

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SELF-INTEREST AND COLLECTIVE
INTEREST: THE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE*
FLIES

MASTER THESIS
RIFAAT SALIH

Supervisor: Dr. ULVIYE SOYSEV

NICOSIA
AUGUST 2019

Approval of Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Saęsan

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master
of Arts.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis submitted by Rifaat Salih titled “**The Conflict between self-interest and Collective Interest: The Historical Analysis of Golding’s *Lord of the Flies***” and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Dr. Ülviye Soysev

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Dr. Ülviye Soysev _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoęlu _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Doina Popescu _____

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with the academic rules and ethical guidelines of the Graduate School of Social Sciences, Near East University. I also declare that as required by these rules I have fully cited and referenced all materials and results that are not original to this study.

Full Name:

Field of Study:

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Ulviye Soysev for the continuous support of my Master's Thesis, for her patience, motivation, and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better supervisor and mentor for my study. I would like to express my gratitude to my family for all their support through the process of writing this thesis. This accomplishment would have been harder without their endless support. Thank you.

ABSTRACT**THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SELF-INTEREST AND COLLECTIVE
INTEREST: THE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE
FLIES*****RIFAAT SALIH****M.A PROGRAM, ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE****SUPERVISOR: Dr. ULVIYE SOYSEV****AUGUST 2019, 110 pages**

Golding's *Lord of the Flies* is one of the most remarkable novels of the 20th century. It shows ongoing conflicts between the personal interest representing human imperfections and the common interest representing human salvation. Accordingly, the main purpose of this study was: first to show how the conflict between personal interest and common interest took place in the *Lord of Flies*. The second is to condemn personal interests as human shortcomings. Third, to reveal the importance of relationships between people. Fourth, to invite the human community to further cooperation and cooperation. In order to achieve the main objectives of this study, definitions, situations, dialogues and expressions of the characters were examined. Most of the characters in the *Lord of the Flies* were found to be selfish. It was a destructive selfishness that ruined human society and the environment..

Keywords: Self-interest, Collective Interest, Totalitarianism, Democracy, Savagery, Civilization.

ÖZ**THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SELF-INTEREST AND COLLECTIVE INTEREST: THE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE FLIES*****RIFAAT SALIH****İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI****DANIŞMAN: DR. ULVIYE SOYSEV****OCAK 2019, 110 Sayfalar**

Golding'in Sineklerin Efendisi, 20. yüzyılın en dikkat çekici romanlarından biridir. İnsan kusurlarını temsil eden kişisel çıkar ile insan kurtuluşunu temsil eden ortak çıkar arasında devam eden çatışmaları gösterir. Buna göre, bu çalışmanın temel amacı şuydu: ilk önce kişisel çıkar ile ortak çıkar arasındaki çatışmanın Sinekler Efendisi'nde nasıl gerçekleştiğini gösteren. İkincisi, kişisel çıkarları insan eksiklikleri olarak kınamaktır. Üçüncüsü, insanlar arasındaki ilişkilerin önemini ortaya koymak. Dördüncü olarak, insan topluluğunu daha fazla işbirliği ve işbirliğine davet etmek. Bu çalışmanın temel amaçlarına ulaşmak için karakterlerin tanımları, durumları, diyalogları ve ifadeleri incelenmiştir. Sineklerin Efendisindeki karakterlerin çoğunun bencil olduğu bulundu. İnsan toplumu ve çevreyi mahveden yıkıcı bir bencillikti.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kişisel çıkar, Ortak çıkar, Totaliterizm, Demokrasi, Savagery, Medeniyet.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL REPORT.....	2
DECLARATION.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
ÖZ.....	6
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	7
 CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION.....	10
The Concept of Conflict.....	10
The Concept of Collective Interest.....	11
The Concept of Self-interest.....	12
Conclusion.....	25
 CHAPTER II	
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	28
The Concept of Conflict.....	28
The Concept of Self-interest.....	30
The Concept of Collective Interest.....	34

The Concept of Democracy.....	35
The Concept of Totalitarianism.....	37
Lord of the Flies as British Society.....	40
The Concept of Savagery.....	42
The Concept of Civilization.....	44

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY.....	47
The Modern Economic Theory of Self-interest.....	47
Plato’s Political Theory of Social Unity.....	51
African Humanism.....	52
African Humanism and Lord of the Flies.....	56
The Analysis Strategies.....	58
The Historical Approach.....	58
Lord of the Flies in Historical and Cultural Context.....	61

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS.....	66
Presentation of Self-interest in Lord of the Flies.....	66
Collective interest in Lord of the Flies.....	79

Self-interest as Savagery in Lord of the Flies.....	82
--	-----------

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION.....	86
------------------------	-----------

Recommendation for Future Research.....	89
--	-----------

References.....	90
------------------------	-----------

APPENDICES.....	102
------------------------	------------

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Turnitin Report.....	102
---	------------

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The present study aims to investigate the conflict between self-interest and collective interest portrayed in *Lord of the Flies* by William Golding. The mentioned novel is selected for the purpose of examining the concepts of self-interest and collective interest because almost all the characters in the novel are portrayed to be selfish who contest with each other to accomplish their selfish interests (Perry, 2009). On the contrary, reflection of collective interest is also found in the character traits of one of the protagonists of the novel who tries to rescue all his fellows from mishap by providing a helping hand whenever needed. The following research objectives have been developed in correspondence to the research aims:

- To apprehend how the conflict between self-interest and collective interest has been presented in *Lord of the Flies* in terms of portrayal of characters, situations, dialogues, and expressions.
- To condemn self-interest as human vices.
- To assert the importance of interrelatedness of human beings.
- To invite the human community to more cooperation and collaboration.

