usually, when a traumatic event occurs, like an attack or a killing, inquiries arise as to why there is such malice in the world, as in the terroristic attacks of September 11, 2001, or the Rwanda genocide. One questions how certain people come to execute their wicked actions upon others. Sometimes certain individuals are conditioned to be immoral due to their social environment, like a bad childhood; other times, experts discern there are no external factors for a person's cruel deeds, such as psychopaths. However, even though one makes these discoveries, it is still a speculation whether evil is instinctive or comes from a person's way of life, his upbringing, or his environment. Doubt emerges as to where a person's sense of morality or immorality develops. Studious deliberation looms over whether the simple fact that humans are intellectual beings who know how to

rationalize and reason lead them to virtuousness or viciousness, and if something more inside of people than their intellect makes them be altruistic or selfish. Introspection surfaces whether a human's animal instinct for survival is taken as part of morality. Although people are imperfect creatures, they have a conscience that signals what is right and wrong; at the same time, though, emotions, curiosity, and self-interest lead them astray from what is good.

Literature also portrays circumstances where characters change from good to bad. One particular novel that illuminates this is William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. This novel, which has been read countless times and taught in high schools for many years, highlights the conflict between human nature and environments. Because adults can resemble children when they are hesitant or making poor decisions, Golding formed his characters to be pre-adolescent children as a means to subtly point at humanity's self-destructive tendencies. The boys in Golding's novel, like humans generally, are morally imperfect. However, the novel questions how human beings, despite being prone to immorality, can still make moral decisions.

Some scholarly journals focus on the political aspect of the novel by referring to its democratic and fascist depictions. This paper is not going to touch on the political theme, but rather the social psychology prominent in the novel. Even though *Lord of the Flies* has also been analyzed to fit Freud's idea of the id, ego, and superego, I will not attempt to go in that direction. The focus will be on the issue of morality and the duality of humans when encountering dire situations, as is in the case of the stranded boys on a deserted island.

By examining William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, this paper offers insight into the crux of immorality in mankind by specifically looking at the characters' behaviors and distinct scenes. Moreover, this analysis employs the rationales of psychologists Philip Zimbardo and Albert

Bandura to illustrate the moral consciousness of the characters in their respective quandaries. This approach contends the novel's selective killing scenes and showcases moral dilemmas of the characters that not only help readers understand and empathize with the boys' plight, but also impart a reflection of human nature in order to redress the inward antagonism and antagonism toward others. This analysis, then, deliberates Golding's pessimistic view of human nature and examines Zimbardo and Bandura's view of human nature to consider whether the boys on the island are indeed saved. Golding demonstrates that despite the cruelty evident in both the human world and the world in *Lord of the Flies*, there is still an optimism that humanity can overpower evil; there is a chance for the human species to not eradicate itself and instead create a harmonious relationship amongst themselves in the present time.

Detrimental experiences as a young man in war, especially the Second World War, impacted William Golding deeply and he developed a keen awareness of the negative aspects of human nature, which are portrayed in *Lord of the Flies*. Golding had naive illusions about the world from the books he read and the peaceful adventures of his childhood. He imagined history and stories about the places where he grew up. Alone, he was his own best friend with his vivid imagination, but at school he was a known bully and took pleasure in fighting (Leone et al., 1997, p. 16). Those days of fighting and bullying did not come close to the atrocities experienced during World War II and the Cold War; afterwards, he could not bring himself to think optimistically of humans. In describing his experience of the war, Golding reflects, "There were things done during that period from which I still have to avert my mind less I should be physically sick" (as cited in Leone et al., 1997, p. 31). Throughout his early thirties, he also witnessed, albeit indirectly, several other discouraging incidents in the world. According

to Leone, “By the time the war was over, [Golding] had rejected his father’s confident, scientific humanism; he had witnessed war’s brutality and had adopted a pessimistic view toward his fellow humans” (p. 19). In the Nobel Prize Award of 1983 Ceremony Speech, Professor Lars Gyllensten (1983) emphasizes Golding’s deep concern: “They were atrocities committed with cold professional skill by well-educated and cultured people —doctors, lawyers and those with a long tradition of high civilization behind them. They carried out their crimes against their own equals.” He was utterly dismayed at the fact that people, who had the ability to reason, to socialize, to tolerate, to love, were the ones creating destruction and chaos. *Lord of the Flies*, then, depicts the problem of evil that was and is present in the world. Golding presents this through a microcosm of boys on an island, who shed their civilized clothes like snakes shedding their skin and exposing their base inner instincts. Golding expressed that he was “pessimistic about the notion that rules and science can save the world, but optimistic about the potential that spirituality can help humans reject evil” (Leone et al., 1997, p. 26). In other words, looking into one’s soul, observing and reflecting upon one’s life is far more valuable and progressive than simple rational thought. Using the novel as a medium, he illustrates the notion that humans are capable of good, but it is their choices that ultimately determine whether they let themselves break the boundaries of tamed civilized action.

Lord of the Flies is set on a deserted island, where several British schoolboys are stranded after their plane, which was evacuating them from the dangers of war, crashes due to an attack during both a nuclear war and a storm. From the outset, the novel already establishes man’s capacity to destroy. The damage made by the airplane cabin is termed the “scar,” “a gash visible in the trees; there were splintered trees and then the drag” (Golding, 1954, p. 29). The

paradisiacal island, untouched by humans, grows lushly until the aircraft leaves a blemish. In the opening pages, Golding sets up man's first conflict with nature by *wounding* the island with a man-made machine. At first, the island seems like a good, fun place to be, but as the days progress, the boys realize they must find ways to survive. Thus, they create their own meager society based on what they can recall of the world they come from. The atmosphere of the island and the characters parallel an Eden-like state and R.M. Ballantyne's *The Coral Island*.

Ralph, a good-looking boy of twelve years, is voted chief, not because of some compelling evidence that he would be a good leader, but because he is the holder of a conch, a fascinating "toy." The conch, then, materializes as a symbol of law and order; every time Ralph blows the conch, everyone gets together in an assembly, and the boys discuss dilemmas and solutions. Piggy, a fat boy with asthma and thick eyeglasses, is the rational thinker of the group, although he is the butt of ridicule and humiliation and nobody listens to him. He stays by Ralph's side for protection and as a seeming advisor to him. Interestingly, Golding makes several parallels to Piggy, a weak subject, and the pigs on the island. Pigs are known to be smart and have poor eyesight. The pigs grunt and squeal, and Piggy, with his asthma and his whines, resembles them. These two boys, at first, bring everyone together, from six-year-old boys to twelve-year-olds. However, soon Jack, a red-headed, skinny boy with freckles, joins this group with his own gang, the Choir. It is evident that Jack lusts for power and control; everything about him expresses such a desire. He becomes easily angry if circumstances do not go his way; he is also manipulative and deceitful. In Jack's group, another boy named Roger is introduced. He is described as a furtive and dark character; eventually, the novel reveals that he has no qualms about his cruel actions. Ralph describes Roger, at one point, as someone "who carried

death in his hands” (p. 196). Simon is the last major character in the novel; he is an outcast in the group, like Piggy, because he has a tendency to faint, the cause being that he is epileptic, and struggles to communicate effectively due to his shyness. By coming together, everyone agrees to the rules, with the main focus being rescue, and a sub-group, the hunters, is formed.

As the narrative unfolds, their attempt to create a society collapses because of the boys’ lack of responsibility and their desire to do what they want, like play or hunt. Apart from the “scar,” they destroy nature even further by accidentally setting fire to the island, pushing boulders down the mountain, and killing pigs. Gradually, the hunters shift from being British schoolboys to “savages” with painted faces. Jack originally comes up with the idea to camouflage in order to easily attack the pigs; however, as he creates his mask, “the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness” (p. 64). The sinews of moral and civilized restraint seem to unravel as they conceive the idea that no one with authority, such as adults, is there to chastise them. Golding illustrates this progression through the impetus of violence. The first killing of a pig brings great satisfaction to Jack because at first, he cannot bring himself to kill a piglet. It is also a turning point, as the diction demonstrates the conversion. The narrator mentions, “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” (p. 69). The fact that Jack “grimaced” and then “laughed” stresses his change from innocence and inexperience to awareness and barbarism. Once they experience the killing of the pig, they know they can do it again.

The boys become more violent; they next brutally kill a sow, which was peacefully nursing her young. After killing the pig, the boys behead it and mount its head on a stick as a

sacrificial gift to the “beast.” The beast crystallizes through the boys’ fear of the unknown. The boys validate the idea of a Beast when there is substantial evidence that there is no such thing as a beast. Their minds concoct the idea of a Beast to displace their own guilt, and, ironically, ease their fear. The painted masks and the Beast are a means to eliminate the culpability of their evil actions. Jack gains more power through his hunting skills because now he is the provider of food and his manipulation of the boys, making them think that there *is* a Beast and he will kill it. If the other boys think that he can find the Beast and kill it, then the boys need not be afraid anymore. This makes Jack seem courageous and strong. However, knowing that the Beast does not exist, Jack uses the fear of it to his advantage. Because of this, most of the boys take his side, and set themselves apart from Ralph’s group. Jack’s group now creates a game that mimics the killing of a pig and compose a ritual chant: “ ‘*Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Bash her in*’ ” (p. 75). Ultimately, the imitation of killing a pig actualizes into a frenzied mob on a stormy night, where the boys end up viciously slaying Simon, who accidentally runs into the circle of boys blinded by the chant and the game. Antecedently, Simon, discovers the truth of the Beast. Simon names the dead pig’s head on a stick the Lord of the Flies, and through a hallucinatory conversation, Simon discerns that the beast is not real and that in fact the “beast” is the wickedness in humans. This idea is probed further in this paper in order to establish whether humans are in fact conditioned to be evil or evil is inside of them.

Even though the Beast is an abstract figure, it becomes concrete when what the boys think the “beast” is revealed to be a dead parachutist. A parachutist, killed in battle, falls from the night sky as Ralph asks for a sign from the adult world. Golding places the dead parachutist in the storyline to remind us that there is not only the war on the island taking place but also a

war outside the island. After Simon's death, all the boys feel a tinge of guilt, but no one readily admits to it. Ralph and Piggy conclude that Simon should not have run into the circle, and that it was an accident, while Jack and his crew state that it was the Beast transformed into Simon. The Beast is the scapegoat, which alleviates the boys' guilt and responsibility for their horrible deed. At this point, Jack and his "savages" are too far gone, while Ralph and his group try to maintain what remains of their civility. In their minds, civilization restrains them from becoming vicious and barbaric, as they see what the other boys become when they release their inhibitions. Jack and Roger go to Ralph's camp and steal Piggy's glasses, which the boys have been using to light fires. Ralph, Piggy, and the twins, Sam'n'eric, decide to go to Jack's camp and talk some sense into the "savages," yet it is to no avail. Jack and Ralph have a physical fight, and Roger kills the main person attached to civility—Piggy—by pushing a boulder off a cliff. He is hit, causing him to fall off and die. The conch also shatters into pieces. There is no longer any sense of right or wrong; logic ends with Piggy's death and animal instinct is invoked. Ralph, then, becomes a hunted being. Ralph's primitive impulses overpower him, so his mind is only set on surviving. The boys end up using fire to smoke him out like an animal. Finally, as Ralph runs from them, he encounters a Navy officer at the edge of the island; this is yet another reminder of an outside war simultaneously going on with the one on the island. Ralph, subsequently, weeps because he acknowledges the barbaric cruelty of which humans are capable.

Lord of the Flies contains the ever-present theme of human duality. The "beast" in the novel is an abstract thing that manifests into a concrete evil. The children concoct the Beast due to their fears and have it as an invincible dark presence; then as the validity of the Beast is established because eventually the boys are going to hunt and kill it, Piggy and Simon make two

significant remarks: Piggy says, “Unless we get frightened of people” (p. 84); Simon mutters, “maybe there is a beast...maybe it’s only us” (p. 89). This awareness proves the beast is not an outside entity, but a person himself is capable of having a beast within. The ancient Cherokee legend, “The Tale of Two Wolves,” notably illuminates on this idea of human duality:

One evening, an elderly Cherokee Brave told his
grandson about a battle that goes on inside people.

He said, “My son, the battle is between two ‘wolves’ inside us all.
One is evil. It is anger, envy, jealousy, sorrow, regret, greed, arrogance, self-pity,
guilt, resentment, inferiority, lies, false pride, superiority, and ego.

The other is good.
It is joy, peace, love, hope, serenity, humility, kindness,
benevolence, empathy, generosity, truth, compassion, and faith.”

The grandson thought about it for a minute and then asked his grandfather:
“Which wolf wins?...”

