

THE STRUGGLE FOR RESCUE AS A SYMBOL OF HUMAN FIGHT FOR DEVELOPMENT IN
WILLIAM GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE FLIES*

YACOUBOU Kassim

Docteur

Enseignant Vacataire

Université de Lomé (Togo)

Département d'anglais

kassim.yacoubou@yahoo.fr

Abstract

The study analyses development as the symbolic meaning of the word "rescue" as used in *Lord of the Flies*. Through the use of social and linguistic semiotics, the study has found that political antagonism constitutes a hindrance to societal development.

Keywords: Rescue, Symbol, Development, Struggle, Human

Résumé

L'étude analyse le développement comme signification symbolique du mot sauvetage tel qu'il est utilisé dans le corpus roman. A travers l'approche sémiotique sociale et linguistique l'étude a révélé que l'antagonisme politique constitue un obstacle au développement sociétal.

Mots-clés: Sauvetage, Symbole, Développement, Lutte, Humain

Introduction

A symbol is “a person, an object, an event, etc that represents a more general quality or situation” (J. Turnbull, 2010, p. 1514). In relationship to literature, many are novelists who maintained that their works always stand for something. For instance, Henry James wrote that: “the only reason for the existence of a novel is that it does attempt to represent life” (J. Delbaere-Garant, 1970, p. 47). With that function of the novel in mind, my reading of William Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* has encapsulated pressing issues of representation. For, in that novel, words and issues portrayed are not without representational meaning. For instance, characters’ struggle to get rid of their lonely life on the island and the hindrances that they encounter on the way along their fight symbolize the difficulties faced by human beings in their effort to develop their social milieus. In this line of thought, William Golding, as quoted by Minnie Singh states:

Before the Second World War I believed in the perfectibility of social man; that a correct structure of society would produce goodwill; and that therefore you could remove all social ills by a reorganization of society...But after the war I did not because I was unable to. I had discovered what one man can do to another... There were things done during that period from which I still have to avert my mind less I should be physically sick. They were not done by the headhunters of New Guinea, or by some primitive tribe in the Amazon. They were done, skillfully, coldly, by educated men, doctors, lawyers, by men with a tradition of civilization behind them, to beings of their own kind (M. Singh, 1997, p. 209).

This passage from William Golding locates *Lord of the Flies* in the context that has motivated its literary production. The evil deeds of man during wars especially that of the Second World War has much influenced Golding’s *Lord of the Flies*.

This article seeks to carry out the parallelism between the novel and true life realities. It shows the evil deeds of some characters and the negative impact of their behavior on the whole fictitious society of William Golding. To achieve this goal, the sociolinguistic theory which is about the study of co-relation between language and society will help analyse the symbolic meanings of the novel. This study concerns how language effects society and also how the society impacts on language. In this regard, Jonathan Culler, as quoted in Ataféi Pewissi’s *Rethinking Womanism: when Difference Maps Chaos* states: “To ask about the meaning of a word or sentence (in literature) is to ask what it does in the work, and to specify what it does one must analyse the developing responses of the reader in relation to the words as they succeed one another in time” (A. Pewissi, 2017, p. 72). According to Ataféi Pewissi, Culler’s opinion about meaning is a proof that language is dynamic in context, for it is the position of words that determines their meanings (ibidem). Thus, within this framework, William Golding says:

At the very moments when I felt the fable to come to its own life before me it may in fact have become something more valuable. For I have shifted somewhat from the position I held when I wrote the book. I no longer believe that the author has a sort of patria potestas over his brainchildren. Once they are printed they have reached their majority and the author has no more authority over them, knows no more about them, perhaps knows less about them than the critic who comes fresh to them, and sees them not as the author hoped they would be, but as they are (M. Titlestad, 2016, p. 22).

From this passage, William Golding wants to show that like any other works of art the meaning of his *Lord of the Flies* has nothing to do with his opinion. Theories among which that of sociolinguistic are the angles through which the meaning of a text can be arrived at. Thus, because of its linguistic aspect and its social base dimensions the sociolinguistic theory will help show how language in *Lord of the Flies* and social contexts are inter-related. This theoretical framework is related to this study because it helps highlight how language and society influence each other.

This article comprises five subtopics. The first two elements concern respectively the study of the symbolic meaning of the word “rescue” and the examination of the conflict of interest among characters.

The three last issues of this article are about the analysis of the social representations of some characters such as: Ralph, Jack and Piggy.