The Concept of Conflict

The specific concept of conflict between self-interest and collective interest is taken because Conflict is the key concept of the selected novel. From an apparent angle,

conflict between savage human impulse and intention to live up to the expectations of the rules of civilization is clearly persistent in the novel which the readers could find from character traits of two principle protagonists. Golding presents the antagonist character as an example of savage human impulse, and the protagonist has been presented as a mirror of civilization. From a deeper standpoint, the antagonist is a reflection of self-interest while the protagonist represents collective interest. In their situation the boys need to put all their personal matters, dreams and trivial games aside and work together to find a way of survival. They do that for a while everything seems planned and they have a well-organized system and if they keep going on that system they will for sure be saved. But the jealousy, greed, lust for control, and selfishness inside them prevails and collapses the whole society. Mostly, the characters portrayed in *Lord of the Flies* are selfish and, of course there are but a few who keep remembering the rest to stay on the right way and be rational. In this study the researcher also aims to investigate whether Golding in his novel aims to attack the political systems of his time or the selfish self-interested human being who is ready to destroy the whole world in order to fulfill his inner, greedy, selfish and sick ambitions.

The Concept of Collective Interest

Collective interest reflects the concept of our instinctive social nature, which leads us to connect and communicate with those around us in order to form new relationships and preserve the permanence of old relations. All this in order to contribute to the collective work that aims to make the members of the community happy away from selfishness. (Van de ven et al., 2007). Medlin (2006) defines collective interest as conjoined self-interests of a number of parties belonging to a same group or network. Thus, it can be

simplified that collective interests refer to the common interests of all the stakeholders of a group, party or network. Here the beneficiary of the outcome of the interest is not a single individual, but all the people present in the group.

The Concept of Self-interest

Self-interest is defined in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2010) as “the fact of somebody only considering their own interests and of not caring about things that would help other people.” (p. 1388) It is equivalent to selfishness; which is defined as “caring only about yourself rather than about other people.” (p. 1388) Bluntly, as Robert Solow (1956) puts it, this canonical hypothesis is greed. Van de ven, Sapienza & Villanueva (2007) argue that “Self- interest focuses on ME—my selfish nature that drives me to acquire resources and things that maximize my individual interests, to have control, autonomy and distinctiveness over others, and to exploit or compete with others as an instrumental means to achieving my self-interests.” (p. 6) The beneficiary of the outcome of interest is what distinguishes self-interest from collective interest. When the beneficiary is interested in personal profit maximization, it is self-interest. From here, it can be stated that self-interest relates to some actions that are exclusively undertaken with the intention of achieving certain personal benefits. This interest can be both tangible (money, promotion, etc.) and intangible (community standing, group status, etc.) in nature (Cropanzano, Gotldman, & Folger, 2005), this is on the one hand. On the other hand, according to Murove (2005) the modern economic theory of self-interest claims that we human beings in our economic relations are motivated only by our self-interests. The same theory also claims that when people follow their self-interest they indirectly contribute to the prosperity and development of the society economically. This theory

goes on more to claim that selfishness of the people or their personal vices, rather than morality, were the reason behind flourishing wealth. Murove (2005) divides ancient Greek philosophers and theologians into two groups; some considered self-interest as a human vice that should be condemned because of its bad results on the unity of the community such as Plato, Pythagoreans, Stoic, and the Church Fathers, and some others who advocated for self-interest considering it as a necessity that contributes to the economic prosperity in community such as Aristotle, Hume, and Adam Smith.

As for ancient Judeo-Christian, Schumpeter (1986) argues that their debate concerning self-interest was almost the same as the ancient Greeks' in the sense that common ownership of property was the center of their discussion rather than the private ownership. Self-interest, as was found in the works of Church fathers such as St. Ambrose of Milan, Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Augustine, was considered as a sin of avarice. This sin of greed is typical of man in his fallen state. The idealistic society for them was the one in which people owned their belongings as shared with others. This practice comes as an appeal to the common good and as a condemn to self-interest. From the above mentioned, it can be said that both ancient Greeks (especially Plato) and the ancient Judeo-Christians seem to share the idea of a future society that is based on the common ownership of property (Murove, 2005).