The old Cherokee simply replied,
“The one that you feed.”
(Nanticoke Indian Association, 2011)

The two wolves mentioned in the Cherokee legend represent the “beast” inside humans that succumbs to the base instincts, just like all the boys on the island, except for Simon, demonstrate—from Jack’s overreaching of power, to Ralph’s lapse in judgment in order to join in the fun, to Roger’s loss of ethical control and pushing the rock to kill Piggy. The boys’ actions emphasize Piggy’s and Simon’s realization of the Beast being human. Ironically, to succumb to the “beast” inside of oneself does not constitute that one is all bad. On the contrary, it shows the flawed creature that a human is. At the same time, the same boys in the novel display moral engagement, which shows their tendencies of good as well. Jack and Roger’s moral restraint,

Ralph's immediacy to learn from his dire mistake of what joining in on the fun encompasses, Simon's charitable actions, and all the boys' weeping at the end of the novel, exemplify the other side of human duality. Golding offers these two sides in the characters to closely resemble real humans that exhibit free will. Sigmund Freud calls it the struggle between the id and super-ego in his analysis of the psyche. The environment that the boys land in contributes to the tension and fear that give way to impulsiveness and detrimental actions. There is no one to rescue them, they do not know if and when they will be rescued, they have limited knowledge in survival, and their pre-adolescent minds are still developing. David G. Allan (2017) communicates that "the feeling of anger or the impulse of greed is often triggered by other emotions such as fear, rejection or desperation. Often, we're not even aware that secondary emotions like anger have a deeper root cause". One negative feeling leads to another and another, like a domino effect of negative feelings that fester and become a bigger problem. When someone wrongs another human being, whether it be an insult, criticism, or a harmful action, they have the potential to later come into *l'esprit de l'escalier*, dwelling on the event, asking themselves what they should have done. That, then, leads to anger or guilt. The result is frequently that they end up either blaming or getting angry at those who are innocent, taking revenge, or not doing anything about it, yet letting it permeate into their veins. In any case, antagonism consumes people and no one is better for it. In this state of mind, misery predominates. Like a carcinogen that blackens the lungs and produces labored breathing, resentment, anger, guilt, jealousy, and hate wither a person.

As the children gather at the beginning of the novel, Jack is already leader of the group of boys in black clothes who are identified as the choir. He is authoritative. Unfortunately, once the

group votes on a chief, and he does not get the position, Jack still tries to exert his authoritative power by first becoming the leader of the hunters. Little by little, he becomes deceitful and turns on Ralph, causing everyone to turn on him in response. Eventually, he completely removes all the power from Ralph. Jack lets antagonism rule, and is unable to control his inner beast. Jack wants control. He is arrogant, gets angry easily when things don't go his way, and feels inferior to Ralph. When he obtains something that everyone wants, it makes him feel more superior. He feels jealousy when he doesn't become chief, he feels anger when the boys do not follow him, he is proud and stubborn to admit he is at fault, and then his hatred is disguised in anonymity through a literal mask of black, red, and white, that covers his wicked actions. He is the first in the novel to turn savage. The bestial tendencies inside Jack continue to spread because impulsiveness and covetousness spread to other characters when unrestrained. Howard Babb (1970) expresses it accurately when he states, "This is the sort of power on which Jack's society proves later to be based, a power manifested in the ceremonial obeisance to himself that Jack requires of his tribe, and expressed in another way through those sacrifices by which the tribe creates its beast, thus sanctifying the forces of irrationality and fear that reign in the children themselves" (p. 21). Jack utilizes fear and his learned skill of hunting to control the boys. He tells them that he can hunt and kill the Beast, and he is the one that provides proper food for their starving stomachs. As long as their selfish needs are met, the boys swear allegiance to Jack.

Human morality offers a way to tame the metaphorical Beast, symbolized in the novel through a decaying pig head on a spike. One is happy when morality is in charge. This usually happens when there are no obstacles or challenges in people's lives. Letting morality guide actions leads to peaceful societies where humans are serene; they are joyful when they are

comfortable. In this state, people tend to help others naturally instead of feeling like it is a chore. People are better able to contemplate and respond to the world appropriately instead of lashing out. In *Lord of the Flies*, Simon, for example, has insight into the conscience and is the one that sees the aspects of human nature more clearly than the others. He is the one that realizes what the Beast really is. He embodies the good in people and is perceived as a martyr. Golding, using imagery, even creates a serene scene where the tiny glowing sea creatures surround Simon and take him to sea.

Through Ralph, the battle between bestiality and morality is expressed. For the most part, Ralph is good. He displays a sort of dignity, hope, and tolerance. He is the leader and tries to create a community that gets along and helps each other, but he also leans towards inferiority and jealousy. When he is dissatisfied, he joins in the fun of leisure and hunting, but not without severe consequences.

In order to pursue the idea of moral engagement that ultimately makes the boys in *Lord of the Flies* redeemable, humans must acquiesce to the notion that they are prone to evil. Philip Zimbardo (2007), an American psychologist who headed the Stanford Prison Experiment in 1971, explores this concept in *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. Here, Zimbardo postulates an individual's behavior changes based on the situation they are in. He goes in-depth recounting his research on the Stanford Prison Experiment, a simulated experiment with college students who role-played being guards and prisoners, and the Abu Ghraib Prison incident, an appalling event of torture and abuse of prisoners by American soldiers in Iraq, that occurred in 2004. He notes, "Within certain powerful social settings, human nature can be transformed in ways as dramatic as the chemical transformation in Robert Louis

Stevenson's captivating fable of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde... Good people can be induced, seduced, and initiated into behaving in evil ways" (p. 210-11). Given the inauspicious circumstances, people mask themselves into monsters under the umbrella of power and ingrained ideology. Zimbardo asserts in his "Foreword" that one has to realize the detriment of "evil" before he can challenge that entanglement and advocate for courage and the positive action of humanitarianism. He states that the "corrosive influence of powerful situational forces... that exist in many common behavioral contexts are more likely to distort our usual good nature by pushing us toward engaging in deviant, destructive, or evil behavior when the settings are new and unfamiliar" (p. vii). He continues to say: "When embedded in them, our habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting no longer function to sustain the moral compass that has guided us reliably in the past" (p. viii). On that account, I apply Zimbardo's moral precepts to the boys of in *Lord of the Flies*. The boys have to fend for themselves on an island that is alien to them. They only know what they have learned in their limited years of life from their British upbringing. These boys are unaccustomed to living in the wilderness. Moreover, in their limited experience of life, the boys' attempt to create an organized society crumbles when Ralph sets up too many rules, Jack disregards Ralph's authority, and eventually everyone ignores the fundamentals of collaboration and survival. To make things worse, the fear of the unknown by the verbal validation of the abstract Beast compels their nefarious intentions to go into overdrive.

According to Fitzgerald and Kayser (1992), "Modern man, who can explain everything in entirely antiseptic, sanitary ways cannot, no matter how often he cleanses himself, rid himself of the decay that comes from within" (p. 85). In other words, once an individual acts upon their base instincts instead of morally engaging in their life's circumstances, he will never be good. If

this were the case, however, there would be no room for moral redemption, and attempts to follow the good path. Despite their inclination to connect *Lord of the Flies* to religion, they impressively postulate that pride is a cause for inhumanity. They suggest that “pride leads to war” (p. 81). To be proud leads to stubbornness, passion, and vanity; if the individual’s pride is wounded, then it generates anger, which then leads to violence. This delineates Jack because he gets humiliated and embarrassed through his hurt pride, yet he finally gets the leadership role through rebelliousness. They also ascertain that Piggy, portraying “scientific humanism,” denies his guilt when they kill Simon (p. 83). In this scene of Piggy’s denial, Piggy refuses to acknowledge rational thought because that would mean that he was actually involved in a murder. Simon substantiates the notion of a spiritual sense that contrasts logic. Not everything is scientific and evident, but some things are intuitively felt and seen if only one took the time to observe and reflect like Simon. Fitzgerald and Kayser argue that the “virulent, global atrocities of the twentieth century were caused by...ideological pride” (p. 85). In regards to the idea of immorality, Fitzgerald and Kayser tend to imply that evil is both innate and conditioned.

In his book *Violence*, Slavoj Žižek (2008), likewise elicits the concept that everyone is bad, in a manner of speaking, even the ones that seem altruistic. He states that besides the visible “subjective violence,” there are two other underlying violences (objective and systemic) that “may be invisible, but [these hidden violences] [have] to be taken into account if one is to make sense of what otherwise seem to be ‘irrational’ explosions of subjective violence (p. 2). Because we are so caught up in what we can obviously see, we fail to see the other forms of violence. Žižek expresses that even some forms of charity are still types of violence, like the businessmen or entrepreneurs that earn money but also give to charity. First they take, and then

they give. He also notes that to do nothing, although it is still violence in a sense, is best, rather than being hypocritical or adding to the chaos of violence. This connects to Jack and Simon's behavior: one acts violently, yet seems to give freely, and the other does nothing, contemplates, and waits. Žižek poses an intriguing angle on violence, which on a deeper level connotes the idea of completely flawed human beings. Žižek, like Fitzgerald and Kayser, tends to ratify that people are opportunistic and would not change for the better. While this is a valid point, a person with a moral dilemma in an awful environment can still be morally saved if he takes a step back and understands his situation in order to do the right thing.

Similar to Žižek, Eric Wilson (2014) argues that violence is a contributing factor in shaping a social being. He revisits Thomas Hobbes' ideology to argue against it. He concedes that "Golding's version of 'the Lost Boys', now radically immersed within the State of Nature and unknowingly following the social logic of community, mimetically re-enact the true sequence of cultural formation" (p. 148). Wilson argues that through mimesis, violence and retribution cohere to each other. By citing Rene Girard, Wilson comments that a cycle of reprisal ensues, obliging the creation of a scapegoat; the "scapegoat must always be socially marginal in some way" to end the cycle (p. 135). In the case of *Lord of the Flies*, Simon and Piggy are examples of socially marginalized scapegoats because no one avenges them. In his approach, Wilson provides that a "collective action of repression usually seeks some sort of outlet through emotional or symbolic displacement" (p. 156). He further states that the surfacing of primitive aspects will "undermine" the more "'advanced' organism" (p. 156). This provides a thought into the immorality, both inherent and conditioned.

The scholars establish the concept that people are often in conflict within themselves, and although humans tend to make a lot of mistakes, some to the point of moral corruption, people still have the power of choice to compel them to be good or evil. Therefore, in this discussion, I will first focus on the scenes of the killing of the sow, Simon, Piggy, and the killing attempt on Ralph to present Golding's despondent view of humanity. However, in the latter part, I will optimistically speculate, drawing from Zimbardo and Bandura, that the boys could be morally saved. Despite the fact that the novel is critiqued to hold a dejected view of mankind, the subtle and particular instances of a few characters in the novel that will be mentioned in this analysis create a constructive perspective angle that with experience and learning comes understanding that drives beneficial action, and in turn, a hope for society's future.

II. THE MONSTER WITHIN

“Maybe,” he said hesitantly, “maybe there is a beast”... “What I mean is...maybe it’s only us.”

—William Golding, *Lord of the Flies*, 1954

Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* shows the negative impact of fully loosening restraint and giving way to desire, or, in other words, letting emotions rule over reason. Golding’s novel is not just about adventure and suspense in a fictional plot of schoolboys stranded on an island that gives the reader a rollercoaster of emotions. The novel suggests heeding caution about oneself and others, because even though people live in a society with law and order, a person is still prone to hurting others and creating chaos. Horror story writer Stephen King once said, “Monsters are real, and ghosts are real too. They live inside us, and sometimes, they win” (LibQuotes, 2021). As imperfect and flawed creatures, human beings tend to feel annoyed, jealous, angry. These negative emotions creep up, and they think of scenarios of how to hurt others. When provoked too many times, an individual snaps and awakens the “monster” within. The intention to hurt becomes real. King and Golding recognize that humans experience different emotions at different times. That is what makes people human, and reasoning with their emotions is another human characteristic. However, too much discord in oneself produces an evil being. When that happens, an individual renders all other beings insignificant. Golding makes this idea evident in *Lord of the Flies*. The novel elucidates a connection between the darkness within the characters and the inner darkness present in all of humanity. Hence, one can ruminate about one’s own actions before doing them and before hurting others in order to live collectively in harmony instead of in animosity. Through the examination of the particular killing scenes of

the sow, Simon, Piggy, and the attempt on Ralph, Golding conveys the characters' motivation that lead to their self-destruction, which illustrate that without morality humans ruin themselves.