1. Rescue: A Literary Representation of Development

Like any community in the world, William Golding's fictitious social milieu in *Lord of the Flies* seeks for its development. Characters' struggle to be rescued from the island is not without reason. The island is not a place worth living on. Therefore, the Island symbolizes poverty that characters struggle to get rid of. As an isolated place, an island is disconnected from the rest of the world. Its separation from other places renders the living conditions difficult. This is what explains characters will power to depart from the island on which they unfortunately found themselves. In this regard, Jack says: "we've got to decide about being rescued" (*Lord of the Flies*, p. 29)¹. This decision is comparable to any true society that becomes aware of the poor situation in which it is bound to live and its firm determination to find a way out of it. In *Lord of the Flies*, the crash of the plane stands for the decline of a given society coupled with the difficulties that follow. In the novel under study, the negative effect of that crash is described by Piggy as what follow: "when we was (sic) coming down I looked through one of them windows. I saw the other part of the plane. There were flames coming out of it" (*LOTF*, p. 13).

The flames produced by the crash of the plane symbolise the tragedy that accompanies the decline of a given society. The proof of the difficulty of life on the island is characterised by the lack of "grown ups" which stands as a symbol of life facility. In this line of thought, Ralph says: "there aren't any grown-ups". We shall have to look after ourselves" (*LOTF*, p. 43). Characters are compelled to create a possible condition for their survival. This situation is parallel to any real society that seeks to implement good strategies for its own development. For instance, after the Second World War Germany was destroyed; but its population did its best in bringing the country out of chaos. As a result, the common goal has been achieved. The development of Germany has been possible because all the actors of development have had the same vision and have worked for the realization of that common vision. Similarly, the characters of the case study novel have had that common vision: "rescue". In order to be rescued from the hard times that they face on the island, they have to think about a common solution: smoke. How can they get it? Ralph answers: "we've got to have special people for looking after the fire. Any day there may be a ship out there...and if we have a signal going they'll come and take us off" (*LOTF*, p. 55). From this quote one can note that smoke constitutes the common solution that is worth implementing for the rescue of characters from the hardships of the island. Therefore, smoke symbolises any plan of development of any true social group. In *Lord of the Flies*, smoke: "...is a symbol of hope; a hope that the boys will return to civilisation. They have the desire to be rescued" (U. Shah, yearless, p. 9) like any society has the will power to be developed. That is "life on the island...only imitate (s) the adults of the outside world attempt to govern themselves reasonably"(J. Barker, 2005, pageless).

Thus, like what happens in some society, misunderstanding has generated a certain blockade to characters hope to be rescued from the island. In the context of this study, some characters' (Ralph and Jack) aspiration to lead their society has led to some divisions within the fictitious social group of the island.

2. Leading Aspirations as a cause of Misunderstanding and conflict among the characters.

The Aspiration to become a leader constitutes a hindrance to Golding's characters' desire to move out of the island. Both Ralph and Jack aspire for leadership on the island. Jack's will to lead is conspicuous when he says: "I ought to be Chief" (*LOTF*, p. 29). One can read the expression of arrogance out of what he utters. His leading aspiration is not motivated by any solid argument. This arrogance is a symbol of peoples' willingness to lead for the sake of leading their societies. Jack's motivation for ruling

¹ The title *Lord of the Flies* will be Referenced as: LOTF

is only focused on his intension to be a “chapter chorister and lead boys” (ibidem). The lack of seriousness in Jack’s intension leads to his loss of election vis à vis Ralph.

However, like in modern societies, the loser (Jack) does not accept his defeat. As a matter of fact, he is not ready to work hand in hand with the winner (Ralph). For instance, his lack of respect let Ralph remind him: “I’m chief. I was chosen” (*LOTF*, p. 14). With arrogance, Jack replied: “Why should choosing make any difference? Just giving orders that don’t make any sense” (ibidem). This quote is a proof that very often political conflicts are caused by the misuse of language. Jack has jealously questioned the democratic process of election by using provocative words. Jack’s criticism of Ralph’s way of ruling is motivated by his aspiration to take the place of Ralph. It is not founded on any solid argument. Therefore, the conflict that Jack arouses is referred to as a “conflict of interest” which, according to the Organisation for Economic CO-operation and Development (OECD),

Involves a conflict between official’s personal interests (what they could gain, not necessarily financially) and their duty as a civil servant and is to be avoided as far as is reasonably possible. In general, the appearance of a contrast of interest is also to be avoided, to minimize the risk to the organisation’s reputation for integrity².