Rhys (1906) argues that for both, Platonist and the Pythagorean, the require the community of property is not simply to dispose of destitution or to help poor people however it was a direct result of a magical reason which was established on the supposition that variety is insidious; consequently, it must be annulled by solidarity. So as to maintain his political hypothesis of social solidarity as a crucial ethical value for

steady social presence, Plato utilizes the human body for instance to express the sort of solidarity he has as a main priority: “Then when one of the citizens experiences any good or evil, the whole State will make his case their own, and will either rejoice or sorrow with him” (Rhys 1906, p. 160). Plato was against the idea of self-interest and he believed that people should see their prosperity as associated with that of the community within a fellowship of ownership of property. For him independence or private proprietorship was the explanation for the social strife and turmoil. The private possession was malevolent in light of the fact that its accomplished to the detriment of the entirety. This thought of Plato is likewise pertinent to the rulers who should be progressively worried about the prosperity of their kin. Plato had this for the rulers: “. . . [N]o physician, so far as he is a physician, considers what is advantageous for the physician, nor enjoins it, but what is advantageous for the sick; for it hath been agreed that the accurate physician is one who taketh care of sick bodies, and not an amasser of wealth” (Rhys, 1906, p. 20). Here Plato wanted to say that the rulers should not be selfish in their office; rather, they should work for the best of the collective interest of the whole community.

Contrary to Plato’s theory of “ideal state”, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E) in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (*Basic Works of Aristotle 1155a-1172a*) has a long conversation about friendship. Murove (2005) argues that Aristotle in tackling the matter of “friendship” and “self-love,” quotes a series of proverbs concerning friendship: “one soul, what friends have is common, equality is friendship. . . Hence he [a friend] should also love himself most of all”(p. 17). Aristotle is expressing his idea saying that for individuals to have the sense of love for others, they must first love themselves. As he says “Therefore the good man should be a lover of self (for he will both profit himself by doing noble acts, and will benefit his fellows), but the wicked man should not; for he will

hurt both himself and his neighbors, following as he does evil passions”(p. 17). Aristotle doesn't refuse the idea of being self-interested but he thinks that it should be neutralized by caring for the wellbeing of others.

Murove (2005) self-interest in humanitarian and political exercises was an indispensable piece of the early economic and political pioneers, as can be found in the works of Mandeville (1924), Hobbes (1962), Hume (2007), and Adam Smith (1976). In the works of these philosophers, the success of riches relied upon people's opportunity in seeking after their own advantages. In such manner, self-interest has turned into the main wellspring of inspiration in the direct of the human economy. The consistent inspiration in the late modern economic discourse of self-interest relies upon the possibility that individuals think and follow up on their own advantages. This is the principle motivation behind why the late economics feel that society will prosper when individuals left alone to seek after their own advantages.

According to Tollock & Mackenzie (1985) modern theorists of late economics claim that self-interest acts as a human motivation that helps us to maximize our facilities. The economic relationship that does not maximize economic benefit cannot be considered. The late modern economic theory to maximize utility means that human are self-interested since they can only satisfy themselves but after they get a bigger amount of whatever they need. This reduction of human economic motivation to maximize utility eliminates other incentives in human financial behavior. In this maximizing view of self-interest, man is stripped of his humanity because his other motives turn to greed (Handy, 1998). Murove (2005) argues that if human economic motivation is reduced to maximizing utility, the problem is that pursuing self-interest will inevitably lead to social

inequality, pervasive pollution, and depletion of resources upon which future generations depend. If humans are only interested in themselves, it becomes difficult to argue for the need to have an all-inclusive moral look that has an interest in the natural environment.

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) is the source from which the self-interest theory in modern economics is derived. In his book, Smith argued that "economic relations are about appealing to each other's self-interest or greed" (p. 423). According to Smith, when individuals appeal to one another's self-interest, they get what they need more than when they appeal to one another's generosity. Besides, Smith noticed that self-interested activities of individuals are great as they lead to performing a balance in social, financial, and political aspects of community, which is more needed than when we intentionally choose to offer shape to these substances through guidelines. Murove (2005), argues that there is a problem with this Smithian theory because it is "based on unsystematic pursuit of self-interest that suggests an anarchic view of society in the sense that there is a lack of concern for what self-interest would do to the whole social order" (p. 2). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines anarchy as "a situation in a country, an organization, etc. in which there is no government, order or control" (p. 49). From this definition we can conclude that individuals are totally free and living in accordance to no laws or orders. Jenkins (2015) argues that anarchy carries negative connotations because it is synonymous with chaos and disorder. It is a term which comes as opposed to the principles of our modern societies which are based on law and order. The lack of authority, structure, laws, and orders consequently will lead to confusion, wild behavior, and disorder. In other words, we can say that in such situations human beings are unable to control themselves, maintain order, and to live peacefully with each

other. The above mentioned about anarchy reminds us of the “State of Nature” of Thomas Hobbes.