At the beginning of the novel, after the English boys crash-land on the island due to a storm and a fire on the airplane wing, Ralph, a twelve-year-old boy, and Piggy, a fat, talkative boy, come together and assess the situation they are in. While Ralph is happy that there are no adults, Piggy is concerned. Later, Ralph finds a conch in the lagoon. Piggy explains that it is a summoning tool and that it could be used to call others on the island. As Ralph blows the conch to call a meeting, others begin to appear from the forest one by one. There are little ones around the age of six and older ones around ten years old. One particular group stands out, which is a group of choir boys led by a boy named Jack. Jack has such a commanding presence that the choir boys ask for his permission to join the meeting. When the boys establish that they have to manage and support themselves, they decide to choose a leader, a "chief." Jack proclaims himself chief, but others think there should be a vote. Ralph is voted chief because of his "attractive appearance" and the conch's powerful influence (Golding, 1954, p. 22). Jack feels humiliated. However, in order to appease him, Ralph offers Jack a leadership position; he would still be in charge of the choir, which turn into "the hunters." This commences the subtle division between Jack and Ralph. The boys create rules but still think they can have fun while they wait to be rescued, but a little boy, age six, with a big birthmark on his face, is the first to create fear in all of them. He is the one that mentions that there is a "snake-thing," a "beastie" he calls it (p. 35), that comes out in the dark. Although the thought of a "beastie" is already implanted in their minds, Ralph puts them at ease for the moment saying that the Queen has maps of all the islands in the world, so they will be rescued. He tells the others that the way to get rescued is to have smoke on the mountain as a signal, so they need to build a fire. They go up the mountain and

build a pyre, and when Jack figures out that Piggy's glasses could be used to create fire, Jack snatches the glasses off of Piggy's face. Jack announces that his group would be responsible for getting meat and keeping the fire going. In their attempt to build a fire, the boys set off a wildfire that burns parts of the forest, and the little boy that first mentioned the "beastie" disappears, and it is assumed that he dies in the fire. Time passes, and Jack hones his hunting skills, while Ralph tries to keep up with the shelters and the organization of the group. The division between Jack and Ralph slowly becomes wider as they argue about which takes priority: Jack's focus on getting meat or Ralph's insistence on building shelters and keeping the fire going for smoke. Eventually, Jack figures out that in order to kill a pig, he and his hunters need to camouflage themselves with paint, so they use white and red clay and charcoal. The painted masks make them feel anonymous and free. Once they kill the pig, they feel triumphant, but the joy does not last because at the same time, Ralph sees a ship that passes by without noticing the boys because the fire is out; no one was keeping the smoke going. Ralph is furious and argues with Jack, driving a deeper wedge into their relationship as co-leaders. Their relationship is maintained until this point. Jack has control because he was finally able to get meat. Everyone is on his side, for they would no longer be eating fruit, fruit that gives them diarrhea. Therefore, Jack, as the creator of dissension, gradually becomes domineering again. This eventually leads to the poignant killing scenes that happen later in the novel.

In order to evaluate the killing scenes, one must first note the unmistakable driving forces behind the killings: the belief of superiority and the fear of the beast. Based on the description of their clothes, "school uniforms," "badges," stockings," "pullovers" (p. 18), and "togs" (p. 23), Golding conveys the boys have had some education in schools. Also, the boys follow the sound of the conch and create and obey rules. They learned how to be civil according to the laws of

society. As Jack declares, ““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”” (p. 42). The boys are English, and just like any dominant nation, they have inherited imperialistic tendencies. Even at the beginning of the novel, after Ralph collects everyone with the sound of the shell and becomes chief, then explores the island with Simon and Jack to verify they are on an island, Ralph claims, “This belongs to us” (p. 29). The sense of domination and power over a piece of land just because they “found it” forebodes the crumbling of their attempted civilization. Because Simon and Jack are of the same upbringing, as in they learned the same things as Ralph, “eyes shining, mouths open, triumphant, they savored the right of domination. They were lifted up: were friends” (p. 29). Here they are of one common mind, so they are in concession with each other. However, as the narrator illustrates the setting, the “scar” is “a gash visible in the trees; there were splintered trunks and then the drag, leaving only a fringe of palm between the scar and the sea” (p. 29). The “scar” is the place where the plane the boys were in crashed. The crash creates a bare-line mark with broken trees, so they, humans, create the wound on nature. They also disrupt nature when they push a rock down the mountain and “[smash] a deep hole in the canopy of the forest. Echoes and birds flew, white and pink dust floated, the forest further down shook as with the passage of an enraged monster: and then the island was still” (p. 28). The boys exclaim: ““Wacco!” “Like a bomb”” (p. 28)! They are excited, and their complete disregard for nature divulges that there is no remorse within them. They even compare their destruction to a bomb, which powerful nations use to destroy other nations and people. Moreover, amid their enthusiasm in building a fire on the mountain the first time, they are careless. They build a fire to have smoke as a signal in the hopes of being rescued. The fire gets out of hand (p. 44). The narrator says, “beneath the capering boys a quarter of a mile square of forest was savage with

smoke and flame. The separate noises of the fire merged into a drumroll that seemed to shake the mountain” (p. 44). The mood becomes ominous, for one of the “littluns,” the one with the birthmark on his face, goes missing and is presumed dead due to the fire. At this point, “[the boys’] faces were lit redly from beneath” (p. 46). The imagery exposes the potential of evil. The wildfire with the suspenseful “drumroll” emphasizes that if one is not mindful of the consequences, situations become uncontrollable. In essence, the disregard of nature by destruction is the boys’ insensitivity for what they believe insignificant. Their careless impulsive decision-making is the beginning of their moral lack of decline.

The boys continue to display their desired superiority by bullying one another and wielding spears. The former shows verbal abuse while the latter physical abuse. Subsequently, the boys begin to fear both, the spear-wielding bullies as well as the abstraction of the Beast. The more tangible fear of bullying is juxtaposed to the boys’ fear of the Beast. The Beast is an abstraction because the boys do not know if it is real. The littlun with the birthmark mentions it, but he thinks he sees something through his fear of the dark and the tree branches moving. Once the notion of a Beast existing is in their heads, the boys fear it, but they are actually fearing the dark and the unknown. Piggy is the one that gets ridiculed the most, especially by Jack. Unfortunately, Piggy’s attributes of having asthma and myopia, and being fat and whiny do not help him much, not to mention his name. Piggy’s name is not revealed. He tells Ralph when they first meet that he does not care what he is called as long as he is not called what other schoolboys called him. Curious, Ralph asks about his undesirable nickname, and Piggy confesses, ““They used to call me ‘Piggy’”” (p. 11). Even though he does not like it, he accepts Ralph calling him “Piggy,” so when Jack calls him “Fatty,” Ralph interjects that that is not his name, that his name is “Piggy” (p. 21), to the embarrassment of Piggy. Sadly, it is the name that

sticks with him. Once Piggy is labeled as “Piggy,” subconsciously in the mind of the other boys, he becomes dehumanized, for in the name itself he is compared to an animal. Zimbardo (2007) comments on this concept of labeling: “Do these simple labels have any effect? It doesn’t seem so initially” (p. 18). He elaborates through an example of a college student who overhears that some college students are “nice guys” while others are “animals.” The positive term triggers a humane reaction and the other “switches off any sense of compassion you might have for them” (p. 18). The negative term “animal” “changes our mental construction of these [other college students]. It distances you from images of friendly college kids who must be more similar to you than different” (p. 18). Comparatively, Piggy is laughed at because of his name and treated as if he does not matter. That makes the others feel superior to Piggy, easier for Jack to rise to power.

Piggy is automatically considered an outcast due to his manner of communication, which is his whiny voice and vernacular expression. For example, he says “We was attacked” (Golding, 1954, p. 8) and “them fruit” (p. 9). Every time Piggy addresses the group, he immediately gets insulted by Jack, who undermines his intelligence. When the boys are trying to build a fire, Piggy says they cannot keep a fire going no matter how much they try. Jack angrily tells Piggy he did not help at all. Piggy whines, “I got the conch ... You let me speak!” Jack retorts, “The conch doesn’t count on top of the mountain ... so you shut up” (p. 42). Piggy futilely tries to have some sort of voice within the group when he has Ralph by his side and the transitory authority of the conch. In truth, the only one that pays attention to Piggy is Ralph, and then only sometimes.

The spears are markers of death: hunting tools, torture devices, and implementations of sacrificial offerings. Jack and the hunters wield their spears as a form of dominance since they are the ones that catch pigs as the real source of food. They have the upper hand in the group

because eating meat (pig) is far more fulfilling than being rescued, and the thrill of the hunt is more entertaining than the chores of organizing shelters and keeping a fire. The spears are the tools that deliver meat, and hunting with spears offers the boys the feeling that they can do anything they like without consequence. The spears are symbols of power, which leads to aggression, and eventually to fear. The delicate conch does not stand a chance against the sharp spear. Jack, especially, associates well with the spear. He likes to be in command, is very aggressive and instills fear. For instance, when Ralph, Simon, and Jack come upon candle bushes (another element of nature) while exploring the island, Jack “[slashes] at [a candle bud] with his knife and the scent [spills] over them” (p. 30). While the others observe the flowers, Jack is violent. The spears are also used to poke at the boys. Robert gets jabbed several times when the boys excitedly role play killing a pig (p. 114); he becomes frightened because he really gets injured. Sam’n’eric (their names are combined because they are twins who act as one unit) are stabbed as well when they become prisoners of the hunters. The novel states:

The chief snatched one of the few spears that were left and poked Sam in the ribs.
 “What d’you mean by it, eh?” said the chief fiercely.
 “What d’you mean by coming with spears? What d’you mean by not joining my tribe?”
 The prodding became rhythmic. Sam yelled. (p. 182)

Here, Jack, as chief, exerts full authority. By now, he thinks he can get away with anything, to the extreme that he orders a second spear to be sharpened at both ends, like the one on which the severed pig’s head is impaled. When the boys kill the sow, Jack orders Roger to sharpen the first stick at both ends; Jack, then, sticks the sow’s head on top of it as a gift for the Beast. The second stick that is sharpened implies that Ralph’s head would be on it. The narrator describes, “Jack held up the head and jammed the soft throat down on the pointed end of the stick which pierced through into the mouth” (p. 136). Jack then declares, ““This head is for the beast. It’s a

gift” (p. 137). This is a striking demonstration of superiority. The pig’s head on a stake carries with it a sense of arrogance and brutality, like having a trophy apart from an offering to the boys’ chimera. This arrogance, brutality, and power leads them to moral decay. At the end of the novel, as they chase Ralph through the forest, they actually intend to cut off Ralph’s head and stick it on the double-sided spear.

Fear of the Beast motivates the characters, especially Jack and the hunters, to distort the truth and use aggression. Fear has a way of allowing one’s imagination to run wild. As a trope in fiction, fear of darkness and fear of the unknown create a myriad of monsters. The first mention of the Beast in *Lord of the Flies* begins when a meager six-year-old boy with a birthmark on his face thinks he sees something. At this age, people already understand the concept of fear because in some way they have experienced something that triggers their fear. Since the little boy in the novel is without his parents in an unfamiliar place, he thinks there is a “beastie.” He describes it as a “snake-thing” that comes in the night. Piggy, who talks for the small boy repeats his words,

“He still says he saw the beastie. It came and went away again an’ came back and wanted to eat him—...He says in the morning it turned into them things like ropes in the trees and hung in the branches. He says will it come back tonight?” (p. 36).

The use of the dash emphasizes the anxious tone and the boys’ need for reassurance that everything is fine. However, the word “beastie” makes it a realization and carries with it the connotation of dread. Ralph tries to diffuse the uneasiness, but he keeps repeating, “But there isn’t a beastie!” (p. 36). He repeats this line five times, which further manifests the Beast; the more he denies it, the more validation he gives to it, making it real to them. Later, Ralph, Jack, and Simon talk about the Beast again. Ralph mentions that the boys are frightened and that they

have nightmares. Jack and Ralph do not say the word, but Simon does, and he brings a sense of foreboding.