From this passage, it can be noted that the search for personal interest or profit is something that can possibly hinder the development of a given social milieu. The lack of common interest among people always leads to the dispersal of constructive energy and to violence, which unfortunately often delay the effectiveness of development actions. In this vain, the role of violent conflict is defined as “development in reverse” (T. Patricia et al: 2017, p. 178). This definition is applicable to situations in *Lord of the Flies*. The conflict that is provoked by Jack has delayed other characters willingness to work for their rescue from the island. In this context, the rescue of children is perceived as a goal to be achieved for the development of their community. The delay is caused by the conflicting mood that prevails among the characters on the island.

Therefore, the fight among the characters starts to the detriment of that for development (rescue). For example, Ralith commands: “all you littluns, go to sleep. We’ve had a fight with the others” (*LOTF*, p. 206). The common fight engaged by the characters on the island for their rescue is stopped or rather forgotten. Personal interest took precedence over everything. This attitude is noticeable in many true societies today; especially, many African countries are more involved in such conflicts of interest. Like Jack and his group in the novel under study, opposition parties always lay emphasis on struggling to be in office and the ruling party also fights to maintain itself in power. As a consequence, the common struggle which is that of development is jeopardised. The effects of the conflict are therefore conspicuous:

The rock struck piggy a glancing blow from chin to knee; the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist. Piggy, saying nothing, with no time for even a grunt, travelled through the air sideways from the rock, turning over as he went. The rock bounded twice and was lost in the forest. Piggy fell forty feet and landed on his back across the square, red rock in the sea. His head opened and stuff out and turned red. Piggy’s arms and legs twitched a bit, like a pig’s after it has been killed. Then the sea breathed again in a long; slow sigh, the water boiled white and pink over the rock; and when it went, sucking back again, the body of Piggy was gone (*LOTF*, p. 222-223).

This excerpt describes the death of Piggy. This death is the microcosm of the destruction or the devastating nature of conflicts. The use of the simile in the passage to compare the death of Piggy to that of a pig shows that during conflicts or war times, people are killed as if they were animals. Piggy’s death characterises human loss during wars. It shows how “political violence negates peaceful coexistence, law and order. ...It militates against the consolidation of democratic and social existence”

² Anonymous, OECD publications, 2005, *Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Sector: A Toolkit*, www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/49107986, p. 8, Retrieved on 28.12.2018.

(R. Howell, 2004, p. 261). In this line of thought, Steven Kettell shows the effects of Iraq war on human beings:

The broader effects of the war have also been nothing short of devastating. In financial terms alone, the costs of the invasion have reached extraordinary heights. By the end of August 2005, they have amounted to more than £ 3 billion for Britain and to more than € 190 billion for the United States, enough to have funded anti global hunger efforts for seven years, or to have immunized every child in the world for over six decades. In more directly human terms, the cost of the war has also been staggering. ...more than 2,000 US soldiers had lost their lives in the conflict, almost 100 British servicemen had been killed (S. Kettell, 2006, pageless).

The quote above shows that both Britain and the United States had been involved in useless expenses to the detriment of humanitarian objectives. This mistake is parallel to what happen in *Lord of the Flies*. Death among characters is privileged to the detriment of their struggle to get rid of their miserable life on the island. It means that, "there is no way a society can be developed when it uses division...as values. ... Societies need to be firmly consolidated" (A. Pewissi, Op.cit). The proof in *Lord of the Flies* is the division among characters and their failure to achieve their common goal, that of their rescue from the island. In this line of thought, in his attempt to show the negative impact of conflicts, Swift, in his portrayal of events in *Gulliver's Travels* points out the destructive and disastrous consequences of conflicts among his characters. Therefore, it is obvious that "when violence is involved, it could have potent and long lasting consequences for social tension and yet have low numbers of fatalities attached to it" (D. Ray and J. Esteban, 2016, p. 7).