In his *Leviathan* (1652), Thomas Hobbes argues that human beings in situations where there is no authority and order are in a state of war with each other. Each individual fights for themselves and everyone becomes enemy to others. When there is no authority human loss trust in each other and they become in a situation resembles a war. For Hobbes, the law of nature cannot prevent humans from revenge upon each other. People can only act as civilized when forced to (Hobbes 1652). Thus, if there are no rules and laws individuals will follow their selfish desires to save themselves and will exploit the others who are under their control for themselves. If individuals are only interested in their self-interest, this automatically will make them neglect the interests of the others and the society at large (Gurove, 2005).

Self-interest, as contended by early modern economist and still pursued by late modern economists, tends in general discard morals in monetary relations as well as inside the universe of our social and political presence as people. Self-interest in later economic discourse is totally against the prosperity of future generations. In the event that one can just live as per his self-interest, there is nothing that can keep him from polluting and depleting the environment and its natural resources (Ikerd 1999; Lux 1990; O’Neil 1998).

The current study aims to investigate the use of collective-interest and self-interest in *Lord of the Flies*. It then aims to reveal how these qualities are reflected on the characters. The conflict between self-interest and collective interest in the novel comes out in the strikingly different approaches. While one approach exemplifies a self-interest

and power hunger, the other approach demonstrates a collective- interests and collective- effort. The collective-interest approach represents the cooperation and help whenever needed to reach everybody. While the self-interest approach represents status of self-gratification and self-satisfaction. It all boils down to the fact that what destroys the community is not the community, but the human within the community. *Lord of the Flies* presents a story that depicts human selfishness. Human can go to extreme to meet their selfish desire. This could result in man's inherent capacities for cruelty, more than cooperation (Perry, 2009). Thus, the focus point of this study is to examine the major factors that bring about the man's incessant need to focus on "self" rather than "communal goal" in *Lord of the Flies* by William Golding.

Lord of the Flies is chosen because it is a book that is "widely read and frequently used in the classroom[but] has received little analytical attention from critics" and "despite a running controversy over the meaning of the novel, critical articles fall largely into a pattern of plot summary and applause for the arrangement of the novel's materials followed by observations of Golding's view of human nature, often embellished with the critics response to that view" (Golding, Baker & Ziegler, 1988, p .ix). It is one of the everlasting novels fall of brainstorming ideas.

The argument of this thesis is that self-interest is immoral to societal life. This idea has not been covered by the theorists. It also puts human beings in competitions which is based on amoral bases and drags them into being in a situation of a war proposed by Hobbes (1962). One who acts solely on the basis of maximizing his or her utility would inevitably deprive others of a humane existence. Since the argument of this study is to figure out the way in which Golding has referred to the self-interest of human beings

through his characters, using self-interest theory as an approach will best serve and answer all the questions raised by this study in the analysis chapter. This study asserts that the situation in *Lord of the Flies* deteriorates because of the self-interest of the characters. Also according to this study Golding was attacking individualism. For him it was the reason behind the world wars and he is inviting the world community to rationality and common sense. So, the argument of this thesis is to consider man's selfish interest as against communal goal in relation to *Lord of the Flies* as a factor leading to the collapse of a society vis-à-vis political system – a gap which the present study seeks to explore. Perhaps, relating the fall of our societies with the conflict between “self” and “communal goal” may make more sense when interpreted in the context of *Lord of the Flies*. Nevertheless, none of the researches have dealt with the inherent concept of conflict between self-interest and collective interest which happens to be the predominant thematic concern of the novel. Self-interest is immoral to our economic relations as well as to our social and political life.

While undertaking this study on the conflict of self-interest and collective interest, it has been observed that the majority of researches that exist till now primarily deal with the conflict between themes of savagery and civilization; democracy and totalitarianism. For example, Chavan (2013) translates the happenings in the novel as a struggle between two political ideologies of totalitarian and democracy. Rao (1974) defines Totalitarianism as “the concentration of absolute power in the hands of a tiny band of people who rule in a despotic fashion” (p. 35). Chavan (2013) argues that totalitarian institutions are products of irrational instincts existed in human beings. These “institutions follow biased decision-making procedures about human action” (p. 1517) a purpose of doing great good to limited people. They are “totalitarian, authoritarian and, dictatorial in nature” (p.

1518). Here it can be argued that totalitarianism is another face of self-interest because self-interested individuals have an ideology of their own, they are the only mind to make decisions. They also force the others to follow their ideologies. They put many restrictions on the freedom and rights of the community. Thus, the self-interested individual uses the people and the resources of the community to fulfill his own barbaric dreams and ambitions. This connection between totalitarianism regimes and self-interest is the reason behind choosing this approach it will help us to highlight the way in which Golding has presented self-interest in his characters. It will also help us to confirm that self-interest of the characters is the only reason behind the fall of the boys' society in *Lord of the Flies*.