“They talk and scream. The littluns. Even some of the others. As if—”
 “As if it wasn’t a good island.” Astonished at the interruption, they looked up at Simon’s serious face. “As if,” said Simon, “the beastie, the beastie or the snake-thing, was real. Remember?” The two older boys flinched when they heard the shameful syllable. Snakes were not to be mentioned now, were not mentionable. (p. 52)

Further on, after they miss their chance of getting rescued because the boys neglect the fire in order to hunt pigs, Ralph indignantly calls another assembly, one of the many futile assemblies. They discuss the topic of fear and the Beast. Ralph again tries to reassure the boys that there is no substantiation to their fear. At this point Jack interjects and calls the littluns “cry-babies” and that everyone gets frightened sometimes. He announces, “The thing is—fear can’t hurt you any more than a dream” (p. 82). However, he contradicts himself in his speech because he says, “Serves you right if something did get you, you useless lot of cry-babies! But there *is* no animal—” (p. 83). The emphasis in the word “is” rather than the word “no” highlights a subconscious trigger. In this speech, Jack manipulates his words to tell the boys that there is a Beast without them overtly knowing, using reverse-psychology. Additionally, fear *can* hurt a person when that fear is acted upon, as evinced at the end of chapter 9 by Simon’s death at the hands of an entranced mob of boys who mistake him for the Beast. The littluns create the fear because they are the only ones that claim to see “something big and horrid,” yet the older boys maintain that fear of the Beast. As the talk continues, they make their own assumptions about where the Beast lives and eats. One boy thinks it hides; others say that it is a sea monster or a ghost, and another that it eats pigs (p. 87-89). Most claim that there is no real Beast, yet they are also afraid—afraid of the unknown darkness. Despite the fact that Jack claims that if they come across the Beast they will kill it, the fear of the Beast intensifies when a dead pilot lands on the island, which now

makes the Beast concrete. Sam'n'eric, who are supposed to be taking care of the fire, are the first to encounter him, but they are groggy, and it is still dark. The narrator describes Sam'n'eric,

Neither of the boys screamed but the grip of their arms tightened and their mouths grew peaked. For perhaps ten seconds they crouched like that while the flailing fire sent smoke and sparks and waves of inconstant light over the top of the mountain. (p. 98)

They cannot see clearly and remain in their spot for an extremely short time and run away to tell Ralph and the others they saw the beast, yet when they recount what they saw, they exaggerate, distorting the truth. Besides saying that the Beast was “furry” and had “wings,” Sam'n'eric exclaim, “‘The beast followed us—’ ‘I saw it slinking behind the trees—’ ‘Nearly touched me—’ (p. 100). Ultimately, everyone panics, and Jack decides to hunt the beast. The one person that rationalizes the truth about the beast is Simon: “Simon ... felt a flicker of incredulity—a beast with claws that scratched, that sat on a mountaintop, that left no tracks and yet was not fast enough to catch Samneric” (p. 103). It does not make sense to him, yet he cannot bring himself to say anything because he is afraid of public speaking. When Ralph, Roger, and Jack go to the mountaintop to verify if the Beast is real, it is dark again. They are definitely scared. The detailed imagery is poignant:

Behind them the sliver of moon had drawn clear of the horizon. Before them, something like a great ape was sitting asleep with its head between its knees. Then the wind roared in the forest, there was confusion in the darkness, and the creature lifted its head, holding toward them the ruin of a face. (p. 123)

The dim light and wind add to the suspense, and if they are about twelve feet away, they can distinguish something; however, they do not completely verify what they see because their fear overwhelms them, so they run away as fast as possible, leaving the actual form of the Beast uncertain. Afterwards, tension ensues as Jack establishes that the Beast is also a hunter that

cannot be killed. He insults Ralph, and then breaks away from the group, and eventually becomes chief of the group of savages.

Zimbardo (2007) mentions in his book, *The Lucifer Effect*, that when observing unusual behavior, in order to understand the causes, the “Who” should not be solely looked at, but also the “What”: “*What* conditions could be contributing to certain reactions? *What* circumstances might be involved in generating behavior? *What* was the situation like from the perspective of the actors?” (p. 8). In the case of the children on the island, they are alone without guidance, leaning only to what they have knowledge of in their youth. Furthermore, the novel hints that the children on the flight were being transported, presumably to a safer environment, due to the implied atomic war in their home country. They do not have the security of the adult world and do not have the reassurance that they will definitely be rescued. Their sense of abandonment, helplessness, and ineptitude brings about many fears and struggles. The metaphorical oppression of the dark island and the need for survival corrupt the children into a mob of evil.

Killing of the Sow

That the characters are being motivated through a desire for superiority and a fear of the unknown is most evidenced in the killing of the sow. Their moral consciousness profoundly declines in this scene. The killing of the sow is the second time the boys kill a pig. Previously, in chapter 4, Jack and the boys kill the first pig, but their motivation is clearly to hunt for food. When they kill this first pig, they are ecstatic with the success of being able to accomplish a goal of killing an animal. Jack, especially, before the first kill, has had a few opportunities to stab a pig but has prevented himself from killing due to his moral conscience; he even gets angry and frustrated with himself for not being able to kill an animal. Jack and the boys are only able to

kill the first pig because they have their faces painted, the masks that allow them to become anonymous. After their triumphant first kill, the boys try again the second time, but this time it is a sow. Now, there are no qualms about killing. Golding graphically paints this scene in a disturbing way. The narrator ominously states, “the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness” (Golding, 1954, p. 64). Zimbardo (2007) postulates:

[...] situational forces mount in power with the introduction of uniforms, costumes, and masks, all disguises of one’s usual appearance that promote anonymity and reduce personal accountability. When people feel anonymous in a situation, as if no one is aware of their true identity (and thus that no one probably cares), they can more easily be induced to behave in antisocial ways. This is especially so if the setting grants permission to enact one’s impulses or to follow orders or implied guidelines that one would usually disdain. (p. 219)

With the fact that there is no one on the island to condemn their actions, there is a sense and feeling that behind a painted mask they are acting a role. Safely in this role, they are able to execute wicked acts. When the first pig is killed, Golding describes Jack’s behavior with a juxtaposition of Jack’s various emotional responses:

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... “I cut the pig’s throat,” said Jack, proudly, and yet twitched as he said it... “There was lashings of blood,” said Jack, laughing and shuddering [...]. (Golding, 1954, p. 69)

Going from “grimaced” to “laughed,” “proudly” to “twitched,” and “laughing” to “shuddering,” conveys Jack’s conflict between acceptance and reprobation of this new endeavor. Ultimately, the important matter is that the children are able to eat meat instead of merely fruit, and Jack is admired for leading the hunters into the triumphant capture. Therefore, because of the painted faces and the successful first kill, the boys become desensitized, which leads into the brutal killing of the sow.

They could have faced a boar, but a boar is more challenging. Instead, they ambush the unsuspecting lot of pigs, and they focus on “the largest sow of the lot,” who was laying “sunk in deep maternal bliss” (p. 134). They choose to attack the mother who was surrounded by her piglets. In the boys’ eyes, the pigs were just “bloated bags of fat” (p. 134). The mentality of dominance is in action. They hunt the sow in a chaotic chase and attack, and the boys drive their spears into the sow’s flesh in:

a horrid parody of an Oedipal wedding night; these emotions, the sensations aroused by murder and death, and the overpowering and unaccustomed emotions of sexual love experienced by the half-grown boys, plus their own irrational fears and blind terrors, release the forces of death and the devil on the island. (Epstein, 2006, p. 207)

Epstein explicates the description of the scene because it correlates to a sinister image of a gang rape. If it was for the sole purpose of food, the boys could have found a boar or another pig, not the one female pig surrounded by her piglets. According to American philosopher Martha C. Nussbaum (2013), the scene is unsettling because “[n]onhuman animals care and grieve; they experience compassion and loss” (p. 138). She emphasizes that sometimes a person tends to feel superior over nonhuman animals because humans are not as “filthy” as animals are, or humans have the ability to reason and be moralistic. Some people, she says, “think that engaging in such a study [of trying to understand and connect with animal behavior] means denying the soul, religious accounts of the origins of life, and perhaps even the special bond force of morality itself” (p. 140). The fact that the study allows people to have a different perspective in having compassion and being considerate of others, which stems from being morally engaging, Nussbaum argues that this very reason can guide people into being more like animals in the manner of utilizing one’s inner soul, rather than rational thought. Animals act upon the fundamental idea of simply putting others first instead of themselves, whereas people tend to do

the opposite. Nussbaum connects the experience of compassion to the animals' sense of emotion, whether it be rudimentary or complex.

One form of compassion that Nussbaum presents is emotional contagion, which also has consolation and target helping as sub-levels (p. 148). In other words, individuals and animals have a sense of compassion through a connection. Nussbaum provides a case study as an example, in which some mice were injected with ascetic acid and that made them feel excruciating pain. The other mice who were not injected but were in close proximity to the mice in pain also exhibited a sort of distress, an "emotional contagion" (p. 149). In the context of *Lord of the Flies*, the detailed imagery of the killing of the helpless sow creates an emotional contagion in the reader, similar to the experiment with the mice. The narrator illustrates,

Here, struck down by the heat, the sow fell and the hunters hurled themselves at her. This dreadful eruption from an unknown world made her frantic, she squealed and bucked and the air was full of sweat and noise and blood and terror. Roger ran round the heap, prodding with his spear whenever pigflesh appeared. Jack was on top of the sow, stabbing downward with his knife. Roger found a lodgment for his point and began to push till he was leaning with his whole weight. The spear moved forward inch by inch and the terrified squealing became a high-pitched scream. Then Jack found the throat and the hot blood spouted over his hands. The sow collapsed under them and they were heavy and fulfilled upon her. (Golding, 1954, p. 135)

The alliteration of the H sound, the polysyndeton of "and," and the negative diction meld into a maelstrom of cruelty. Upon the conclusion of the barbarous killing, the boys are insouciant, leaving the reader wide-eyed and appalled and sympathizing with the sow.

The sow's head is fixed upon a sharpened stick as a gift for the beast. Thus, after the obscene occurrence, it is not surprising that the ghastly "[pig]head[,] ... dim-eyed, grinning faintly, blood blackening between the teeth" becomes the "Lord of the Flies" (p. 137). Many

have suggested that the “Lord of the Flies” is a reference to Beelzebub, or the devil. Simon, after witnessing the entire incident of the killing, imagines the pig-head talking to him with the voice of a “schoolmaster” and figuring that “everything was a bad business” (p. 137). The Lord of the Flies tells Simon, ““Fancy thinking the Beast was something you could hunt and kill!”” (p. 143). As one who has deep human insight, Simon realizes “the beast” lies within each boy. The Lord of the Flies warns him not to try and correct the situation because it will go worse for him (p. 144). While Simon’s intuition is for the betterment of the group, the others are blinded to that fact because Simon cannot speak properly and confidently, so he gets brushed aside.

Killing of Simon

Although Simon is good and tries to do well, his inability to project his thoughts creates a chasm between himself and the others. If the boys would have listened to Simon, they might have better understood the nature of the beast and not ended up in such an evil predicament. The moment Simon realizes that the “beast was harmless and horrible; and the news must reach the others as soon as possible” (p. 147), the setting becomes ominous. That night on the island, the air is hot and heavy, and there is thunder and lightning, indicating the coming of a storm. Robert J. White (1964) suggests, “Man, of whom society is a reflection, is never wholly in conscious control of himself. His passions are endowed with a vitality and energy of their own, so that they can force him, as if from the outside, into conduct almost alien to himself” (p. 170). In other words, impulsiveness and passion tend to work self-indulgently in a person without control. In chapter 9, Jack is having a party with the hunters, feasting on the pig (the sow). Ralph and Piggy are set apart, but the lure of the meat brings them to the party. The scene demonstrates how the

boys are starting to stray from reason and principle and toward passion and selfishness. Jack asks, “Who’ll join my tribe and have fun?” (Golding, 1954, p. 150). “Have fun” is a foreshadowing phrase. The phrase is first used by the lord of the flies when Simon hallucinates that he is talking to the pig-head. This signifies that the lord of the flies’ warning that something bad is going to happen to Simon is going to come into fruition. As Jack and Ralph begin to argue over leadership, “the flickering light became brighter and the blows of thunder were only just bearable” (p. 151). Jack declares that the boys do their dance to diffuse the tense situation. They start chanting while imitating killing a pig with one boy playing the role of the pig, ““*Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!*”” (p. 152). They create a circle with a steady movement and “Piggy and Ralph...[find] themselves eager to take a place in this demented but partly secure society” (p. 152). Zimbardo (2007) affirms, “Sensible human beings can be deceived into engaging in irrational actions under many disguised dissonance commitment settings. Social psychology offers ample evidence that when that happens, smart people do stupid things, sane people do crazy things, and moral people do immoral things” (p. 220). This indicates that the psychological stress of an individual can hinder reason and induce him to commit wicked deeds. The novel evinces, “There was the throb and stamp of a single organism” (Golding, 1954, p. 152). The boys are in a trance under thunder and lightning. Meanwhile, “A thing was crawling out of the forest...The shrill screaming that rose before the beast was like a pain. The beast stumbled into the horseshoe” (p. 152). In this ordeal, the author mentions Simon’s name once, while the other times it is “thing” and “beast.” The Beast is an abstract entity when the littluns first mention it; it is an unknown being, merely something to be feared because of the darkness of night and the unknown. When the dead pilot, carried by the parachute

and wind, lands on the island, the Beast concretizes because the boys actually see something, but are not entirely sure of what it is. Once Simon sees that it is actually a dead, rotting person, he runs to tell the others. Here, the reader notes he is “Simon;” however, in the midst of the darkness of night, the heaviness of the air, and the rapture of the circled mob, Simon is a “thing.” As he breaks into the entranced circle, Simon is a “beast.” This shows that the boys are not aware that the one who stumbles into their circle is Simon. In the pandemonium, the imagery details Simon’s grisly death:

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 beast struggled forward, broke the ring, and fell over 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. (p. 153)

The boys think they are killing the Beast in the confusion, but the actual Beast is finally unveiled in this scene—the boys are the Beast. In the evening assembly where Ralph tries to bring everything back to order after the killing and eating of the first pig, they all speculate about the Beast. The boys provide their own conception of the Beast. Piggy says that life “is scientific” (p. 84). He does not believe in the beast, and then states, ““Unless we get frightened of people”” (p. 84). Simon and Piggy touch on the idea of the beast being inside themselves. Simon also, struggling, expresses, ““maybe there is a beast...What I mean is...maybe it’s only us”” (p. 89). The Beast turns out to be a metaphor of the evil inside them.