However, the failure of characters to establish peace among them shows the weakness of many politicians in the development of human values among which, that of the instauration of peace in their countries. In this context, the officer says: "I should have thought that a park of British boys_ you're all British aren't you? _would have been able to put up a better show than that" (*LOTF*, p. 248). In the context of this quotation, British boys symbolise human beings in general. The writer has the officer deplored the inability of human beings to cultivate peace among them. It is in the writer's attempt to show the inferiority of people, especially politicians to put up a better show that he called for an external force to come for the liberation of the British boys on the Island. This failure of children to present a better show leads to a certain conclusion:

The evil is us. The war against the evil is not a matter of opposing others but of confronting ourselves, our own desire. In this sense, *Lord of the Flies* is a story of fascism in us all. Thus in the famous preface he wrote for a 'book of ethics', Michel Foucault claimed that the 'major enemy, the strategic adversary is fascism. ...And not only historical fascism, the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini...but also the fascism in us that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us' (B. Diken and C. B. Laustsen, 2006, p. 443).

This quote shows that one is not only in conflict with others, but with themselves too. Though the children on the island have escaped Hitler's fascism, they were not able to escape that fascist attitude within themselves. This is the situational irony which can be read in *Lord of the Flies*. In the normal circumstances since children do not know many things about evil deeds in life, they should behave in accordance with social values; but unfortunately it is the contrary which is observed. In this line of thought, William Golding states: "*Lord of the Flies* was simply what it seemed sensible for me to write after the war, when everybody was thanking God they weren't Nazis. And I'd seen enough and thought enough to realize that every single one of us could be Nazis" (B. W. Shaffer, 2006, p. 54).

This fact demonstrates the radicalism of evil. For,

Evil is radical. It targets the very humanity of the human being, reducing it to an animal, or a homo sacer, which is why it is radical. Such evil is hard to grasp. The philosophical tradition and Christianity have always understood evil as being determined by a lack, as a secondary phenomenon that can be eliminated. *Lord of the Flies*, in contrast, expresses an explicitly evil will that cannot be understood as anything else. In this sense *Lord of the Flies* breaks with every

utilitarian doctrine and with the idea that every human being has an inherent value. The fire, or the paradise island turned hell, is the symbol of this radical evil (ibidem, p. 444 - 445).

It means that for a society to be well organised, individual or self organisation is important. Each individual should be able to overcome the evil inside themselves before being able to confront that of outside. The theme of *Lord of the Flies* according to William Golding is “an attempt to trace the defects of society back to the defects of human nature. 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” (D. Spitz, 1970, p. 22). The parallelism between Golding’s text and the real life is that it is read at the same time as an allegory of humankind’s tendency to moral decline and a portrait of the savagery of children (M. Titlestad, 2016, p. 36). Considering the socio-political situation in some of African countries, a certain similarities between them and what prevails in Golding’s fictitious world in *Lord of the Flies* are conspicuous. These countries spend much of their time in misunderstandings between parties on power and those who aspire to rule. As a matter of fact, a great deal of their time is devoted to reconciliations than working hard for their development. For instance, according to Douglas Kimemia, “conflicts remain a hallmark of life on the African continent, which is prone to civil conflicts, discord, strife, civil wars, and cases of genocide (D. Kimemia, 2021, p. 2).

However, in many societies, the choice of the form of government and the way of life go hand in hand with the behavior of the actors aspiring to govern these societies. In the context of *Lord of the Flies*, this attitude is conspicuous through some characters such as Ralph and Jack and Piggy. Ralph is a democrat whereas Jack is a totalitarian. As for Piggy, he symbolises civilisation and rationalism.

3. The Democrat Ralph

“Democracy is fair and equal treatment of everyone in an organization, etc., and their right to take part in making decisions...” (A S Hornby, 8th edition, 2010, p. 388). Ralph embodies this system of government because on the island he is the one who decides about the idea of the election of a leader. He says: “Seems to me we ought to have a chief to decide things” (*LOTF*, p. 29). This quote shows the high level of democratic values in the character Ralph. Election is the process through which the people decide about who will lead them. Meaning that one cannot lead if he or she is not chosen by the population to do that. Apart from being chosen by the people, Ralph also is conscious enough about the fact that a ruler does not decide all alone. For instance, he relies on the decisions made from meetings rather than individual decisions. That is the reason why when he and Piggy discovered the conch, they did not keep it for their own use. In this line of thought, he abides by the idea of Piggy who says: “we can use this to call the others. Have a meeting” (*LOTF*, p. 22). Having meeting is about discussing with everybody in order to make a decision that will be accepted by the whole population or the majority of it. Besides, “Ralph, the representative of civilization and democracy, lives by rules, acts peacefully, and follows moral commands and values the good of the group, who dramatically reveals the condition of civilization and democracy in Golding’s time” (X. Li & W. Wu: 2009, p. 119). In this line of thought, David Spitz states:

Chosen chief by an election, he sought always to maintain parliamentary procedures, to respect freedom of speech, to rule through persuasion, with the consent of the governed. He was not an intellectual, but he ‘could recognize thought in another’. He could gain understanding from Piggy and had ‘the directness of genuine leadership’, as he demonstrated when he consoled and (temporarily) won over the opposition candidate by naming him second-in –command, by putting him in a charge of the hunters(D. Spitz, Op. cit., p. 26).