On the other hand, Democracy according to Chavan (2013) is the product of the rational instincts of human beings. They are founded on rationality and are humanistic. The purpose of these institutions is to “widespread rational decision-making procedures” (p. 1517) about human actions reflecting the aim of doing a great good in favor of the greatest number of individuals. Owen (2003) defines democracy as “a mode of government in which the members of the unit of rule are equal consociates and have collectively an effective capacity to govern, either directly or via intermediaries, matters of common interest (or concerning the common good) qua membership of this unit of rule” (p. 107). Here it can be argued that Democracy can be looked at as the reflection of collective interest in which all individuals are equal when it comes to responsibilities assigned to them. There is a sense of cooperation and collaboration. The authority is elected through a voting system. The decisions concerning the community are not from the leader only but from different opinions of the members of the community. The main purpose behind the collective interest is to keep the unity of the community which will

preserve its strength and steadfastness when crises come up. According to Chavan (2013) the clear message sent through Golding's novel is that human are naturally inclined to destructiveness and the only thing that can save the world from falling is "agreement by common sense." Another study which has seen that the focus of *Lord of the Flies* is the individuals of the society is Suzanne Gulbin's (1966). In her study Gulbin points out that the main purpose of Golding in *Lord of the Flies* is a Sociological criticism. According to her Golding suggests that the success and failure of governments depend on the chosen individual that is assigned as a leader to that government. That is why Golding chooses two characters one representing the good side of human beings and the other representing the dark side and puts these two characters in a conflict in which the dark side prevails. Moreover, according to her Golding's purpose is not to show that the dark side is better than the good side that is why it prevails, but his aim is to show that the majority of human beings are seduced and prefer the dark side because it is the right side that reflects the real sick side existed in all humans. Her study also shows that *Lord of the Flies* portrays a scenario in which the characters are freed from the rules of adults and the society in general and they try to have a system of their own for survival. The dark side described in Gulbin's study holds many characteristics that go with the one under discussion. The evilness existed in the characters (Dalrymple 2005; Hasan Al-Saidi 2012). All these studies are justified and are of good purpose but they all share one weakness which is describing the structure of the novel. They all describe or criticize the systems of the society more than going deep in analyzing the human being which is the center of Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. In his own words Golding (Golding, Baker & Ziegler, 1988) states "The theme of [*Lord of the Flies*] is an attempt to trace the defects of the 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”(p. 251). The current study will concentrate totally in revealing and analyzing the sick man that Golding refers to in his work. The argument of this thesis is “that self-interest is antithetical to communal life as advocated in the ethic of *Ubuntu*. One who acts solely on the basis of maximizing his or her utility would inevitably deprive others of a humane existence” (Murove, 2005, p. IV).

Golding portrays the protagonist of the novel as the representative of collective interest who has lots of positive traits in the manner that he senses that self-interest leads to disintegrating of relationships, moral values and deterioration of sanity. Hence, he attempts to put up things together and integrate everybody even though his endeavors prove futile many times. Therefore, it is clear that intergroup conflict is the key element of the novel where the perspectives and ways of the antagonist and his allies are found to conflict with that of the protagonist and his allies. Here Realistic group-conflict theory (Coser, 1956; Levine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif, 1966) applies perfectly well which states that “intergroup conflicts are rational in the sense that groups do have incompatible goals and are in competition for scarce resources” (p. 287). Obviously, this idea of rationality is more applicable on contending groups but it has been outspreaded to also contain individual group members. In this sense, it conveys the idea that if it is logic for groups to compete, it must also be logic for individual group members to compete as well. According to researchers (Taylor and Moghadam, 1987) realistic conflict theory is “essentially an economic theory that presumes that people are selfish and will try to maximize their own rewards” (p. 34). This theory can be applied to *Lord of the Flies*. Here also the Realistic group-conflict theory will be of great serve in analyzing the kind of conflict happens in the novel. It will help to understand best the real reason behind the

conflict that goes on among the characters and the way in which that conflict leads them to barbaric killing and environmental destruction. In the novel, the community is divided into two groups. The first group has an elected leader by the majority of the community, has the right to lead and make the important decisions concerning the whole community. This leader also has councilors who have right to see whether the leader's decisions are bound to the law or not. Moreover, the community always has some specified protected rights such as the right to free speech or freedom in beliefs (Gadsby, 1995). The leader and the community are bounded to the law. Everyone in the community works hard to achieve a common goal which is safety and rescue of the all members. On the other hand, the second group is led by a person who has an ideology of his own; he is the only one who makes decisions concerning the whole community. He also forces the community to follow his ideology and do as he wishes. The leader is the only mind who thinks on behalf of all members. What he says and does is the right. There are no rules he has to follow. He puts many restrictions on the freedom and rights of the community. Thus, the leader uses the people and the resources of the community to fulfill his own barbaric dreams and ambitions. Hence, the conflict between the two groups arises because we have two different groups each has its own way of life or ideology. According to this theory there are other reasons that lead to the rise of conflicts and hostility between the competing groups such as "valuable but limited material resources"(Brief et al., 2005).