Simon is dead, and the rain that ensues relieves the tension, splitting up the group. When the rain stops, everything is still. Simon’s corpse is laying on the beach, staining the sand with blood. Then, little by little, bioluminescent creatures approach Simon’s body. They surround the

body, illuminating it, while the tide slowly carries Simon's body to sea. In another case study by Nussbaum (2013), elephants reacted to a young elephant that was killed by a poacher. The elephants tried to revive the dead elephant but to no avail. When they realized nothing could be done, they gave her a burial by covering her with dirt (p. 149-50). Although it's not exactly similar, the bioluminescent creatures in *Lord of the Flies*, perform a similar ritual for Simon. It is as if they are a witness for Simon's suffering; they gather around him like a ceremonial burial, carrying him off to sea with the tide. The novel depicts the sadness of the death, for which only the creatures of nature have pity:

Along the shoreward edge of the shallows the advancing clearness was full of strange, moonbeam-bodied creatures with fiery eyes...Now it touched the first of the stains that seeped from the broken body and the creatures made a moving patch of light as they gathered at the edge. The water rose farther and dressed Simon's coarse hair with brightness. The line of his cheek silvered and the turn of his shoulder became sculptured marble. The strange attendant creatures, with their fiery eyes and trailing vapors, busied themselves round his head...Softly, surrounded by a fringe of inquisitive bright creatures, itself a silver shape beneath the steadfast constellations, Simon's dead body moved out toward the open sea. (Golding, 1954, p. 154)

This scene, an epitome of pathos, imparts a sense of the idea of compassion that Nussbaum posits. The creatures demonstrate the "thought of nonfault" and "eudaimonistic thought" by slowly and gently giving Simon a peaceful funeral. Moreover, the vivid and pitiful imagery of this scene contrasts with the appalling events that just transpired. The keen dedication of the creatures towards Simon and the calmness of the atmosphere juxtaposed with the brutality of the mob invites a reflection on the significance of moral consciousness. Armela Panajoti (2019) notes, "when Ralph, after Simon's death, is shocked by their participation in it and calls it murder, Piggy corrects him and calls it an accident, refusing to accept Ralph's recognition of

their inner capacity for evil” (p. 104). Zimbardo (2007) suggests, “People are less rational than they are adept at *rationalizing*—explaining away discrepancies between their private morality and actions contrary to it” (p. 220). While Ralph tries to make sense of the situation and accept the fact that they too are accountable for Simon’s death, Piggy justifies their involvement by saying, “It was dark. There was that—that bloody dance. There was lightning and thunder and rain. We was scared!” (Golding, 1954, p. 156). Piggy’s denial indicates that if he admits to his involvement, he acknowledges he was part of the violence, and he is desperately trying to stay righteous. He cannot even bring himself to say the word “murder;” however, as he repeats that it was an accident, he expresses, “Coming in the dark—he hadn’t no business crawling like that out of the dark. He was batty. He asked for it” (p. 157). Piggy argues that Simon died because he deserved it, subconsciously confessing that he partook in the evil dance that led to Simon’s death. What Piggy is demonstrating is “social reality.” According to Zimbardo (2007),

social reality...is the way actors view their situation, their current behavioral stage, which engages a variety of psychological processes. Such mental representations are beliefs that can modify how any situation is perceived, usually to make it fit or be assimilated into the actor’s expectations or personal values. (p. 221)

Therefore, Piggy adheres to the fact that Simon’s death was an accident because of different factors that do not include himself.

Killing of Piggy

Piggy is killed because, throughout the novel, he is seen as the Other, as an outcast. Even the fact that he is called Piggy makes him akin to pigs, not to mention that his hair does not grow, and he is fat. Zimbardo theorizes that the most detrimental thing to do is to dehumanize an equal

being by reasoning that others are not the same in aspects of human condition (p. 222). Piggy is made fun of at the beginning because of his name. He is the target of Jack's insults and aggression. Zimbardo argues, "In contrast to human relationships, which are subjective, personal, and emotional, dehumanized relationships are objectifying, analytical, and empty of emotional or empathic content" (p. 223). Despite Piggy's intelligence and reasonable thought, nobody takes him seriously, not even Ralph. Occasionally, he listens to Piggy's voice of reason, but Piggy annoys him, so he ignores Piggy. Moreover, Piggy's glasses are taken away several times to ignite fires and eventually the boys break them. When there is a need of the glasses in order to light a fire, Piggy is not given a chance to offer them freely. In other words, Piggy does not have a say; he is dehumanized. Thus, in the eyes of the others, Piggy is worthless.

Snatching away and stealing his glasses with no effort from the boys, especially Jack, conveys that Piggy is like an object. With the rising antagonism against Ralph and, by association, Piggy, the scene where Piggy tries to courageously oppose Jack and the boys is decidedly the moment of Piggy's death. Piggy adamantly tries to hold on to the power of the conch, the symbol of order, and is determined to stand up to Jack because "what's right's right" (Golding, 1954, p. 171). At this point, Golding distinctly labels Jack as "chief" and the boys as "savages" because after Simon's death, they beat a boy named Wilfred and claim that Simon was really a Beast disguised (p. 160). With their painted masks that make them feel omnipotent, they have fully encompassed the meaning of savage. This is why Sam'n'eric warn, "'But they'll be painted! You know how it is'" (p. 172). Ralph, Piggy, and Sam'n'eric approach the "fort" where "the chief" and his "savages" stay. Jack and Ralph fight, but Piggy cannot see and is crouched on the ground helpless. The twins, by order of Jack, are tied up, and "[n]ow the painted group felt the otherness of Sam'n'eric, felt the power in their own hands" (p. 179). When Piggy tries to

communicate reason, he is booed. In this altercation, “Someone was throwing stones: Roger was dropping them, his one hand still on the lever. Below him, Ralph was a shock of hair and Piggy a bag of fat” (p. 180). Roger does not consider the boys to be at his level; they are nothing. Consequently, Roger is the one that pushes a huge rock down the cliff, aiming at Ralph and Piggy. It hits Piggy and the conch is no more: “Piggy fell forty feet and landed on his back across the square red rock in the sea. His head opened and stuff came out and turned red. Piggy’s arms and legs twitched a bit, like a pig’s after it has been killed” (p. 181). Even upon his death, Piggy is compared to a pig. Jack’s sudden outburst, ““See? That’s what you’ll get,”” conveys the disconnect in morality (p. 181). Instead of feeling remorse, Jack demonstrates an absolute power, which motivates him to attack Ralph with a spear.

Attempt on Ralph

When Jack intentionally hurts Ralph, he gives the boys authority to do as he does. In this case, the “anonymous devils’ faces” charge at Ralph with spears. Zimbardo (2007) believes,

System Power involves authorization or institutionalized permission to behave in prescribed ways or to forbid and punish actions that are contrary to them. It provides the ‘higher authority’ that gives validation to playing new roles, following new rules, and taking actions that would ordinarily be constrained by pre-existing laws, norms, morals, and ethics. (p. 226)

In Jack’s new society, what had been learned before crashing on the island has erased, and the only thing that exists is to eliminate the ever-present threat—Ralph. Ever since Ralph was voted chief, Jack implicitly took a disliking to Ralph. With Jack’s angry outbursts, he antagonizes Ralph. From the outset, Jack is jealous of Ralph and how the other boys take a liking to him. The only way Jack could get power was to show aggression. Once the conch and Piggy disappear and the boys obey without complaint, Jack has a renewed sense of superiority, which

marks him and the boys feeling invincible, as when the novel mentions Bill: “But really, thought Ralph, this was not Bill. This was a savage whose image refused to blend with that ancient picture of a boy in shorts and shirt” (Golding, 1954, p. 183). Jack hurls a spear at Ralph, the once leader of the group, marking the event of Ralph becoming the hunted. In the novel, Ralph maintains that they are boys with sticks playing a hunting game, not immoral savages with killing tools. At the bitter end, the comprehension of the boys’ transformation from decent human beings to corrupt beings is grim. Moreover, Ralph is reduced to act and feel like a hunted animal. Sam’n’eric caution Ralph that Roger is a “terror,” implying about his sadistic tendencies. and that the “chief” (Jack) hates Ralph, so Jack’s group is going to hunt him down and Roger has “sharpened a stick at both ends” (p. 189-190). Jack’s ultimate intention is for Ralph to meet the same fate as the pigs, brutally and indifferently. During the hunt, ironically, the boys are finally able to make enough smoke to act as a signal, but their only objective is to smoke him out like an animal, setting the island on fire in the process. Just like at the beginning of the novel, the hunt is preceded by the sound of “drum-roll” (p. 192). With the suspense, nature is also in chaos. In desperation, Ralph keeps on hiding and stabbing “savages” when he must. He hears the menacing ululations of the boys, and “hopeless fear” pressures Ralph to “cry for mercy” and rush “toward the open beach” (p. 200). If he would not have come across the naval officer on the beach, Ralph would have died. The boys exhibit the same frenzy that they illustrated in killing the sow and killing Simon, which would have overwhelmed the savages and driven them to kill Ralph in a potentially more diabolical way.

In regard to Jack and his group, Panajoti (2019) postulates that the base instincts of savagery and rebelliousness, triggered by the “resistance to power,” get redirected to innocent people, like Simon, Piggy, and Ralph. She points out that Simon’s death is disregarded as

nothing more than an accident or a disguise from the Beast, while Piggy's death mirrors the deaths of the pigs. In addition, Ralph is lucky through "adult intervention" (p. 105). That is to say, the boys' inclination to oppose Ralph and what Ralph represents, which is the civilized way of society, results in devaluing the three boys—Simon, Piggy, and Ralph. Their sense of authoritative power and fear of the Beast are the catalysts for the destruction of their moral selves. White (1964) posits, "The Beast that the boys have so much feared that they have offered it bloody sacrifice is the body of a man resting against a bulging parachute seen in the half-light of late evening. That the Beast turns out to be human, that it has fallen and is now rotten and corrupt emphasizes once again that the object of the boys' dread is, in fact, a dark side of themselves" (p. 169). In scrutinizing the immoral nature of the children through the killing scenes of the sow, Simon, Piggy, and Ralph, one certainly doubts that they can actually be saved. This conveys a duality in each individual. The situation extremely matters to the point where villains or heroes are created. The stressful situation they are in affect their moral sense of judgment. In understanding why the boys are motivated to kill so eagerly, people can turn around and discover a sense of courage and the capacity for moral redemption in the boys, as well.

III. REDEEMING THE LOST BOYS

Regardless of whether inhumane practices are institutional, organizational, or individual, it should be made difficult for people to remove humanity from their conduct.

