From Heart of Whiteness to Heart of Darkness and the Subversion of the Western Eurocentric Discourse: A Postcolonial Reading of Golding's Lord of the Flies

من قلب البياض إلى قلب الظلام، نسف خطاب المركزيّة الأوروبيّة: قراءةٌ ما بعد الكولونياليّة لرواية أمير الذباب لِ غولدينغ

Mohammed GOUFFI *

Degree: PhD

Professional title: Lecturer Department of Letters and English language, Mohamed Boudiaf University of M'sila, Algeria.

mohammed.gouffi@univ-msila.dz

Submission date :13/07/2022 Acceptance date: 05/09/2022 Published date :29/09/2022

Abstract: The present essay scrutinizes the subversion of the western Eurocentric discourse of civilizational supremacy in William Golding's Lord of the Flies (1954). It attempts to trace the way Golding delineates the deviation of the European society from the world of order and civilization that is referred to here as 'the heart of whiteness' into the world of disorder and savagery or what is labelled here as 'the heart of darkness' to create a form of internal colonization. Put under a postcolonial microscope, the study attempts to show how the western Eurocentric view of civilization is undermined in such a way the conflict is described as a sort internal colonization. As a picaresque text, the novel offers the readers an opportunity to probe into the experience of children group who—when are evacuated from Britain because of a nuclear war—find themselves stranded in an uninhabited island after the crash of their airplane and the death of all the adults. In dealing with the new situation, the schoolchildren decide to fashion a utopian society, but their attempts at establishing a social order gradually devolve into savagery when some of them turn into internal colonizers in a Darwinist fashion. Finally abandoning all moral constraints, the colonizer-boys commit murder and lead mutiny against democracy's camp before they are rescued to return to civilization.

Keywords: Heart of Whiteness, Heart of Darkness, Subversion, Eurocentricism, Discourse, Postcolonial theory

*-Corresponding author

الملخص: يَبحثُ هذا المقال تحديدا في نسف خطاب المركزيّة الأوروبيّة تُجاه التفوّق الحضاريّ الغربيّ في رواية أمير الذباب (1954) لويليام جولدينج، حيث تستهدف هذه الدراسة الكيفية التي يُجسّد بها الكاتبُ انحراف بوصلة المجتمع الأوروبيّ عن أطُر النظام والحضارة، وذلك ما أُشير إليه في سياق الدراسة بمسمّى "قلب البياض" وانزلاقه نحو عالم الفوضى والوحشيّة أو ما يصطلح على تسميته "قلب الظلام" ما يُمهّد لقيام شكل جديد يُدعي "الاستعمار الداخليّ". تُقدّم الرواية للقراء، وهي تنتمي الى جنس البكاراسك، فرصةً للتحقيق في تجربة مجموعة أطفال يجدون أنفسهم عالقين في جزيرة غير مأهولة بعد تحطم طائرتهم وموت كل الكبار، حيث يتمّ إجلاؤهم من بريطانيا بسبب حرب نووية، وللتعامل مع الوضع الجديد يُصمّم الأولاد على بناء مجتمعهم الخاصّ، ولكنّ محاولاتهم لتأسيس نظام اجتماعيّ مُحكم التنظيم تتحول تدريجياً إلى وحشيّة، حينما ينقلب بعض الأولاد إلى مستعمرين داخليّين على طريقة نظريّة التطوّر لداروين. وفي الأخير، يرتكب الأولاد المستعمِرون جرائم قتل متبوعة بإعلان تمرّد على معسكر الديمقراطيّة عقب تخليهم عن جميع القيود والقيم الأخلاقيّة، قبل أن يتمّ إنقاذهم وإعادتهم إلى رحاب الحضارة.

- Introduction:

Although Golding's *Lord of the Flies,* published in 1954, is "now considered classic" (Johnston and Mangat 19), it is still the centre of rich discussions since its coming "to the limelight and its underlying philosophy has been variously interpreted since then" (Haldar v). An ostensibly simple story of schoolchildren stranded on an uninhabited island, *Lord of the Flies (*henceforth *Lord)* has confirmed to be one of the most mysterious and provocative literary pieces ever written. As an allegorical and picaresque text, the novel sketches the ordeal of schoolchildren who find themselves alone in an unpeopled island after the crush of their airplane— while being evacuated from Britain because of a nuclear war, resulting in the death of all adults. The story suggests that the boys begin primarily to think of rescue, but also in building their own society, a society that is similar to the one they left behind in the heart of whiteness. However, the eventful scenes of the story reveal the children's gradual devolvement into savagery and anarchy. This novel still maintains canonical status to the present day as "the ways in which the boys adapt to their new tropical background

is the book's main theme, and 'interpretations' of it depend largely upon a reader's own particular preoccupations" (Braybooke 356).

Seeing its demanding themes, the novel was the centre of much attention in British and world literary and cultural circles for what it has to say on human nature, the collapse of civilizational values, and the human inclination to primitivism and savagery. In addition, many researches discuss stylistically the plot, the novel's symbolism, and even the text's reflections on feminism. Nonetheless, the present study is an attempt to ponder "the dangerous but necessary job of interpretation" (Gallagher 198) in the novel's unexplored layers of meaning. Namely, it offers a relatively different reading of the novel where meaning is further contextualized by tracing historical views on Eurocentricism from a postcolonial perspective. It argues that in the novel the readers can conceive of the schoolboys' experience as an experimental displacement from heart of whiteness: Britain, into heart of darkness: the uninhabited island.