This study is divided into the following chapters for the purpose of a systematic assessment of the research topic at hand. Following is the chapter plan along with the contents that are be presented in each of the chapters:

This first chapter is the introduction of the study. It lays the foundation of the research topic by developing a background related to the topic. Along with this, other research elements like definitions of the concepts, research aims, objectives, themes, main arguments and theoretical framework have also been presented here.

The second chapter is the review of the literature considering the previously published research which is relevant to the current study. The concepts that are going to be covered in literature review are: Conflict, Self-interest and Collective interest.

The third chapter serves as Methodology which is divided into two sections; the first section serves as a theoretical framework of this study and the second section is devoted to the analysis strategies of the study.

The fourth chapter is divided into two sections. The first section is dedicated to the manner in which the term of self-interest is portrayed in the novel. Will apprehend how the concept of self-interest has been presented in *Lord of the Flies* in terms of portrayal of characters, situations, dialogues, and expressions. This study considers the theme of self-interest of great importance because it is considered to be the main reason that leads to the fall of society in *Lord of the Flies*. The study proposes that most of the characters in the novel are portrayed to be selfish. Characters' selfishness prevents them to work together as one strong community; instead they enjoy having fun, hunting, and doing trivial games. The second section focuses on the collective interest presented in the novel represented by the protagonist and his efforts to establish a united community.

The fifth chapter sheds light on Self-interest as a portrayal of savagery in *Lord of the Flies* taking into consideration the negativity of self-interest and its bad consequences. There are many incidents that lead to brutal behavior and various manifestations that

form the brutality depicted in the novel. The best way of knowing the quality of brutality depicted in *Lord of the Flies* is the examination of its manifestations. Golding's main purpose behind this is to show what life might look like when there are no social boundaries and rules. The question that comes to our mind here is whether things we usually connect to goodness, such as good notions, unselfish deeds, compassion, kindness, or bravery can be seen among people when there are no more limits of community. The answer on this question is given through the fact that all the savage and brutal happenings in *Lord of the Flies* are done by some children who are usually considered as innocent and naturally good.

The sixth chapter is the final chapter of the current study that concludes the entire study findings. In addition, the limitations of the study and future scopes shall also be discussed in this chapter.

Conclusion

The purpose of this section is to re-state briefly what I have covered in the Introduction chapter. The chapter starts with the main purpose behind conducting the current study which are: First, to find out how Golding has presented the conflict between the concepts of Self-interest and Collective interest; Second, to shed light on the negativity of the concept of Self-interest and its bad consequences as portrayal of savagery in *Lord of the Flies*. These aims are based on the ideas that the majority of the characters portrayed in *Lord of the Flies* are self-interested who are concerned only about their selfish desires away from the collective interest of the whole community. Consequently, their selfishness makes them be divided into two competitive groups.

I have defined both the concept of Self-interest and Collective interest. The collective-interest approach represents the cooperation and help whenever needed to reach everybody. While the self-interest approach represents status of self-gratification and self-satisfaction. It all boils down to the fact that what destroys the society is not the society, but the human within the society. *Lord of the Flies* presents a story that portrays human selfishness. Human can go to extreme to meet their selfish desire. This could result in man's inherent capacities for cruelty, more than cooperation. Thus, the focus point of this study is to examine the major factors that bring about the man's incessant need to focus on "self" rather than "communal goal" in *Lord of the Flies* by William Golding.

The current study is a critique against the modern economic theory of Self-interest according to which human beings in their relationships are only motivated by their Self-interest which is considered to be a positive instinct that leads to the prosperity and development of society. According to Murove (2005) this theory has been for a long time the center of controversy among ancient and modern intellectuals. An overview of different opinions of the intellectuals has been given. Some of these intellectuals have praised the self-interested individuals in the society such as (Aristotle, Mandeville, Hobbes, Hume, and Adam Smith) and others have considered Self-interest as a negative phenomenon such as (Plato, the Church Fathers, Stoic, Pythagoreans, and Robert Heilbrunner), according to Murove (2005).

I should stress that my study is primarily concerned with *Lord of the Flies*. Golding's other works will not be taken into consideration. This study cannot be generalized to Golding's other writings as it picks only *Lord of the Flies* for its evident specialty and

type. However, the scope that simultaneously emerges from the present research is that it has totally bypassed other themes that emerge from the novel and are equally significant as that of the one under discussion. Moreover, biblical significance of characterization in portrayal of the themes of self-interest and collective interest has also not been explored in the present study. Hence, future researches on the novel can consider these concepts for further study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present chapter reviews the literature and contains a critical analysis of the most noteworthy contributions of other authors to research. The literature review will consider previously published research relevant to this study. This will include, among other things, books, press articles, reports and theses. Provides an overview of what has already been said or done in this particular area of study; what are the prevailing theories, opinions and hypotheses? And what methods or sources of research might be appropriate. The literature review will be a critical review of other works. Being critical will enable the researcher to point out any gaps, weaknesses, or areas that require an extension in this specific subject area.