(Bandura, 1999, p. 207-208)

In the previous chapter, the focus was on particular scenes in which the characters are primarily motivated by the ideas of dominance and fear, propelled by limited knowledge, ignorance, and unfamiliar surroundings. The characters' selfish needs promoted the disintegration of their collaboration and care for one another. Even though Golding paints a compelling picture of hopelessness for humanity in *Lord of the Flies*, the small instances of righteousness cannot be disregarded; in these moments, there is hope for humanity. The children cannot absolutely be abandoned, and the reader cannot conclude that the children cannot be saved. After all, they are still children, not even teenagers yet. Golding's daughter, Judy Golding Carver, clarifies that despite everything her father witnessed, and the deeply troubling moral faults of the characters in *Lord of the Flies*, her father was an optimist. In connection to *Lord of the Flies*, she argues, "My father is often accused of being a pessimist. He often denied the accusation. He pointed out that Piggy and Simon are very good characters and almost unreasonably...brave in standing up to what they see as mistaken and disastrous authority" (William Golding Official, 2020, 00:18:10-40). In his Nobel Prize Lecture of 1983, Golding even mentions, "I am optimistic when I consider the spiritual dimension which the scientist's discipline forces him to ignore" (1983). Thus, what both Golding and his daughter reveal is that when science, rational common sense, and facts cannot be attributed to aspects of human nature,

there is the force of spirituality, the inner self, the heart, or the soul that guides a human being. Sometimes logic is not always right, so one has to think with the heart. At times, when one is in-tune with his own self, as in when one knows his true self, corruption from the outside world does not penetrate inside the depths of one's soul. In the face of adversity, some become heroes.

Considering the human condition and morality and reflecting upon the novel's message, there is indeed something redeemable within the boys. Although the instances where the boys display moral consciousness are sporadic in the novel, Golding certainly demonstrates moral engagement through Simon's actions, Roger and Jack's restraints, Ralph's acknowledgment of murder, and the fact that the boys cry at the end of the novel. The implications of their behaviors illuminate the hero within each boy, which reveals that each potentially has the capacity to remain or return to a state of humanity.

Moral engagement is activating a will to do good, to follow one's conscience. It can be in one's own natural character or socially constructed; either way, moral engagement can be defined as an effort to do the right thing. Defiance against abusive authority, challenging injustice, and altruistic deeds illustrate a resistance to evil and a significant advancement in moral conduct, which lead to acts of heroism. Heroism does not have to be an extraordinary deed by an individual, much less the ability to wield a superpower; on the contrary, heroism is simply having the courage to do the right thing when encountering injustice or violence.

According to Zimbardo (2007), "the very same situation that can inflame the *hostile imagination* and evil in some of us can inspire the *heroic imagination* in others" (p. viii). In other words, one tense situation can produce a merciless monster or benevolent human being. As the boys are all together on a deserted island, all are under stress, yet each boy acts differently and exhibits

different levels of morality. Most turn towards evil, but others exemplify the good in human nature. They are ordinary schoolboys who make impactful choices. Zimbardo generalizes:

Knowing when to stay involved with others, when to support and be loyal to a cause or a relationship rather than dismissing it, is a delicate question that we all face regularly. We live in a world in which some people aim to use us. In that same world are others who genuinely want us to share what they believe are mutually positive goals. (p. 447)

In the realm of the island, the ones who continuously strive for a good outcome are Simon and Ralph despite the overwhelming fear that takes over the other boys. Both boys, Simon more than Ralph, maintain their moral consciousness because they stay morally engaged, Simon through his charity and lack of sociability with the other boys, and Ralph through his focus on being rescued.

Even Jack and Roger, who are portrayed as the exemplars of evil, implement a compliant attitude to the notion of “moral agency,” as psychologist Albert Bandura (1999) calls it. He postulates that “moral reasoning is translated into actions through self-regulatory mechanisms rooted in moral standards and self-sanctions by which moral agency is exercised” (p. 193). Therefore, in regards to Roger and Jack, their “self-regulatory mechanisms” is their past knowledge of socialization, and their control over themselves by governing their actions. According to Kelly Smith (2008), Zimbardo’s reflections in *The Lucifer Effect*, illuminates the “nature of courage,” despite the cruelties that are mentioned (p. 289). On that same idea, therefore, in *Lord of the Flies*, the boys’ tension and stress at being stranded and alone on the island trying to fend for themselves presents their moral dilemmas to impart a reflection that hinders them from exercising cruelty, which poses a sense of hope reflected in people that humanity can overpower evil and create a harmonious society.

Simon's Actions

Zimbardo (2007) posits, "Heroism focuses on what is right with human nature[;]...people are capable of resisting evil, of not giving in to temptations, of rising above mediocrity, and of heeding the call to action and to service when others fail to act" (p. 461). Simon is a true hero. He epitomizes this idea because despite his handicaps of being afraid of speaking in public, having seizures, and being the odd one, these disabilities do not deter him from his purpose of doing the right thing. Golding asserts, "There is that nobility. There is Simon who will go up the mountain even though he's killed for it" (Faber & Faber, 2019, 00:00:10-16). After Jack and his group of hunters kill the sow and stick the sow's head on a stick as a gift to the unknown beast, Simon looks at the pig's head filled with flies and imagines the pig's head talking to him; he calls it Lord of the Flies. Simon just witnessed the hunters' evil deed against the sow, so the pig's head converts from something literal, an actual pig's head on a stick, to the abstract evil. Simon challenges the "institutional" or "systemic" powers, as Zimbardo (2007) terms it, through his defiance of the Lord of the Flies, who speaks in the voice of a "schoolmaster." The Lord of the Flies symbolizes an authoritative figure in charge of the soul's corruption. It tells Simon, "My poor, misguided child, do you think you know better than I do?" (Golding, 1954, p. 143). Usually, when dealing with authoritative figures, people do not question; they just accept the situation. People in charge command and do what they like and think they know more than others. It takes courageous individuals who adhere to their principles of morality, or just plain decency, to oppose villainous power. That is what Simon does. During his fabricated conversation with the Lord of the Flies, it warns Simon by saying, "We are going to have fun on the island! So don't try it on...—Or else...we shall do you" (p. 144). Simon imagines the Lord

of the Flies as the dark entity that hovers over the boys, so Simon thinks the Lord of the Flies is the evil part of the other boys. As the pronoun “we” suggests, Simon discerns that if he goes against the unrestrained freedom the boys are enjoying, he will meet a tragic fate. Despite the warning, Simon defies the Lord of the Flies by needing to verify what the Beast actually is, even though he knows this will bring the anger of the other boys and his own death. When Sam’n’eric mistake the dead parachutist for the Beast, Simon does not believe Sam’n’eric saw the Beast. Instead, Simon “felt a flicker of incredulity—a beast with claws that scratched, that sat on a mountaintop, that left no tracks and yet was not fast enough to catch Sam’n’eric. However Simon thought of the beast, there rose before his inward sight the picture of a human at once heroic and sick” (p. 103). Simon, in his connection between the Beast and humans, realizes that humans are capable of being “beasts,” so he understands there is a duality in human nature; it is both good and evil. Choosing to not give in to fear, he, instead, decides to remain logical, discover the truth, and reveal it in an attempt to bring the boys back to the “moral order.” Golding comments that “one tends to have a figure that stands for the moral order, [...] but the moral order as an attribute of the numinous” (Golding and Baker, 1982, p. 145). Simon is more self-aware and intuitive; therefore, he is the only one who realizes where the evil actually resides, which is inside humans who are actually both good and evil.

Through his introspection, Simon tries to give sound advice to Ralph and the group, but he always gets caught up in a predicament. At one of the assemblies, wherein the boys are discussing fear and the Beast, Simon becomes extremely shy and cannot clearly articulate his thoughts, so the boys laugh at him. The narrator specifies, “Simon became inarticulate in his effort to express mankind’s essential illness” (Golding, 1954, p. 89). Here, Simon knows that

humans can be evil and tries to express that knowledge to the others, but his attempts are in vain. In another instance, while Simon is having a seizure, “Simon [speaks] almost in [Ralph’s] ear. Ralph found that he had a rock, painfully gripped in both hands, found his body arched, the muscles of his neck stiff, his mouth strained open. ‘You’ll get back to where you came from’” (p. 111). Ralph does not quite understand what Simon means, but embedded in his sentence with the pronoun “you’ll,” Simon clearly sees Ralph, but not himself, will be saved. Thus, in these two scenes, Simon fails to make the others, especially Ralph, realize the meaning of the whole situation. Both are a chance to convey the truth, as Simon has a sort of premonition.

His wisdom and knowledge would have been able to make the situation better, but the boys are impatient and ignorant. After Sam’n’eric say they saw the Beast on top of the mountain where the fire is supposed to be maintained for smoke, Ralph, Jack, and Roger go to the mountain (at night) to investigate. They think they see the beast but do not get close enough to verify because they are too afraid. Later, Simon again proposes they attempt to investigate the validity of the Beast: “‘I think we ought to climb the mountain...What else is there to do?’” (p. 128). He feels they have made a mistake in thinking there is a Beast on the mountain. Nobody listens to him. He, then witnesses the killing of the sow and the Lord of the Flies speaks to him. He imagines a blackness spreading and faints. When he wakes up from fainting, Simon is determined to discover the truth. His discovery shows it is a dead pilot entangled in his parachute. Simon “pushed on, staggering sometimes with his weariness but never stopping...He crawled forward and soon he understood. The tangle of lines showed him the mechanics of this parody; he examined the white nasal bones, the teeth, the colors of corruption” (p. 146). Simon’s courage to challenge the Lord of the Flies and the boys’ ideology makes him heroic; he actually

goes against the perpetrators of evil. Zimbardo (2007) theorizes, “We are not slaves to power of situational forces. But we must learn methods of resisting and opposing them” (p. 446). He assesses that in spite of the negative situation one is in, one can still produce actions that are morally engaging, such as Simon’s deliberate denial and understanding of the situation that makes him uncover the truth.

Roger and Jack’s Moral Restraint

Roger and Jack are seen to be the violent authorities on the island. However, they grapple with their own moral dilemmas. Although Roger is depicted as a “terror” (Golding, 1954, p. 189), he exhibits restraint. He cannot be wholly lost if he is able to restrain himself on occasion because this means he is able to still be good. For example, when Roger follows Henry (a littlun), Roger is hindered by a sense of a moral standard that was cultivated in him by the society of his past. The narrator describes:

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 policemen and the law. Roger’s arm was conditioned by a civilization that knew nothing of him and was in ruins. (p. 62)

Regardless of the fact that his past society is in “ruins,” Roger continues to uphold to the rule that one should not hurt others, and if he does, he would suffer the punishment enforced by rule-makers, and so he “dares not” hurt Henry. Bandura (1999) formulates that the “regulation of humane conduct involves much more than moral reasoning”; it “must link moral knowledge and reasoning to moral action” (p. 193). Roger’s thought, along with his action, prove that his self-

control results from a learned moral conduct, which entails his will to act morally. Zimbardo (2007) also posits, “We become more resistant to undesirable social influence by always maintaining a sense of personal responsibility and by being willing to be held accountable for our actions” (p. 453). In the case of Roger, he still felt liable if something were to happen to Henry, and even in the absence of rule-makers, he prevents himself from hitting Henry.

Roger and Jack show that they can get along and abide by the rules. They illustrate the ability to be in social agreement with Ralph, the group’s chosen leader. This endorsement of social order is to maintain the peace. When people follow society’s rules, everyone is in a consensus of good will toward others. Roger is the one that decides to have a vote for chief so that everyone is in agreement (Golding, 1954, p. 22). Jack, as leader of the hunters, shares leadership with Ralph, and when they go exploring the island their attitude towards each other is that of friendship. One rule that the boys establish is that whoever holds the conch is allowed to speak, and Jack obeys this rule even when he does not want to. For instance, after Ralph spots a ship in the distance, he notices that the other boys had gone off hunting, forgetting about the fire and smoke, which costs them a chance at getting rescued. While Jack is elated to have caught and killed a pig for food, Ralph is furious that they have missed this opportunity. Ralph realizes the group is beginning to lose focus on getting rescued, so he calls an assembly to put everything back on track. As Ralph talks, “Jack stood up, scowling in the gloom, and held out his hands. ‘I haven’t finished yet.’ ‘But you’ve talked and talked!’ ‘I’ve got the conch.’ Jack sat down, grumbling” (p. 81-82). His patience is minimal, but he still acknowledges the power of the conch and Ralph’s authority. Although Roger and Jack detach themselves from the group and

become “savages,” their own group still has rules that they follow. In each of these situations, they collectively co-exist with rules of a society in order to cooperate and survive.

Jack’s individual moral restraint is first seen when he, Ralph, and Simon explore the island. They encounter a piglet, and Jack, while intent on killing the pig, does not budge, for he feels the weight of taking a life.