In scrutinizing the novel's actions that oscillate between order and civilization to chaos and tyranny, the study endeavours to achieve set of objectives. To begin with, the research intends to deal with *Lord* as postcolonial novel, showing up the dilemma of a traumatic passage from the world of order and whiteness into the heart of darkness. Second, it aims to account for the boy's moral and political deviation from the ideals of whiteness to result in dismantling heart of whiteness, setting the pillars of a heart of darkness. Moreover, the essay's focus is increasingly centered on novel's representation of the clash between Ralph's tribe and Jack's tribe in such a way the latter's thirst for power allows for the emergence of the intriguing trope of the child-colonizer. In sharp contrast to the general critical perception, this paper explores how the novel presents a critique to the British Empire. For instance, the analysis sets to negate Stefan Hawlin's standpoint embedded in his paper insightfully entitled, "The savages in the forest: decolonising William Golding", claiming that Golding's novel "is, in its odd way, a defence of colonialism" (125). He writes:

> The ambivalence of feeling involved in the decolonisation process lies at the heart of *Lord of the Flies*, for the novel is defensive about the surrender of Empire, and makes an attempt to restate the old Empire misrepresentations of white enlightenment and black savagery. Under a thin disguise it presents the cliché about the bestiality and savagery of natives, the 'painted niggers' in the forest, ready at a whim to tear each other to pieces in tribal conflict unless the white 'grown-ups' come to rescue them from themselves. It is, in its odd way, a defence of colonialism. (125)

Notwithstanding Hawlin's claims, the present study surmises it is from the child experience in the isolated land that the will to colonial dominion emerges. In this regard, the other objective of the present research is to show how the novel implicitly criticizes the western Eurocentric discourse and foretells its subversion. Departing from the point that "both orientalist and colonial discourses employ the trope of the child to categorize the Other as innocent and childlike," (Sugirtharajah *Imagining Hinduism* 31) the study seeks to explain how the novel undermines the western Eurocentric view of supremacy, wherein the conflict is described in terms of an internal colonization, wherein the child-colonizer descends from the metropole: the locus of civilization and culture. Hence put under a postcolonial microscope, it is important to note that the application of postcolonial theory is not exclusively applied within the contexts of external colonization. It can be employed even within states where a minority exploits the majority or vice versa. But precisely because of that, this study therefore approaches *Lords* from a postcolonial perspective, wherein the white rebellious boys are the colonizer; the civilized and defenseless boys as the colonized; and the tropical island the colony.

So, in the process of achieving these objectives, the study begs the following questions: as postcolonial text, how does Golding's *Lord of the Flies* delineate the dilemma of moving traumatically and deviating abominably from the world of order

and whiteness into the heart of darkness? In what way does the novel represent of the clash between children tribes in such a way the hunger for power allows for the emergence of the intriguing trope of the child-colonizer? How does the text present a critique to the western Eurocentric discourse and how does it prophesy its subversion?

Of course, there is a certain sense in which the study tries to deal with the colonial experience in the novel as a microcosm of the larger crippling design of western world to non-European continents. More specifically, my argument goes in line with Amar Acheraiou, who avers that "within global colonial politics and mythology, this design reflects the coloniser's tendency to relegate the colonised to children or *in-fans*, which means lacking coherent speech, and thus unable to represent themselves and take charge of their countries" (70). In setting such a context, the study can generate an indescribable power of interpretation.

While it often seems that Golding's *Lord* is an exhausted material of research, the innovative spirit of this research lies in its capacity to present an aware reading of this works of fiction, in such a way that approaches the intriguing intersection between discourses of internal colonialism, literature, postcolonial theory and human nature. In a sense, the research is important in the sense it sets to breathe a new life in a novel whose enigmatic representation leaves a room for a postcolonial questioning. In other words, the present essay will transcend the traditionally investigated themes like civilization vs. savagery, struggle to build civilization, the issue of man's inherent evil, the novel's reflections on contemporary outlets for violence, loss of innocence, dangers of mob mentality, war and the future of mankind the effect of fear.

1. The Burden of Englishness and the Continuous Faith in Western Civilization: Building a Heart of Whiteness in the Deserted Island

Artistically written and beautifully structured, Golding's *Lord of the Flies* is "one of the most pessimistic fictional exposés ever written of the inherent barbarism attributed to young boys" (Ziolkowski 163). It portrays the dark side of human nature and sheds light on the significance of the power of reason and intellect as instruments

for finding a sense of purpose and order as opposed to the chaos of existence. The author intently invites the readers to reflect on the contradictions that characterize the twentieth century world whose crucial manifestation is an incessant conflict between good and evil through a journey purposefully meant to be led allegorically by children. In the novel, a group of children is evacuated from Britain in an unnamed time of war, but it is meant to echo the events of a nuclear war in World War II. The airplane, boarded by adults and prep-school boys as passengers, crashes on an uninhabited island, and all the adults are killed. Intriguingly enough, the novel presents a lively narrative of events that explore what James R. Baker calls "a metaphor of injection" (137). In a sense, "the boys are literally injected into the island, in that passenger tube; thus, like little maggots or flies they spread into this virginal world, this virginal natural world" (Baker 137). In dealing with the new situation, the story thus prompts an outpouring of reactions and reflections upon the boys' struggle to come to terms with the issue of being under no adult supervision and their attempt to found their own society.

The novel's power of characterization and aesthetics of representation alert the readers to consider the distorting evolution of human societies from *tabula rasic* innocence and goodness into evil and savagery. Brought up in the homeland— Britain in this context represents the heart of western whiteness; the children are initially met by the challenge of keeping civilization and order in the absence of the parental protection, state security and rule of the law. More specifically, the boys endeavour to create a culture of light similar to the one they left behind in the heart of whiteness whose most important step is to establish democratic laws and codes in order to evade sliding into chaos and anarchy.