The Concept of Conflict

The history of the conflict dates back to the first starting point of human history and is unlikely to end. Our survival on this planet depends on how we deal with the various salient points of disagreement that are supported by seemingly contradictory interests and characteristics as well as hostile environments. The most destructive type of conflict, for example, is interstate war and common war consists of a harsh coercive way of meeting enemies. While the struggle accommodates individual plight and cultural destruction, its most striking features are not limited to physical brutality. Peaceful types of conflict are similarly prevalent in the search for different qualities and rare origins. In achieving significant social change, retreat from power is not inevitable. (Joeng, 2008).

According to Boulding (1963); Jehn & Mannix (2001) “conflict is an awareness of the parties involved of discrepancies, incompatible wishes, or irreconcilable desires” (p. 5). March and Simon (1993) define conflict as “a breakdown in the standard mechanisms of decision-making so that an individual or group experiences difficulty in selecting an action alternative” (p. 132). According to Singer and Small’s (1972) Correlates-of-War-Project (COW), Conflicts are violent clashes that occur between two parties where one party is a state and when there are more than 100 dead. This definition includes only soldiers and other military arsenals and does not include civilians. Amason and Schweiger (1997) describe conflict as a “double-edged sword”, with both good and bad effects. This is because most of the viewpoints about conflict have portrayed it as bad to the group because it harms group cohesiveness, delays “the decision-making process”, and undermines job satisfaction (Gladstein, 1984; March & Simon, 1958). The wellbeing and imperativeness of connections, gatherings, and society everywhere are unequivocally tested by social quandaries or clashes between transient personal circumstance and long haul aggregate intrigue.

Researchers (Cosier & Rose, 1977; Eisenhardt et al., 1997) have argued that the conflicting values and goals in the group create conflict between the group members. According to some new studies, conflict may occur among group members in collective decision-making even in the case where group members have the same goals. The reason for this is because members with different knowledge bases and experiences deal with group tasks from different angles (Amason, 1996; Jehn et al., 1999). The affective dimension of conflict (Amason, 1996; Guetzkow & Gyr, 1954), also labeled as relationship conflict (Simons & Peterson, 2000), emotional conflict (Pelled et al, 1999), or interpersonal conflict (Eisenhardt et al, 1997), however, it is a perception of personal

clashes, usually involving anger, frustration, tension, discomfort and hostility among team members (Simons & Peterson, 2000). According to Amason (1996) cognitive conflict is task-related and emerges from contrasts in judgment or points of view among group members; emotional conflict, in any case, is passionate and emerges from personal incompatibility.

The Concept of Self-Interest

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines Self-interest as “the fact of somebody only considering their own interests and not caring about things that would help other people” (p. 1388). According to *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2001) the term self-interest means “consideration only of what is best for you rather than other people” “It means regard to, or pursuit of, one’s own advantage or welfare, to the exclusion of regard for others” (p. 1293). Hence the term self-interest means that the individual cares only about his personal utility and welfare. This dictionary defines the word selfish-the root of self-interest- as “caring only about your-self and not about other people” (p. 1293). Accordingly, self-interest and selfishness can be used interchangeably because both refer to someone who is only concerned about what is in his own favor with exclusion of the others.

Schwartz (1986) argues that self-interest is one of the basic motivations of the individuals. Many theories of human behavior emphasize this fact such as evolutionary biology, neoclassical economics, behaviorism, and psychoanalysis. All these theories emphasize that man cares only in his personal interest; this is on the one hand. On the other hand, many of the most significant social science research (Batson, 1991; Etzioni, 1988; Kohn, 1990; Lerner, 1980; Mnsbridge, 1990; Sears & Funk, 1990; Sen, 1977;

Tyler & Dawes, 1993) of the last twenty years hint to the fragility of self-interest patterns of behavior. According to Tyler (1990) people frequently care more about the equity of the systems that they experience than about the material outcomes these strategies produce. Individuals are inclined more towards the outcomes of their group than their own (Dawes, Van de Kragt & Orbell, 1988), and that their perspectives toward open approaches are frequently shaped more by their qualities and philosophies than by the impact these arrangements have on their merchandise prosperity (Sears & Funk, 1990).

Kamarck (2002) argues that modern psychology agrees that people are and should be self-interested. But this is only a part of individual motivation. It is also important to realize that self-interest is not necessarily synonymous with selfishness. Selfishness is concentration on the individual, with no regard for others. The selfish person is interested only in himself, wants everything for himself, gets pleasure from taking, not giving. A selfish individual is lacking in self-love. To make up for this deficiency, a selfish individual tries to get gratification by acquiring material possessions or power.

The modern monetary hypothesis of self-interest contends that in their financial relations individuals consistently carry on in a manner that maximizes their utility. The works of Greek scholars and the Church fathers have affirmed this thought. Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, argued that people are naturally self-interested:

For that which is common to the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it. Everyone thinks chiefly of his own, hardly at all of the common interest; and only when he is himself concerned as an individual [sic]. For besides other considerations, everybody is more inclined to neglect the duty which he expects another to fulfill (p. 1261).