However, has Ralph succeeded in achieving his goal? Has his democratic leadership led to the rescue of the children?

Although he is the only one who worries over the welfare of the other boys and his instinct of civilization survives longer than any other character, he is not resolute and decisive when facing the problems. Since he becomes a leader, Ralph is determined to seek way for rescue by keeping a

signal fire for attracting a passing ship. But with the appearance of beast from water, Ralph is confused in despair to ask a sign from that ruined world. In 'Beast from Air', after their exploration, his intelligent is crippled by fear, so they keep a signal on the rock instead on the top of the mountain. When Jack challenges his authority, Ralph does not give a firm counterattack, even wants to give up the position of chief, and takes part in the feast of Jack and killing of Simon. To a great degree, Ralph helps the expanding of savagery (ibidem, p. 119-120).

From this passage, one can note that Ralph's desire to implement a strict democracy has led to the destabilisation of his society. Which means that for one's democratic values to gain success, he or she should every now and then run a convenient rampant in his or her decision making. Leniency is a moral value but very often its over implementation is accompanied with failure. From the depiction of issues related to the exaggerated leniency of Ralph, Golding wants to show the negative effect of being an exaggerated lenient leader. That is a minimum of firmness is important in a democratic system of government. For, democracy does not advocate for destabilisation. Ralph has failed to succeed in rescuing himself and other children from the hardships of the island because of his laissez faire vis à vis Jack's evil deeds. The reason that lies behind the submissiveness of Ralph who symbolises the democratic system is to show the shortcoming of such a system of ruling. Since it gives freedom to citizens in many aspects of life, some people use this freedom as a reason to create disorder and chaos. It means that to a great degree democracy may contribute to the expending of unrest. For instance,

If we set the story against the social background during World War II, it is easy for us to find the boys in the novel from the politicians at that time. 'If Ralph is Chamberlain and Jack Hitler, Roger is the Gestapo'. This kind of comparison is seemingly surprising to us, but as a matter of fact there's something reasonable in it. Chamberlain was British Prime Minister before the war, who took a policy of appeasement towards Hitler's aggression. It's his diplomatic policy that should be partly responsible for Hitler's expansion, which finally caused the greatest tragedy in the history of the world. There is something similar between Ralph and Chamberlain. Ralph is the chief among the boys, but when Jack challenges his authority, he in most cases is reluctant to fight against Jack. He has such a capability but he fails to make use of it. He could challenge Jack physically and defeat him once and for all ... (Ibidem, p. 120).

This passage above shows that there is a kind of comparison between the true events around two political figures (Chamberlain and Hitler) and those of Golding's fictitious world (Ralph and Jack). Ralph symbolises Chamberlain whereas Jack embodies Hitler. From this comparison, Golding wants to draw the attention of his readership on an actual fact. For him, the practitioners of democracy should avoid the mistake which is made by Chamberlain in his implementation of democratic system during his time. This mistake concerns the fact of exercising too much leniency in a democratic system of government. That is the reason why his depiction of the events in *Lord of the Flies* recalls the history of such a mistake and its impact on societies. For,

Every society does indeed, in some measure at least, rest on force. We may appeal to God, even claim (as we now officially do) that this is a nation 'under God'. We may invoke the sanction of justice, even claim (as we officially do) that we provide 'liberty and justice for all.' We may rely on consent, even claim (as we regularly do) that our governors are chosen by the freely recorded and continuing consent of the people, through elections, and that they derive 'their just powers from the consent of the governed.' But we, along with every other so-called civilized nation, nonetheless maintain an army and police force. Without them, or so it is believed, we cannot resist the will of greater powers or impress our will on those with lesser force (D. Spitz, Op cit, p. 32).

This passage above concerns the fact that power is accepted if it used in the name of justice.