Certainly, of all the values that Europeans speak eloquently of in terms of their superiority over other races, democracy is the most treasured one. The images of whiteness, in terms of establishing set of rules that organizes life in the new land, pervade the novel. The rules of order and civilization that are designed to contain and

minimize the human impulse towards savagery can be seen in their "desire for social and political order through parliaments, governments, and legislatures [...] represented by the platform and the conch" (Kelly 07). In the novel, the protagonist Ralph spies a conch, which Piggy identifies as "ever so valuable" (Golding 09) that can be blown as a trumpet. Upon Piggy's urge, Ralph blows into the shell, using it to summon any other survivors to the beach. In what follows, boys come streaming out of the jungle onto the beach, assembling on the platform near Ralph. In Eurocentric discourse, the author goes beyond the common notion of democracy whose meaning could be felt in the conch shell that is employed to call for meetings, establishing a protocol for speaking and being heard, asserting that only the one who holds the shell would be entitled or allowed to voice an opinion.

Important to note, Golding's idiosyncratic imagination helps serious readers grasp the story's details as being the ultimate incarnation of the English civilizational codes. Keep in mind, nonetheless, that these steps show that the will and readiness for order and democracy exists even within the children. It is, however, possible to read the children's preliminary behaviour as a mimetic process of adult conduct in the homeland and a step toward building a heart of whiteness for children as missionaries of civilization. To see this more clearly, Bhabha states that mimicry "emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" (Bhabha 85). The children mimetic departures from their English traditions generally serve to confirm their assertive stance to maintain whiteness. In stressing the civility of the British persona that the cultural background implies, the author draws the attention to the promising rise of a new heart of whiteness on the marooned island. In a sense, the author makes "the jungle seems for a moment like the Home Counties" (Wilson 10).

Effectively, the predisposition to live by rules, act peacefully, follow moral commands, and value the good of the group translates itself in the novel through boys' assemblage to debate their condition and vote on a chief. The vote seems to be the

boys' stepping-stone to achieve transition from the darkest times to the brightest moment of self-discovery. The following passage illustrates the idea in question:

Ralph lifted the conch. "Seems to me we ought to have a chief to decide things."

"A chief! A chief!"

....

"Let's have a vote."

"Yes!"

"Vote for chief!"

"Let's vote—" (Golding 15)

The election ends in choosing Ralph over Jack. The elected leader enjoys a kind of quiet charisma and sharp vision. His power rests upon a focus on domestic order, civil obedience and the rules of civilization. Ralph as the civilized man insists the civilizing mission: "All this I meant to say. Now I've said it. You voted me for chief. Now you do what I say" (Golding 70). The successful election seemingly reproduces the power that characterises the Eurocentric discourse, which places the English superiority to the fore. Serious readers can extrapolate the decisive role of Piggy in paving the ground for Ralph to preside and for the newly established community to enjoy security. Ian Shapiro—professor of political sciences at Yale University—avers, in his book *Politics against Domination*, that "having a convenient Piggy to pillory can be a sure path to power, especially if this is ties to protecting the community from insidiously threatening beasts" (50).

In the novel, Jack, though losing the election, addresses his mates emphasising that their Englishness entails them to be acting rightly. He 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*" (Golding 34 my emphasis). At the symbolic level, the author seems to be saying that democracy is one way to have civilization and safety of humankind. Practically, in the western consciousness, their racial superiority was, and is still, backed up by philosophies such as the notion of the

White Man's Burden. In fact, ideology has the power to erect high feelings of solidarity among a certain group. The White Man's Burden to civilize and enlighten the Other. "This duty entailed in the colonial project's self-proclaimed ideals consisted of both enlightening the natives and helping their undeveloped countries to advance materially and technologically" (Acheraiou 70). In fact, the White Man's Burden principle had generated, and still does, pride and vanity among its embracers and believers. Subsequently, Eurocentricism took stronger roots to accomplish ulterior imperial prospects under the catchy mottos of civilizing and Christianizing what was regarded as heathen, dark, primitive and backward continents. In so doing, this complex of superiority turned out to be pretext that morally legitimized territorial expansion and to justify ethnic cleansing.

In the novel, the boys' new consciousness is anchored within the European superiority that resides in economic achievements and political systems, technologies, and the high-quality life its societies enjoy. To see this more clearly, the boys attempt to found rules and arrangements for housing and sanitation. Piggy suggests, "I got the conch! Just you listen! The first thing we ought to have *made was shelters* down there by the beach" (Golding 36 emphasis). As the novel progresses, readers can see the boys going through different experiences, bringing them closer to the world of adults. For example, their success in organizing their debates becomes a signal of an advanced state of civility. No one is able to speak unless he is greenlighted by the conch shell holding:

Ralph says:

"And another thing. We can't have everybody talking at once.

We'll have to have 'Hands up' like at school."

He held the conch before his face and glanced round the mouth.

"Then I'll give him the conch."

"Conch?"

"That's what this shell called. I'll give the conch to the next person to speak. He can hold it when he's speaking." (Golding 25)

In another dimension, Golding's narrative accentuates responsibilities division and jobs assignment. Jack insists: "an army is still necessary - for hunting pigs" (Wilson 11). Ralph in response suggests that Jack remains in charge of the choirboys, designating them hunters. Jack subsequently is mollified by this seemingly small gift of command that assuages his bitterness of losing leadership to Ralph. Nonetheless, Jack's new job heralds a fact that Ralph's leadership is contested by Jack, whose thirst for power is fuelled by the hunting mission assigned to him.