[Jack] raised his arm in the air. There came a pause, a hiatus, the pig continued to scream and the creepers to jerk, and the blade continued to flash at the end of a bony arm. The pause was only long enough for them to understand what an enormity the downward stroke would be... They knew very well why he hadn’t: because of the enormity of the knife descending and cutting into living flesh; because of the unbearable blood. (p. 31)

As a child listening to the terrified noises of an animal, it is normal to have this heart-wrenching moral dilemma; after all, an animal is similar to a human being in its instincts and biological elements. Human beings are like animals in the sense that they feel fear and react with a flight or fight impulse when in danger. Both animals and humans are motivated by their environments and react instinctively to various situations. Furthermore, just like humans, animals have a beating heart, an active brain, and other similar organs; pigs, in particular, share many biological similarities with humans. Therefore, Jack hesitates to kill the first pig because he recognizes the fact that the animal is a *living* being, similar to a human.

According to Zimbardo (2007), “We can be led to do things that are not really what we believe in when we allow ourselves to become trapped in an expanded present moment” (p. 455). This means Jack, as leader of the hunters, knows that he needs to take charge and hunt for food; hunting, of course, necessitates killing. He knows killing is wrong, but he still needs to become desensitized in order to accomplish the goal of getting food, or he will never be able to get food.

This is equivalent to doctors who need to perform surgery or law enforcement who need to counter injustice; they need to be limitedly desensitized in order to handle the issues ethically. Unfortunately, Jack becomes “trapped” in the “expanded present moment” because he forgets about his past civility and does not consider the future consequences. Once his desensitization is established, it produces evil actions. However, Zimbardo proposes, “we must increase our collective sensitivity to the broad range of daily situations where interventions occur as a ‘natural’ process of social life and where a violation of ethics goes unnoticed because of its prevalent and insidious presences” (p. 233). This expresses the need for balance in order to not break the boundaries of human rights. As specified in the previous chapter, Jack indeed crosses an ethical line because he purposely hunts down Ralph at the end, but, paradoxically, Jack is still capable of maintaining and reverting back to moral standards based on the previous instances wherein he was able to accept the rules and hesitance to kill.

Ralph’s Acknowledgment of Murder

On the spectrum of good and evil, Ralph is in the middle. He tries to be good, and his practicality allows him to focus on the goal of being rescued, so he maintains responsibility for his actions throughout the novel. He does stray a little when he experiences the thrilling world of hunting. As Ralph and the group search for the Beast on the mountain, they come across a boar and Ralph declares that he hit the pig. He enthusiastically says, “I hit him all right. The spear stuck in. I wounded him!” (Golding, 1954, p. 113). Afterwards, Ralph feels free from chores; hunting was a fun game, and he “sunned himself in their new respect and felt that hunting was good after all” (p. 113). After the boys have killed the sow and Jack has formed his own

detached group of savages, Jack and the savages invade Ralph's group to steal fire for their cooking. Ralph chooses to be mature and do what is suitable. He acknowledges, "Without the fire we can't be rescued. I'd like to put on war-paint and be a savage. But we must keep the fire burning" (p. 142). A short while later, Ralph and his group are lured by the temptation of meat, and Jack allows them to eat, but Ralph starts up an argument again because Jack wants to have his own tribe and Ralph repeatedly asserts that he was chosen chief. When the issue of shelters arises due to the impending storm, Jack releases the apprehensiveness that the boys feel and orders them to dance—the devilish dance of pretending to kill a pig, but this time their chant is "*Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!*" (p. 152). In this reckless affair, "Piggy and Ralph, under the threat of the sky, found themselves eager to take a place in this demented but partly secure society" (p. 152). They do so because they feel included, and so the confusion rises to a pandemonium. The whole chaotic occurrence leads to the death of Simon, who is thought to be the Beast. Then comes the aftermath—regret and guilt. Zimbardo (2007) argues that a step to resistance of evil is to admit that one is wrong and to learn from that experience, not to justify mistakes because that only leads to supporting "immoral actions." He points out, "Accept the dictum that to err is human... You had every reason to believe it was right when you made it, but now you know you were wrong" (p. 452). That is the difference that is seen between Ralph and Piggy. In his consternation, Ralph takes the shell, the symbol of law and order, "caressingly" and kneels, "leaning against the trunk [where the assemblies take place]" (Golding, 1954, p. 156). He slowly and undeniably comes to the realization that he was involved in Simon's death. He, "shivering," tells Piggy, "That was Simon... That was murder" (p. 156). Piggy tries to justify their actions by saying it was an accident, but Ralph, "cradling the conch, [rocking] himself to

and fro” (p. 157), understands the significance of the one night of unleashed impulse. He recognizes that he too is susceptible to evil things. He utters, ““The things we did—’... ‘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” (p. 157). The dashes in the text, combined with the connotation of “loathing,” emphasize the shock and distress Ralph feels in admitting his involvement. Ralph does not ignore the fact that he had something to do with Simon’s death; on the contrary, he tries to fundamentally understand the evil within himself because his conscience tells him the killing was wrong. Of course, his self-awareness is limited since he is only twelve years old; nonetheless, he does not dismiss his conscience like Piggy, who declares, ““Coming in the dark—he hadn’t no business crawling like that out of the dark. He was batty. He asked for it”” (p. 157). Piggy does not accept the blame for the crime committed, giving the excuses that he was on the outside of the circle and that he could not really see. This situation illustrates the dichotomy of human nature. Ralph takes his steps toward resisting evil by acquiescing that he did something reprehensible and being perceptive about it, which he ultimately certifies, ““I’m frightened. Of us”” (p. 157). Piggy, on the other hand, exposes the “egocentric biases,” as Zimbardo (2007) coins it, that people tend to have when they think they could not do such atrocious deeds. Zimbardo points out, “Most of us hide behind egocentric biases that generate the illusion that we are special. These self-serving protective shields allow us to believe that each of us is above average on any test of self-integrity” (p. 5). Based on the sole reason that people are imperfect human beings that have a number of emotions, individuals cannot conclude that they are an exception merely because they strive to do good. When one’s internal state is challenged with the stress of their situation, one can do something similar to what Piggy does.

At the time Simon is killed, it is dark; there is thunder and lightning and there is the trance of the chant and the body movements. The killing is not condoned by the reader, but it is understandable that it happened. All in all, “We need to be reminded not to live our lives on automatic pilot but always to take a Zen moment to reflect on the meaning of the immediate situation, to think before acting” (p. 453). Zimbardo advises to observe and then act in order to prevent individuals from acting rashly and feeling remorse afterwards, just like Ralph. If Ralph would have thought a little more and listened to Piggy when he said to leave after eating meat, he would not have been in his predicament of guilt and regret; withal, the fact that Ralph actually feels remorse makes the reader empathize with him because he is ashamed of what he did.

Atoneable Lamentation

At the end of the novel, as Ralph is being hunted down by the chief (Jack) and his “savages,” he stumbles onto the beach to find a naval officer standing looking at them. Some critics, like Marinela Lupsa, stipulate that even though the children are physically saved, they, ironically, will board “a war ship that after saving a group of ‘wild’ children will continue its mission and kill people in the name of saving civilization” (Tomoiaga et al., 2012, p. 190). Moreover, the adults have no way of coming to terms with peace. The novel alludes to a war that is concurrently taking place with the events on the boys’ island, hence the reason for their air transportation without their parents. While conversing with Ralph, at the beginning, Piggy expresses the thought that nobody knows where they are, and it is going to be difficult to be rescued: ““Didn’t you hear what the pilot said? About the atom bomb? They’re all dead”” (Golding, 1954, p. 14). Then, in chapter 6, there is an aerial battle ensuing, which further

implies that the adult world is not at peace. The title of the chapter, “Beast from Air,” is significant because the aerial war is another metaphorical Beast; people die. War is evil, and the beast as it is referenced in the novel is evil too. The dead parachutist drops from that world above:

There were other lights in the sky, that moved fast, winked, or went out, though not even a faint popping came down from the battle fought at ten miles’ height. But a sign came down from the world of grown-ups... There was a sudden bright explosion and corkscrew trail across the sky... There was a speck above the island, a figure dropping swiftly beneath a parachute, a figure that hung with dangling limb. (p. 95)

This imagery does not evoke the slightest optimism about the boys’ future; however, at the very end of the novel, the boys begin to cry, evoking the catharsis. The crying is not an insignificant detail; it firmly illustrates a hope—a hope that humanity has a chance for survival, that humaneness is not abandoned. The narrator describes:

The tears began to flow and sobs shook him. He gave himself up to them now for the first time on the island; great, shuddering spasms of grief that seemed to wrench his whole body. His voice rose under the black smoke before the burning wreckage of the island; and infected by that emotion, the other little boys began to shake and sob too. (p. 202)

The pathos suggests that the boys have gained knowledge of the severity of their actions and their characters, while the naval officer comments, “Jolly good show” (p. 202) and “Fun and games” (p. 200). The naval officer renders the children insignificant by thinking they are simply playing games. In his closed mindset, he believes the children are not capable of immoral actions. He even thinks that his involvement in war is of moral integrity because he comes from a country (England) which deems itself superior, thus, contributes to the one-sided thinking. Albert Bandura (2002) terms this as “moral justification.” He explains that moral justification

happens when people justify their violent actions as being something that is morally rationalized in the individual's mind as "serving socially worthy or moral purposes" (p. 103). In the case of the naval officer, he justifies the children's plight as a sort of enjoyment rather than a dire situation, and his neat and decorative white uniform, in his mind is a symbol of the moral righteousness of the English. The children understand more the gravity of the situation rather than the adult. Golding asserts,

the fact that man is, I believe, by nature a moral creature, and when he's in free fall he, so to speak, stumbles over his morals without knowing they are there. He exploits people and then finds that with this comes guilt and that you can't be free of right and wrong because you know by some kind of instinct when you've exploited somebody, when you've hurt somebody, when you've cheated somebody. You know when you lie and all the rest of it. It's no good saying none of these things matter. They do. They matter intensely to man because he is not just man, he is a social being. (Golding and Baker, 1982, p. 133-134)

This is the reason for the children crying; they know they have "stumbled" and are feeling overwhelmingly distressed. In his anguish, Ralph "dumbly" looks at the officer who just mentioned "Jolly good show." The phrase becomes absurd in comparison to what Ralph was experiencing before the officer shows up. Ralph remembers the ordeal of the island and begins to have "spasms of grief" (Golding, 1954, p. 202). Ralph's crying spreads to the other boys. E.L. Epstein (2006) posits, "The moral is that the shape of a society must depend on the ethical nature of the individual and not on any political system however apparently logical or respectable" (p. 204). The focus of the novel's ethical quandaries is centered on the children, not on the adults who are at war. The children are the ones crying; the children are the ones who have the epiphany of the grave nature of the perverseness of fear, hate, superiority, and passiveness. To illustrate, the narrator states one of the most significant lines of the novel: "Ralph wept for the end of innocence, the darkness of man's heart..." (Golding, 1954, p. 202).

Unfortunately, the children are no longer innocent, but have the experience thrust upon them. Sometimes, children cannot help their negative circumstances but have to learn how to cope and adjust in order to survive a cruel world. However, in understanding the concept of the cruel world, children can develop more compassion, empathy, and self-control. As people say, children are our future. The children have learned, through their time on the island, the circumstances that have led to “moral disengagement” (Bandura, 1999, p. 194). As Dolly Chugh, et al. (2014) emphasizes, moral disengagement “enables ordinary people to do unethical things, free from the stomach-churning and self-flagellation that such behavior usually evokes” (p. 88). The boys’ sense of anonymity through the face-painting, their desensitization to violence, and their dehumanization of others advanced the propagation of their evil nature. The sudden eruption of their crying signals a moment of confrontation with themselves. *The American Heritage College Dictionary* defines “cry” as a verb, meaning “to sob or shed tears because of grief, sorrow, or pain.” As a noun, cry is “a loud utterance of an emotion, such as fear or despair,” even an “urgent entreaty or appeal” (American Heritage, 2002, p. 343). This short, one-syllable word contains the intensity of the children’s tragic circumstances, the reckoning plea to their spirit of humanity. In this action, the children go through an emotional purge of antagonism and cruelty. Their cries offer an atonement that makes the children redeemable because, as their innocence is lost, they are left with the experience that will haunt them in the future. Their cry is also a cry of hope because they will grow up to be adults in the future. Unlike the naval officer on the beach in his impeccable white uniform, they will have the capacity to make comparisons and offer solutions of peace rather than continue or create war.