4. Jack as an Expression of Totalitarianism

Jack is Ralph's antagonist. He symbolises totalitarianism through his authoritarian position on some of the issues of *Lord of the Flies*. Totalitarianism is a centralised control by an autocratic authority. It is a political concept in which citizens should be totally subject to an absolute state authority (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh edition, 2003, p. 1320).

Through the characterisation of Jack authoritarianism becomes more conspicuous in *Lord of the Flies*. It reads:

Jack then, is authoritarian man. Like Hitler and Mussolini, he came of an authoritarian tradition; himself a satanic figure with his red hair and black cape, he was also the leader of a black-capped and black-cloaked gang that marched in step-'something dark (that) was fumbling along'-and followed orders. His 'was the voice of one who knew his own mind,' and when it was suggested that there ought to be a chief he immediately and arrogantly demanded that position for himself. Defeated in an election, he took of the hunters, the forces of naked power. 'We will have rules!' he cried excitedly. 'Lots of rules! Then when any one breaks 'em-' But his desire for many controls did not of course extend to controls he disliked, to those over himself. Then he rejected the rules and claimed the right to decide for himself. To Ralph plea that he had been chosen chief, Jack replied: why should choosing make any difference? Just giving orders that don't make any sense... Bollocks to the rules! We're strong-we hunt! If there is a beast, we'll hunt it down! We'll close in and beat and beat and beat-' He was contemptuous of the masses, dismissing the little ones as 'useless'. 'It's time some people knew they've got to keep quiet and leave deciding things to the rest of us-' Madness came often into his eyes, and when as hunter and warrior he again cloaked himself, this time behind a mask of paint, he lost all inhibitions (D. Spitz, op cit, p. 27).

The fact of comparing Jack to Hitler shows the degree of violence which is exercised by Jack. For him, the use of the excessive force is the only way through which the will of any leader can be implemented by the governed. Through Jack, Golding ceased the opportunity to show the weaknesses of a totalitarian government. For instance, when "Jack's voice sounded in a bitter mimicry" (*LOTF*, p. 114), Ralph tried to draw his attention on the importance of respecting rules, he replied: "who cares... Bollocks to the rules! We're strong-we hunt! If there's a beast, we will hunt it down! We'll close in and beat and beat and beat---" (*ibidem*, p. 114)! According to Jack, the use of force or power is the only ultimate way through which leading becomes effective. His use of language is destructive. It is not in favor of making peace.

5. Piggy: a Symbol of Rationalism

Rationalism is "the belief that all behaviour, opinions, etc. should be based on reason rather than emotions or religious beliefs" (J. Turnbull, Op cit, p. 1216). Throughout *Lord of the Flies*, Piggy has been an advisor to the whole group of children on the island especially, to Ralph. He shows signs of intelligence. His expression of intelligence starts in the novel with the advice that he gives to Ralph when they come across a conch. He advise Ralph: "We can use this to call others. Have a meeting. They'll come when they hear us" (*LOTF*, p. 22). It means that Piggy is the only character who is capable of understanding the role of the conch as an instrument of reason and order. With this rational attitude of Piggy in mind, he is compared to Socrates as what follows:

Piggy I take to be Socrates, the voice of reason. Like Socrates, he is ugly, fat and-to men unappreciative of reason-a bore, with a disinclination for manual labor. He is the 'outsider'. He alone shows marks of intelligence; he can think; he has brains. He not only thinks; he knows himself as well as other men. 'I done some thinking. I know about people. I know about me. And him.' Like Socrates in the Paedo seeking to remove the child-like fears of Simmias and Cebes, it is Piggy who reminds the others not to act like children but to behave like grown-ups. Above all, it is he who recognizes that there is no beast and no fear-'unless we get frightened of people.' All in all, he is indeed 'the true, wise friend' (D. Spitz, Op cit, p. 26).

Apart from this rational attitude of Piggy, he also symbolizes civilization. His spectacles are the only items that represent civilization and modern life on the island. When he wears them he becomes capable of seeing and is more rational. For instance, when other children do not want to do reasonable things he complains:

‘then when you get here you build a bonfire that isn’t no use. Now you been and set the whole island on fire. Won’t we look funny if the whole island burns up? Cooked that’s nothing to laugh at! You said Ralph was chief and you don’t give him time to think. Then when he says something you rush off, like, like-’(LOTF, p. 59).