Jack and the group under his command carelessly sacrifice the duty of tending the fire—– they built hoping that a passing ship will see the smoke signal and rescue them—–so that they can take part in the hunts. Jack's mind undergoes a transformation when he savoured the pleasure of exercising power against a living being: a pig, to be exact. The boys start to acquire knowledge and enjoy game of power and submission and in that, there is more than the eye can see when it comes dropping mask of whiteness using camouflage strategies like in wars:

> He [Jack] smeared on the clay. "If only I'd some green!" He turned a half-concealed face up to Roger and answered the incomprehension of his gaze."
>
> "For hunting. Like in the war. You know—–dazzle paint. Like things trying to look like something else—–" He twisted in the urgency of telling. "—– Like moths on a tree trunk" (Golding 52).

In this context, Jack's resort to camouflage tactics forces readers to recognize a change in the child behaviour. In using coal, green, and red paint, Jack seems more determined to change his face where whiteness would no longer impose limitations and order: "[Jack] rubbed the charcoal stick between the patches of red and white on his face. He peered at his reflection and disliked it. He bent down, took up a double handful of lukewarm water and rubbed the mess from his face. Freckles and sandy

eyebrows appeared" (Golding 53[1]. "This regression is given an evolutionary dimension: Jack seems to merge with primordial man" (Wilson 17). Although the reflection of Jack's new face on water is at first of a negative impact, but it is an overriding step for him and the hunters to free themselves from the burden of Englishness and whiteness by disguising their whiteness. Later, Jack is awed by the strange difference made by the camouflage.

Following distortion of his whiteness, Jack gives commands to some of the boys: "Come on! I'll creep up and stab—" (Golding 53). In that capacity, he lets the mask speak and compel instead of him. In describing Jack's orders to the members of his tribe Golding wrote, "the mask compelled them" (53). Fundamentally obedient to orders and concerned with the articulation of tyrant ruler in the island, the boys quickly submit to the mask that compels them, as the mask is the assertion Jack's own creation and a symbol for conveying authority. Golding's words as regards Jack's transformation highlight just how far the boys have descended into chaos. At the symbolic level, Golding refers to it as mess: the mess from his face (Golding 53):

> [Jack] fell on his face and a brightness appeared in the depths of the water. He looked in astonishment, no longer at himself but at an awesome stranger. He spilt the water and leapt to his feet, laughing excitedly. Beside the pool his sinewy body held up a mask that drew their eyes and appalled them. He began to dance and his laughter became a bloodthirsty snarling. He capered toward Bill, and the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness. The face of red and white and black swung through the

[1] Jack planned his new face. He made one cheek and one eye-socket white, then he rubbed red over the other half of his face and slashed a black bar of charcoal across from right ear to left jaw. He looked in the pool for his reflection, but his breathing troubled the mirror. (Golding 53)

> air and jigged toward Bill. Bill started up laughing; then suddenly he fell silent and blundered away through the bushes. (Golding 53)

Jack's new mask can be seen as the opposite idea ofFrantz Fanon suggested the idea of 'white masks' worn by 'black skins' in his book *Black Skin, White Masks* (Nayar 2015, 104). In a Fanonist sense, African mimic man is motivated to speak the European tongue like the European himself and lead a European lifestyle. However, interesting is the idea that Jack's case it is a 'black mask' worn by 'white skin' to create a mimicry of in Lacanian fashion with a little difference. The Lacanian perspective views mimicry as a camouflage that does not bring about a harmonization with the environmental background, but Jack aspires for a camouflage that brings a harmonization that removes his sense of shamefulness.

It is clear from that point that Jack becomes a firm seeker of power regardless of the rules the boys set thus far to maintain order. Demonstrating that behavioural transformation occurs in tandem with a growing thirst for power, the novel directs the reader's attention to the moment Jack celebrates his new status. Interesting is the idea that Jack is nowhere seen to feel a sense of shame in exceeding the borders of whiteness. When he looks at his own reflection after painting his face with clay and charcoal, he recognizes the tremendous sense of pride that this physical transformation seems to give. Jack furnishes himself with a sense of freedom from what Golding calls "shame and self-consciousness" (53). In such contexts, then, the newly acquired power helps Jack transfer his boyish laughter into rituals that heralds a "bloodthirsty snarling" (53). Raymond Wilson, in his insightful analysis of the text, stresses how Jack internalizes a good idea of himself as an awesome stranger:

> Jack is obsessionally preoccupied with hunting, and he significantly equates hunting with war. Through camouflage, he disguises himself not simply from the others, who are 'appalled' by his transformation, but from himself, too, so that he appears to himself as 'an awesome stranger'. He hides behind this new mask, which liberated him 'from shame and

> self-consciousness' into savagery, and his laughter turns into a 'bloodthirsty snarling' before which Bill falls silent from terror. The word 'snarling' strongly hints at a reversion to an animal condition. (22)

In what follows, the research will look into the shift of Jack's behavioural pattern that would make him an increasingly sadistic and brutal as he gains power over the other boys. More specifically, the research will analyse the gradual conversion of the innocent boys into small colonizers whose outset is turning around the laws forged initially to keep stability and order.