In spite of the overpowering violence, the moral standard in the boys can be re-established by their awareness of evil. Zimbardo (2007) insists, “It is by understanding the how and why of such evils that we are all in a better position to uncover, oppose, defy, and triumph over them. By becoming more ‘evil smart,’ we build up a firm resistance to having our moral compass reset negatively” (p. viii). Therefore, one can optimistically speculate that through the glimpses of heroism of Simon, restraints from Roger and Jack, the admittance of wrongdoing from Ralph, and the crying of the boys that the boys’ can be redeemed. Zimbardo expands that the evil that surrounds us can be “countered, and eventually overcome, by the greater good in the collective hearts and personal heroic resolve of Everyman and Everywoman” (p. 488). This elucidates on the idea that if a few people, not just one, come together to combat evil, good triumphs. If Ralph and Piggy would have supported Simon instead of thinking him weird, there may have been a chance to reasonably survive well on the island. Golding agrees with this notion because he considers:

Now with our awareness of ourselves as individuals inescapably comes in this other thing, this destructive thing, the evil, if you like. It seems to me that this self-awareness, intelligence, with these come the defect of their virtue. We have to learn, and it's quite possible, I think, that we never shall learn, that as a species that will be the thing which will trip us up, our own intelligence and our own lusts. But if we are going to survive those two aspects of man, his selfishness and his intelligence, we've got to learn to control those, otherwise they tend to destroy us. I think they are what mark us off from the animal kingdom, so far a marked off from it. (Golding and Baker, 1982, p. 135)

Reflection, self-control, altruism, and learning from mistakes are choices that individuals make to oppose inward evil. Self-knowledge impedes immorality to penetrate one’s moral nature. Golding’s intention in pitting boys against each other is this self-awareness in order to redress people’s inner antagonism and the antagonism towards others.

IV. CONCLUSION

He can still be a noble creature although...he breaks.

—William Golding

As Golding did not refer himself as a pessimist, which is a view that mostly all readers and critics hold, this paper attempted to show the optimism that he believed is subtly demonstrated in *Lord of the Flies*, conjunctionally to Zimbardo who also shows optimism through understanding of the evil impact on individuals. In the words of Golding: “My own faith is that the truth of the future lies [in that] we shall behave humanly and a bit humanely, stumbling along, haphazardly generous and gallant, foolishly and meanly wise until the rape of our planet is seen to be the preposterous folly that it is” (Nobel Lecture, 1983). Thus, his very own work, *Lord of the Flies*, corroborates the duality of human beings. On the one hand, he observes the wickedness that cultivates inside a person, and on the other, he also recognizes a humaneness maintained in a person’s core. The noted killing scenes, as a metaphor to people’s impulsive behavior, renders the novel disheartening. The killing of the sow, of Simon, of Piggy, and the attempt on Ralph portrays the crux of immorality in mankind. The characters’ motivating factors of superiority and fear generated by the children’s distressing situation lead to desensitization and dehumanization, corrupting the boys’ moral standards. As Golding states, “...anything will break given sufficient strain and any human being will break given sufficient strain” (Faber & Faber, 2019, 0:00:45-53). Despite their malicious conduct, the children demonstrate moral engagement. The fact that their collective moral consciousnesses activate in the stressful predicament of being alone without parental guidance and having to fend for

themselves with the basic survival necessities, not to mention controlling their childish fears, is worth appreciating, for it reveals humans are not at a total loss.

Simon holistically embodies an ordinary hero. He manifests concern and compassion to others, especially the more vulnerable like Piggy and the littluns. Roger and Jack hesitate to perform evil actions. Both validate that moral choice is rooted in an individual regardless of their unscrupulous actions. Ralph's confession of his involvement in Simon's death due to his unrestrained impulses certifies that a guilty conscience can redirect someone's wayward path. Finally, the boys' shared grief express an optimism toward humanity. It indicates that human beings might be morally redeemed despite their lapses in judgment, or moments of evil. Therefore, the ending of *Lord of the Flies* should not only be seen as a dejected view upon mankind, as many scholars have pointed out, but as an auspicious perspective that with experience comes understanding, and with understanding comes positive action.

Drawing extensively from Philip Zimbardo's book *The Lucifer Effect*, the examination of the various scenes and the boys' motivations and actions evinces an understanding and empathy to the boys' plight. Zimbardo's lengthy research and experimentation establish that when people find themselves in certain negative situations that cause tension, good people can become evil, yet good people can also uncover their inner strength through courage and oppose immorality and injustice. Simon and Ralph's charitable and righteous actions attest to this notion of fortitude and valor, while the long, tense stay on the island suggests Jack and Roger's degenerate behavior.

Psychologists, philosophers, authors, behavioral scientists, and others have been, are, and will continue to find logic in what makes humans human and what could be done to find peace in oneself and collectively. Arguably, if people cannot eliminate their negative emotions, which

lead to impulsive and immoral conduct, and, hence, evil, it is futile to think that *every* single person in this world will be good. William Golding stresses,

But then, all day long action is weighed in the balance and found not opportune nor fortunate nor ill-advised but good or evil. For this mode which we call the spirit breathes through the universe and does not touch it: touches only the dark things held prisoner, incommunicado, touches, judges, sentences and passes on. Both worlds are real. There is no bridge. (Nobel Lecture, 1983)

Golding accentuates evil will always be evident, as is good. Evil is ironically necessary for good to shine. Negative experiences promote wisdom and altruism. To this extent, utilizing literature like *Lord of the Flies* and research like that of Philip Zimbardo, and evaluating the antagonism between people's inner selves and towards others, humans can be able to change in order to be in harmony and not destroy each other. Anything is worth a try, and if it helps change a negative perspective to a positive one, then there is a promising hope for mankind, but not utopian nor dystopian, but rather a balance. Just as such, Golding puts it very well:

They may allow man to speak to man, the man in the street to speak to his fellow until a ripple becomes a tide running through every nation – of commonsense, of simple healthy caution, a tide that rulers and negotiators cannot ignore so that nation does truly speak unto nation. Then there is hope that we may learn to be temperate, provident, taking no more from nature's treasury than is our due. It may be by books, stories, poetry, lectures we who have the ear of mankind can move man a little nearer the perilous safety of a warless and provident world. (Nobel Lecture, 1983)

In the context of seeing a brighter future for society through the research of the novel, this paper calls attention to Martha Nussbaum's approach of compassion displayed by animals and connection to humans discussed in relation to the killing of the sow and Simon's death. Her research could further be considered in rationalizing the issue of morality. While Zimbardo focuses on situations, Nussbaum focuses on animals. According to Nussbaum (2013), animals

can teach people a lot about being morally conscious and socially agreeable. For example, if humans are not in predicaments of suffering, they need to vividly imagine the suffering in order to be compassionate, which leans to the understanding of morality. Nussbaum theorizes that “having the generally valuable capacity to see ourselves as beings who can make choices, pursuing some inclinations and inhibiting others, we also develop the capacity to impute defective choice to others, and we inhibit compassion on that account” (p. 158). In other words, as rational beings, we blame, find fault, and ostracize others when their actions go against our judgment or do not fit in to the norm, which is a flawed product of civilized society. She continues to indicate that we have other bad behaviors in contrast with animals: “genocide, sadistic torture, ethnic cleansing” (p. 159). This is true, aside from animal predators whose instinct is to kill for food. Humans must be able to associate with animals because animals do not have the capacity to care about inferiority or identity; therefore, the study of animals allows people to not only care for the suffering of other human beings, but also care about the suffering of animals. Humans desire respect and acceptance, and even though some people might think they are above others, they are still all the same—humans; hence, compassion and altruism learned from dogs who provide unconditional love, learned from elephants who mourn, help, and celebrate others, and even learned from mice who experience similar pain, support a just world that could be lived in harmony. In regards to *Lord of the Flies*, nature itself, the pigs, and the bioluminescent creatures in the natural world offer a counterpoint to the boys on the subject of morality. We can start by accepting Nussbaum’s idea that animals have much to show humans about having the moral freedom to choose compassion over cruelty and respect over indifference.

Golding's novel, superficially and most prominently, expounds on the deterioration of mankind without proper guidance from a prudent and just leader. However, looked at from a different angle, Golding advocates for the invincible individuals who try to make a difference. Simon and Ralph still try to maintain order and amicability in the overpowering antagonism of the boys' uncivilized group. Zimbardo's text also supports those individuals that are overruled by the majority. Through his research of the Stanford experiment and Abu Ghraib prison, there were only a few people that stood up against inhumanity. It only takes one person to make a difference in a group whose negativity and immorality is feeding off of groupthink. It only takes one person to understand the severity of a situation and, most importantly, act upon it. The characters' behaviors in *Lord of the Flies* expounds on the awareness of the crux of immorality. In depicting their moral dilemmas and synthesizing both the impulsive and base instincts that lead to cruelty with the moral engagement of their actions, Golding certifies that although human duality exists, there is still a redeemable quality that proves that humanity can overpower evil. Additionally, people in the present time can acknowledge evil inside themselves in order to have the courage and capacity to change for a more moral and sound world.

REFERENCES

- Allan, D.G. (2017, January 18). Which side of ourselves will prevail? The Wisdom Project. *CNN*.
- American Heritage. (2002). Cry. In *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, (Fourth ed., p.343). Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Babb, H.S. (1970). *The Novels of William Golding*. Ohio State UP.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities. *Personality & Social Psychology Review (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)*, 3 (3), 193. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3.
- .(2002). Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31 (2), 101–119. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1080/0305724022014322.
- Chugh, D., et al. (2014). Withstanding Moral Disengagement: Attachment Security as an Ethical Intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 51, 88–93. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2013.11.005.
- Epstein, E.L. (2006). Notes on Lord of the Flies. In William Golding, *Lord of the Flies* (pp. 203-208). Penguin.
- Faber and Faber. (2019). *William Golding on the Surprising Optimism of Lord of the Flies* [video]. YouTube. www.youtube.com/watch?v=6SOdsDQO-gE.
- Fitzgerald, J.F. & Kayser, J.R. (1992). Golding's 'Lord of the Flies': Pride as Original Sin. *Studies in the Novel*, 24 (1), 78-88. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/29532839.
- Golding, W. (1954). *Lord of the Flies*. Penguin.
- Golding, W. & Baker, J.R. (1982). An Interview with William Golding. *Twentieth Century Literature*, 28, (2), 130–170. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/441151.
- Gyllensten, L. (1983). Award ceremony speech. *NobelPrize.org*. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1983/ceremony-speech/>
- Leone, B., et al. (1997). *Readings on Lord of the Flies*. Greenhaven Press.
- LibQuotes. (2021). *Stephen King Quote*. <https://libquotes.com/stephen-king/quote/lbr9x4c>
- Nanticoke Indian Association. (2011). *The Tale of Two Wolves*. Nanticokeindians. www.nanticokeindians.org/page/tale-of-two-wolves.
- Nobel Foundation. (1983). *William Golding: Nobel Lecture*. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1983/golding/lecture/>
- Nussbaum, M.C. (2013). *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*. Harvard UP.
- Panajoti, A. (2019). The Lure of the Island: The workings of power in Golding's Lord of the Flies. *British and American Studies*, 25, 97-105. ProQuest, <https://tamiu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.tamiu.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/lure-island-workings-power-goldings-lord-flies/docview/2253170035/se-2?accountid=7081>.
- Smith, K. C. (2008). The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil. *Public Integrity*, 10 (3), 287–291. EBSCOhost, tamiu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=33160475&scope=site.

- Tomoiaga, L., et al. (2012). *From Francis Bacon to William Golding : Utopias and Dystopias of Today and of Yore*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
EBSCOhost,search.ebscohost.com.tamtu.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?
direct=true&db=e000xna&AN=523531&scope=site.
- White, R. J. (1964). Butterfly and Beast in 'Lord of the Flies.' *Modern Fiction Studies*, 10 (2), 163–170. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26278635.
- William Golding Official. (2020). "*Writing Lord of the Flies: War and Fatherhood* [video]. YouTube. www.youtube.com/watch?v=LQRO08aV4qw&t=91s.
- Wilson, E. (2014). Warring Sovereigns and Mimetic Rivals: On Scapegoats and Political Crisis in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. *Law & Humanities*, 8 (2), 147-173. EBSCOhost, doi: 10.5235/17521483.8.2.147.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil* (1st ed.). Random House.
- Žižek, S. (2008). *Violence*. Picador.

VITA

Tanya Alfaro attended Laredo Community College through the Honors Program and received an Associate's Degree of Arts in French in May 2002. She then attended the University of Texas at San Antonio, where she graduated with a Bachelor's degree of Arts in French and a minor in English Literature in August 2005. During her time at University of Texas at San Antonio, Tanya also attended the Université Grenoble Alpes in Grenoble, France in Summer 2004. From 2017 to 2021, she strived for her Master's degree of Arts in English at Texas A&M International University. She is currently a high school English teacher at Lyndon B. Johnson High School in Laredo, Texas, where she has been teaching for fifteen years.