Unlike Jack, Piggy’s use of language is constructive. Whatever he says falls within the framework of changing his society in a positive manner. He is against savagery. He constitutes a symbol of those who are ready to give all kind of advice for a better show in their true communities. That is the reason why the author has provided him with rationalistic and democratic orientation. His devotion to be responsible for the wellbeing of the whole society is coupled with his resistance to forfeit civilized standards in favor of savage ones (B. W. Shaffer, Op cit, p. 62). However, like in true societies, neither good people nor good things last. In spite of his appeals to human reason and justice, Piggy is killed by Jack. That is democracy, rationalism and justice are destroyed by totalitarianism. For this reason, “Ralph wept for the end of innocence, the darkness of man’s heart, and the fall through the air of the true, wise friend called Piggy” (LOTF, p. 248).

Conclusion

This article has carried out the parallelism between the novel and true life realities. It has shown the evil deeds of some characters and the negative impact of their behavior on the whole fictitious society of William Golding. In the context of *Lord of the Flies*, This study has analysed it in its political perspective. From the inability of the characters to set a good social organisation and peace on the island, the study has arrived at the conclusion that what matters for many politicians in societies is their personal interest. They do not mind the development of their social milieus. This personal interest is a consequence of the evil inside the nature of all individuals. Therefore, in order to have a better show in societies, each individual must first of all confront the evil inside themselves before attacking that of outside.

The study has also pointed out the fact that political antagonism may lead to the destruction of a society. The point is that if politicians (the ruling party and the opposition one) criticize each other just for the sake of doing it, it will be difficult for them to come together in order to implement actions of development. This is what explains the failure of Ralph and Jack to rescue themselves and other children from the hardships of the island. Which means that in normal circumstances only ideas (developing strategies) may be contradictory. Actors of development should advocate for love among themselves. In this case, the harmonisation of each situation should be a common target of political classes if they really mind the development of their common social milieu.

Bibliography

- BAKER James, 1963, "Why it's no go: Critical Essays on William Golding", *The Arizona Quarterly*, vol. 19, No.4, p. 293-305.
- BRUCK Tilman, Patricia Justino et al, 2017, *Conflict and Development: Recent Research Advances and Future Agendas*. United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research.
- DAVID Spitz, 1970, *Power and Authority: An Interpretation of Golding's Lord of the Flies*. *The Antioch Review*, vol. 30, No.1, p. 21-33.
- DELBAERE-GARANT Jeanne, 1970, *James on Art and the Novel in: Henry James: The Vision of France*, Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège.
- DIKEN Bulent and Carsten Bagge Laustsen, 2006, *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, <http://alt.sagepub.com/content/31/4/431>, (12.10.2021).
- GOLDING William, 2009/1954, *Lord of the Flies*. Ibdan: Sam-Adex Printers Sanyo.
- HOWELL Rachel, 2004, *Political Thuggerly in Vogue*, Chicago, L and T Press Ltd.
- JOAN Esteban and Debraj Ray, 2016, *Conflict and Development*. New York University: Edi Working Paper Series.
- KETTELL Steven, 2006, *Dirty Politics: New Labour, British Democracy and the Invasion of Iraq*, London and New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- KIMEMIA Douglass, 2021, "The Impacts of Political Conflicts in Africa", *Journal of African Conflicts and Peace Studies*, vol.4, Iss.2, <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jacaps/>, (25/10/2021), p. 1-33.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, Eleventh edition, 2003, Massachusetts, Merriam-Webster Incorporated.
- MINNIE Sign, 1997, "The government of Boys: Golding's Lord of the Flies and Ballantyne's Coral Island", in *Children Literature*, vol.25, John Hopkins University, John Hopkins University Press, p. 205-213.
- OECD Publications, 2005, *Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Sector: A Toolkit*. www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/49107986, (28.12.2018).
- PEWISSI Ataféï, 2017, *Rethinking Womanism: When Difference Maps Chaos*, Accra North-Ghana: Yamens Ltd.
- SHAFFER W. Brian, 2006, *Reading the Novel in English 1950-2000*, Malden MA, Blackwell Pub.
- TITLESTAD Michael, 2015, "This is not the way the world ends: Richard Hughes's rejoinder to William Golding's Lord of the Flies", *Studia Neophilologica*, 88:sup1, DOI: 10.1080/003932741096034, (20.09.2021), p. 33-46.
- TURNBULL Joanna, 2010, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, New 8th Edition.
- "significance of fire in Lord of the Flies," Umama Shah: International Islamic University, Islamabad, www.academia.edu/9754955/ (25.10.2018).