2. The Subversion of the Western Eurocentric Discourse and Internal Colonization: from Small Tyrants to Child-Colonizers

In the previous section, analysis followed the rise of heart of Whiteness in an isolated and deserted island by English school-boys who quickly understand the burden of their Englishness that leads them to forge a Eurocentric discourse that helps them keep the legacy of superiority they left behind in Britain, the centre of western supremacy. However, the genius of Golding's novel resides in its narrative strategy that overthrows the course of events upside down, in an artistic fashion, to present the sordid side of Eurocentricism. In absence of a rational ordering of their activities, the children head towards chaos that is approached from a postcolonial perspective.

In effect, the novel was written "in the middle of the period when Britain was beginning to give up Empire in a confused and reluctant way. 'Great' Britain's feelings of superiority were under threat, ruthlessly guarded in psychological and emotional terms but actually undermined by the pressure of nationalist movements and anti-colonial feeling" (Hawlin 125). Premised on a postcolonial framework, the central concern of *Lord* in this context is an explicit critique of the deviation of the little of the boys from the contours of Englishness, sliding into chaos that sets the pillars of a colonial autocratic state in the heart of darkness. In other words, the work is a powerful examination of how human nature is motivated by the colonial instinct to gratify immediate desires, act violently to obtain supremacy over others, and to

enforce tyrannically the individual's will upon the majority, leading to the deterioration of values.

Clearly, the transformation might be seen in Jack and the hunters' increasing attraction to hunting and bloodshed. The idea that the boys had outwitted a living thing, imposed their will upon it, is certainly a turning point towards erasing the aspects of whiteness in the newly established society. William C. Mayborn comments, "Jack's choirboys go hunting, and they neglect their fire duties. This failure causes the boys to miss an opportunity to signal a passing airplane. Ralph and Piggy are upset with Jack's mistake, whereas the rest of the children are happy to enjoy meat from the fresh kill" (02). This hence heralds the rise of the colony in the heart of darkness.

The outset of Jack's conversion can be traced to the moment Jack begins to refuse to help in shelters building and develops through drawing the other boys gradually away from Ralph's influence seducing them by the pleasure and fun hunting seems to promise. His success is empowered by the boys' natural fascination to and disposition toward the exciting hunting activities that would give impetus to violent impulses and evil to float to the surface. Striking is the idea that Jack, Roger and the hunters become colonial parents to the other children. Jack and his hunters provide food (meat) and the physical power they exercise provides security to the frightened boys. Raychel Haugrud Reiff highlights the significant task of Jack in providing comfort to the little boys who were in desperate need of some reassurance against the beast: "some of the littluns tell of their fear of a beast that comes from the water. Although Ralph once again insists that there is no beast, *Jack promises that he and his hunters will look for it*" (69 emphasis added).

By the time we reach this point in the book we cannot fail to notice how Golding's portrayal of apparently a parental sense of protection offered to the boys lifts Jack's tribe to the status of colonial parents. In postcolonial parlance, the metaphor of the child expounds the colonizer's tendency to implement a philanthropic parental authority over colonial subjects as lacking agency and consciousness to take care of

their own matters. As regards Golding's novel, the argument goes hand in hand with Sharada Sugirtharajah's claim that

> The *trope* of the *child* serves a number of purposes useful to the *colonizer*: it allows the *colonizer* to exercise his benevolent parental authority over colonial subjects. For the colonial parent the *child* symbolizes, a state of innocence, unspoiled purity or a natural state, and therefore the child cannot exercise its rational faculties. *The colonial parent now becomes the guardian into whose care colonial subjects are entrusted*. In other words, the colonial parent takes upon himself/herself the responsibility of looking after the physical, mental, moral and spiritual welfare of colonial children. The problem is that the child is never allowed to grow; its identity is permanently fixed and frozen. (Sugirtharajah "Max Muller and Textual Management" 162)

It is then surely possible to extrapolate that in *Lord*, Jack and his hunters represent the colonial parent whose job is to supervise the colonial innocent children: Ralph, Piggy and the civilized boys, seeing that they cannot exercise their rational faculties. In this regard, the colonial parent turns into the guardian upon whom the responsibility of looking after the physical, mental, moral and spiritual safety and wellbeing of colonial children.

In response to the colonial parental authority, the colonized boys find in Piggy ––the most intelligent, rationally balanced boy who represents the group's intellect–– a solace to smoothe the troubled space between their identity real-ness and the new state of the colonial-disabled children to which Jack relegates them to. In a sense, "the children are static symbols but they are capable of limitless growth" (Chellappan 04). Strikingly, Piggy is quick to notice that the Jack works upon disallowing the colonial child from growing autonomous identity. The parent colonizer relentlessly fixes and freezes the child's agency in order to visualize power. Piggy recognizes the distortion of the boys' consciousness and the hazardous change

in their aim from working to get saved into indulging themselves, he responds to awake their conscience begging significant questions regarding: "who they are: humans or animals or savages", and the most important question is connected to grownups impression on the boys' deviation.

"What are we? Humans? Or animals? Or savages? What's grownups going to think? Going off—hunting pigs—letting fires out—and now!"

A shadow fronted him tempestuously.

"You shut up, your fat slug!"

There was a moment's struggle and the glimmering conch jigged up and down. Ralph leapt to his feet.

"Jack! Jack! You haven't got the conch! Let him speak."

Jack's face swam near him.

"And you shut up! Who are you, anyway? Sitting there telling people what to do. You can't hunt, you can't sing—"

"I'm chief. I was chosen."

"Why should choosing make any difference? Just giving orders that don't make any sense—" (Golding 79)

Not surprisingly, in the colonial parental discourse, Jack's humiliating words to Piggy found the seeds of major procedure to silence the wise intellectuals in the heart of whiteness as a first necessary step to neutralize the potent effect of their minds on enlightening and illuminating the masses. Here, Ralph intervenes to remind Jack that he does not have the shell conch and thus not entitled to speak only to receive statements that question his legitimacy as the leader of the new society. Looking upon the whole scene since the early moments of an undeclared rebellion, one will not find it hard to view in Jack a staunch opponent, but a seeker of power. Here, as the antagonist moves within the centre of civilization, he needs to minimize any importance of democratic procedures to elect leaders; and therefore, leaping over democracy as whole. Golding's narrative strategy artistically manipulates the readers'

absorption of events towards the perception of the new truth: the deceptiveness of any trust in western civilisation. In a similar vein, James Gindin maintains: "the linear movement of the novel, the progress of the narration, is symbolically directed toward the human interior, stripping away what Golding sees as the falsity of confidence in civilisation" (16).

A reader of critical attention would not fail to see in the schoolchildren small tyrants who would overthrow the rule of the law only to establish the law of the jungle. In the following passage, it is possible for the reader to gauge the weight of Jack's experience who is no longer satisfied by the laws that restrict his violent impulses. The best solution is to mitigate or downplay the importance of the laws:

Jack's voice sounded in bitter mimicry.
"Jack! Jack!"
"The rules!" shouted Ralph. "You're breaking the rules!"
"Who cares?"
Ralph summoned his wits.
"Because the rules are the only thing we've got!"
But Jack was shouting against him.
"Bollocks to the rules! We're strong—we hunt! If there's a beast, we'll hunt it down!
We'll close in and beat and beat and beat—!" (Golding 79)

Throughout the novel, Jack the little tyrant strongly associates the power with hunting and vice versa. This would certainly lead the young English boys to dissolve of civilized, moral, disciplined code of conduct in such a way it makes them grow accustomed to a wild, brutal, barbaric life in the jungle. Chaos, better than civilization, the rebels feel, could respond to their ever-growing transgression and lust for power. Analysis here shows how the novel layers of meaning may go well beyond the "portrayal of children as 'emissaries of death and destruction" (Ziolkowski 182), to bring to the surface the metaphor of the Child-colonizer.

In the novel, there seems to be a paradigm shift in Jack's behavioural pattern as his actions transcend his earlier pronouncements that owing to their Englishness they have to abide by the law and that by virtue of their supremacy they should the best in every field: "*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*" (Golding 34). Jack's point of view has been diametrically opposed to what he said. Jack, in other words, is instrumental in this ironic conversion, which brings us to the more absurd rhetoric of a sadist colonizer who finds in the evolutionary theory of Darwin, an intelligible justification of violent outlets. Jack colonial sadism makes him for a moment forget his passion for hunting to call for rules, but in doing so he is, ironically enough, breaking the rule that forbids him to speak without the shell (Wilson 13). In what follows, Jack and the hunters become the fittest creatures that survived toughest conditions to practise Social Darwinists held that "the victors in imperialist or capitalist battles were, by definition, the fittest and that science stood on the side of conquest" (Olsen 30-31).

In another dimension, Jack seems to be a nationalist who uses the Englishness principle to justify his propensity to subjugate the boy making them submissive to his colonial ego. His tendency can be compared to western institution of colonialism that rose under pretexts of civilizing and Christianising the non-European and non-white other, while in fact the greed is the real reason for colonialism. What is particularly emphasised here, though, is the colonial spirit of both children and adults and their reversion to systematic viciousness. Harold Bloom in his book *William Golding's Lord of the Flies*, claims that "the moral implication that Golding intended doubtless was that the group reversion to organized savagery in his book was no different from adult reversion, at any time" (08). In this regard, while imperial greed spurred on the Europeans to subdue continents and to plunder their wealth on supremacist grounds, Jack employs supremacist ideology to justify his delinquent tendencies. It can be said

that that Jack's spiteful bent offers him the position of an internal colonizer, who finds in the boys who choose order and civilization the colonized target to subordinate.

> A dual symbol portrayed as both 'unformed' and evil-like, the child became a privileged colonial trope defining the colonized races. It combined with the metaphor of primitiveness which together served to justify Europe's mission to nurture the colonized into civilized, responsible adults. (Acheraiou 70)

Just as major European powers that effectively manipulated and oriented their Eurocentric ideologies towards achieving imperialist ambitions, the boys-colonizer seek to allow themselves a mandate to submit the other boys. This mandate is based on the the Victorian perspective of superiority the industrialized societies enjoy over unindustrialized cultures. In this respect, "the Victorian perspective was that "savages" were inferior to industrialized peoples and that civilization must be imposed on them for their own good, whether they liked it or not" (Olsen 30).

In *Lord*, one necessary step is to achieve hegemony is to othernize the civilized boys to fit the colonized's sphere. Interesting is Cui Chen's idea that draws parallel between first English explorers of the New World and Native Americans. The latters were regarded as backward and uncivilized and thus perfectly fit what Chen calls the "savage other":

> The novel does not present any Native American, but it alludes to them through the imagination of these English children, who through their cultural training would be inclined to regard Native Americans as savages, and thus assume a "savage" identity themselves in the end [...] In doing so, the novel plays with the mapping of two pivotal tenets in the European imagination of the "savage other": the savage's belonging to another place, an alien "elsewhere," which in this case is an isolated and uninhabited island, and the savage's belonging to another time, the earlier. (Chen 2)

At the most basic level, in order to accomplish othernization, the hunters start to diffuse superiority to other civilized children and correspondingly they deserve to rule the whole island and submit the vulnerable boys. This sort of essentialization grows out of the logic of European colonialism as a system of governance that is premised on expanding the colonizers' cluster of culture and lifestyle.

There are, of course, intriguing parallels that arise through conflating examinations of Golding's Jack and Conrad's Kurtz in his novella *Heart of Darkness*. Strikingly, the readers can discover in Jack's character a version of Kurtz, who is undoubtedly one of the enigmatic characters in twentieth-century literature. Depicted exactly like Jack, Kurtz is as a petty tyrant who embodies Europe and the deterioration of the European values. While Kurtz finds the dark interior of himself in Africa, Jack explores the dark side of human nature in the uninhabited island. Interestingly enough, Jack departs from the values of Englishness, while Kurtz premised his adventure on whiteness that demands: "Each station should be like a beacon on the road towards better things, a centre for trade of course, *but also for humanizing, improving, instructing*" (Conrad 40 my emphasis). However, the implication of both expectations is that there is more than the eye can see when it comes to tasting the power that could be theirs. In this respect, Jack and Kurtz abandon their humanitarian ideals and set themselves up as little dictators or minor gods that both the othernized boys in the island and the natives at the Inner Station should obey.

In another dimension, it is possible to use Golding's text to explain the how western colonialism is mediated through children's experience. To follow the argument further, in fulfilling imperialism, it was very important for imperialist western countries such as Britain to have the support of their people so as to advance the colonial project. That is why they made of their Eurocentric framework an operative practice for getting support to maintain colonies and then benefitting the colonizer nations. As little imperialists, Jack and the hunters' success in providing meat for the group gives them advantage and feeds their innate ability to commit violence.

It is a seminal moment in the growing collision between the heart of whiteness and the newly emerged heart of darkness. At a point of time, the colonizer-boys become increasingly fanatical and intolerant and even ready to go to war against their mates. In such a context, Karen J. Renner in her *Evil Children in the Popular Imagination* points out that children's play is saturated with imaginations related to war. She writes: "It's apparent, too, that the boys have war on the brain, for many of their actions are described with military terminology. At one point, for example, Golding depicts Ralph mimicking combat when he "danced out onto the hot air of the beach and then returned as a fighter-plane, with wings swept back, and machine-gunned Piggy" (135). In a similar vein, Roger's character represents a devilish and brutal boy-colonizer who displays, early on, a spiteful aggression toward the weak, vulnerable and defenceless. His aggression does not end at this level, but goes on to reveal unprecedented level of ferocity whose most important manifestation is, for instance, torturing Sam and Eric until they join Jack's tribe. In turning himself into a charismatic colonizer in the island, Jack goes beyond breaking the laws to challenge Ralph's chieftainship.

Heart of Whiteness Falls apart and the Erection of Heart of Darkness

In fact, over the course of their stay in the deserted island, members of Jack's tribe become dictators. It is believed that "dictators are psychopaths, this is the simplest and most seductive psychological explanation of dictatorship. Its features are, among others, deceitfulness, impulsivity and lack of remorse" (Senoussi 08). The implication of infantile dictatorship in this vein is that Jack and his followers' aggression seems to go beyond stealing Piggy's glasses making Ralph's tribe unable to keep a signal fire going so that their rescue could be possible. In what follows expounds why narcissistic dictators refuse to tolerate any sort of instruction, criticism or objection. In the novel, Ralph, Piggy and the twins Sam and Eric, who are the only remaining members of Ralph's group, take a step to resist Jack's colonial authority. Readers sense how portentous it that children who —still cling to civilization and order decide to go to Jack to demand that Piggy's glasses should be given back. *Lord*

presents Jack as having "the mentality of a Fascist, and a total disregard for those who are weaker than himself" (Wilson 63).

However, the civilized boys seem nowhere attentive to the metamorphosis of Jack and his followers who turn more narcissistic and "the narcissist's personality is so precariously balanced that he cannot tolerate even a hint of criticism and disagreement (Senoussi 08). The turning point in Jack's tribe internal colonialism, nonetheless, is unprecedented levels of violence that ends up in fratricide. In other words, as Piggy begs Jack to take the right decision, Roger releases a huge boulder that strikes Piggy, killing him and shattering the conch. It is worth noting that murdering Piggy sounds even easier for Roger, but at this moment, the boys become so hardened that when Jack screams at Ralph, "See? See? That's what you'll get! I meant that! There isn't a tribe for you anymore! The conch is gone—" (163) and hurls a spear at him, no one objects.

At the symbolic level, the death of the island's most brilliant intellectual is truly an invitation to explore the darkened psychic interior of Western civilization. Enlightened minds like Piggy's have no place in a society governed by a new colonially-driven autocratic culture and therefore within the boundaries of that culture the rescue and co-existence would have been practically impossible. On the other hand, the conch's shattering is the highest point that represents the moment the heart of whiteness begins to fall apart while at the same time it stresses the erection of heart of darkness.

Jack and his hunters find in their subjugation of Ralph's followers an irresistible pleasure. Nevertheless, the hunters take steps forward in intimidating the Ralph's followers. After killing Piggy, they capture Sam and Eric, leaving Ralph utterly alone. At this moment, Jack— eaten up by ambition— seizes his grip to usurp Ralph's power, declaring himself the absolute chief of the island (70-71). Not surprisingly, Jack's colonial spirit leads his tribe to set fire to the island to find and kill Ralph by smoking him out of his hiding place. The boys turn so diabolical that they hunt Ralph as if they

hunt the pigs. As a colonizer, the rising of Roger's hostility reaches a fever pitch when he decides to prepare a stick on which to mount Ralph's head in case they manage to kill him. Ralph runs on the beach pursued by Jack and his barbarians, he falls at the feet of a British naval officer, who, seeing the smoke, has arrived to rescue the boys. The officer is disillusioned with the fact that the boys were not able to manage better the state of affairs in the island.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the postcolonial analysis of William Golding's *Lord* demonstrated that the children's fruitful attempt to establish heart of whiteness engineered by rules of order and civilization has soon led to the subversion of the western Eurocentric discourse of civilizational supremacy. In other words, although the boys succeeded in electing a leader and setting parliamentary rules on the island, but they soon deviate from being well-behaved, orderly children who long for rescue to cruel, murderous hunters who relinquish their desire to return to civilization. Most importantly, Jack and his hunters lose any sense of innocence only to become internal colonizers whose colonial Darwinism makes it difficult for the readers not to see in them colonial parents who turn into colonial tyrants. Jack's monomania for power does not make him only forget his earlier pronouncements that they have grown up in English society, and they assume that their new society shall be modeled after it only to become a second version of Conrad's Kurtz. In this regard, Kurtz's last words before his death are "The horror! The horror!" indicate the extent to which he is ultimately changed by the jungle. At the same time; however, by the end of Golding's novel, Ralph weeps for the shock ensuing from the loss of innocence and the darkness he perceives in man's heart. Both wanted to bring civilization to dark places only to mourn the erosion of European values of civilization.

Works Cited

Acheraiou, Amar. Rethinking Postcolonialism: Colonialist Discourse in Modern Literatures and the Legacy of Classical Writers. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Babb, Howard S. The novels of William Golding. Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1970.

Baker, James R. "An Interview with William Golding", Twentieth Century Literature, Summer, 1982, Vol. 28, No. 2, William Golding Issue (1982), pp. 130-170

Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. London: Routledge, 1994.

Bloom, Harold. William Golding's Lord of the Flies (Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. Blooms Literary Criticism, 2008.

Bloom, Harold. William Golding's Lord of the Flies—New Edition (Bloom's Guides) (2010) Bloom, Harold. Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Lord of the Flies—New Edition. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008.

Braybooke, Neville. The Castaways—The Mariner: Two William Golding Novels: New Blackfriars, Vol. 51, No. 603 (1970): pp. 356-361

Chellappan, K. "Vision and Structure in Lord of the Flies: A Semiotic Approach". Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Lord of the Flies—New Edition. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008. pp 03-10

Chen, Cui. "The Child Savage: Rethinking the Eurocentric Rhetoric of Civilization in William Golding's Lord of the Flies", Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction, 2020, DOI: 10.1080/00111619.2020.1782327

Conrad, joseph. Heart of Darkness. London: Harper Collins, 2013.

Gallagher, Michael P. "The Human Image in William Golding": Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review, Summer/Autumn, 1965, Vol. 54, No. 214/215 (Summer/Autumn, 1965), pp. 197-216

Gindin, James. "The Fictional Explosion: Lord of the Flies and The Inheritors" Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Lord of the Flies—New Edition. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008. pp 11-26

Gindin, James. Macmillan Modern Novelists: William Golding. Palgrave Macmillan, 1988.

Haldar, Santwana. William Golding's Lord of the Flies. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2006.

Hawlin, Stefan. "The Savages in the Forest: Decolonizing William Golding." Lord of the Flies: William Golding, Critical Survey, 1995, Vol. 7, No. 2, Heritage: textual landscapes (1995), pp. 125- 135

Irvine, Purushottama Bilimoria. Postcolonial Philosophy of Religion. Netherlands: Springer, 2009.

Johnston, Ingrid and Mangat, Jyoti. Reading Practices, Postcolonial Literature, and Cultural Mediation in the Classroom. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012.

Jones, Richard. "William Golding: Genius and Sublime Silly-Billy", The Virginia Quarterly Review, AUTUMN 1984, Vol. 60, No. 4 (AUTUMN 1984), pp. 675-687

Kelly, Maureen. CliffsNotes Golding's Lord of the Flies. New York: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc, 200.

Mayborn, William C. (2019): "Where are the Grown-Ups? Thinking about Anarchy with "Lord of the Flies", Journal of Political Science Education, DOI: 10.1080/15512169.2019.1679640

Nayar, Pramod K. 2015. The Postcolonial Studies Dictionary. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Olsen, Kirstin. Understanding Lord of the Flies Westport: The Greenwood Press, 2000.

Reiff, Raychel Haugrud. William Golding Lord of the Flies. New York: Marshal Cavendish, 2009.

Renner, Karen J. Evil Children in the Popular Imagination. Macmillan: Palgrave, 2016.

Senoussi, Mohammed (2021): The Psychology of Dictatorship: A Journey into Muammar Gaddafi's Mind in Yasmina Khadra's The Dictator's Last Night, Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction, DOI: 10.1080/00111619.2021.1992337

Shapiro, Ian. Politics against Domination. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Sugirtharajah, Sharada. "Max Muller and Textual Management: A Postcolonial Perspective". Postcolonial Philosophy of Religion. Andrew B. Irvine, Purushottama Bilimoria Purushottama Bilimoria, edited by Andrew B. Irvine. Netherlands: Springer, 2009.

Sugirtharajah, Sharada. Imagining Hinduism: A Postcolonial Perspective. London: Routledge, 2003

William Golding. Lord of the Flies. New York: Penguin Books, 2001.

Wilson, Raymond. Lord of the Flies by William Golding. London: Macmillan Education, 1986.

Ziolkowski, Eric. Evil Children in Religion, Literature, and Art Cross-Currents in Religion. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.