Some others like Plato, Stoic and Pythagoreans, kept up that individuals were collective commonly. The fore referenced thought regarding individuals was additionally embraced by the church fathers who thought about self-interest as a transgression of voracity and eagerness .The economic and political early modernists like Mandeville(1924), Hobbes(1962), Hume(2007) and Adam Smith(1976) supported self-interest in individuals and political exercises. These essayists accepted that the thriving of the wealth of society relies upon the people's opportunity to seek after their self-interests. Late modern economic talk of self-interest is established on the assumption that people think and follow up on the bases of that which is to in their advantage. Late modern monetary hypothesis of utility augmentation alleges that people act only after calculating costs and benefits(Murove, 2005).

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1976) from which the self-interest in modern economic is derived, claimed that "economic relations are about appealing to each other's self-interest or greed" (p. 423). As indicated by Smith, when individuals claim to one another's self-interest, they get what they need more than when they bid to one another's generosity. In addition, Smith noticed that oneself intrigued activities of individuals are great as they lead to performing a balance in social, financial, and political aspects of community, which is more needed than when we intentionally choose to offer shape to these substances through guidelines. Murove (2005) argues that there is a problem with this Smithian theory because it is "based on unsystematic pursuit of self-interest that suggests an anarchic view of society in the sense that there is a lack of concern for what self-interest would do to the whole social order" (p. 2). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines anarchy as "a situation in a country, an organization, etc. in which there is no government, order or control"(p. 49). From this definition we can conclude

that individuals are totally free and living in accordance to no laws or orders. Jenkins (2015) argues that anarchy carries negative connotations because it is synonymous with chaos and disorder. It is a term which comes as opposed to the principles of our modern societies which are based on law and order. The lack of authority, structure, laws, and orders consequently will lead to confusion, wild behavior, and disorder. In other words, we can say that in such situations human beings are unable to control themselves, maintain order, and to live peacefully with each other. The above mentioned about anarchy reminds us of the “State of Nature” of Thomas Hobbes.

Robert Heilbroner (1972) self-interest is a financial call of an anarchic hypothesis of society since it leads to a community that is founded on unregulated competition looking for monetary increase. Consequently, the modern economic and its call exclude solidarity through a feeling of belonging to the society. Accordingly, if individuals are only concerned about their own self-interest, it suggests that they are not concerned with the interests of others and of their community. For contemporary neo-liberal financial analysts consider society to be a dynamic, what is genuine for them is people and their personal matters.. This is why governmental pursuit to promote welfare through progressive taxation considered as an involvement in individuals rights and freedom (Brittan 1988; Heyne 1983; Nozick 1974; Rand 1963a, 1964).

One of the main reasons that lead to producing conflicts in groups and society is the existence of self-interested people. In his *Leviathan* Hobbes (1662) convincingly stated that “selfish urgings lead such a war as is every man against every man”(p. 9). In a society where there is no authority to solve these conflicts human life will be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short”(p. 9). Pascal, Hobbes’s French contemporary, expressed a

similar pessimistic view saying: “We are born unfair; for everyone inclines towards himself. . . . The tendency towards oneself is the origin of every disorder in war, polity, economy etc.”(p. 20). Selfishness was depicted as the root of all evil (Sigmund, 2010). Adam Smith(1776\1976) offered a totally different view concerning this matter. He claimed that the “ invisible hand” unites the greedy and selfish efforts of individuals: by working hard to achieve their self-interests, consequently, they prosper the common good. According to Smith (1776/1976) the selfish person works unconsciously for the public good “By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it.” Greed promotes behavior beneficial to others. Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* (1776/1976):

It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages. Nobody but a beggar chooses to depend chiefly upon the benevolence of his fellow-citizens (pp. 26–27).

The Concept of Collective Interest

The term public interest reflects the concept of our instinctive social nature, which leads us to connect and communicate with those around us in order to form new relationships and preserve the permanence of old relations. This will help individuals to contribute to the collective work that aims to make the members of the community happy away from selfishness. Medlin (2006) argues that collective interests are conjoined self-interests of a number of parties belonging to a same group or network. Thus, it can be simplified that collective interests refer to the common interests of all the stakeholders of

a group, party or network. Here the beneficiary of the outcome of the interest is not a single individual, but all the people present in the group.

Jensen (1994) argues that pursuit of collective interests includes making decisions and performing actions to fulfill our social energy is to contribute to the welfare of others, without taking into consideration our own self-interests; some have named this altruism desires. Wagner and Moch (1986) argue that collectivism - happens when the requests and interests of groups are more important than the wishes and needs of individuals in society. Individuals in groups tend to pay attention to the group's interest, even if this in some cases negatively affects their personal interest. Simply, it is a distinction between self-directed and collective orientation.

According to Piliavin & Chang (1990) numerous experimental investigations in the sociologies confirmed that individuals are headed to seek after both self-and collective interests. For example, in managing their everyday life, people work to both upgrade their own positions, power, and rewards, in addition to performing prosaically behaviors for the good of the other members of the community that may not be consistent with their individual self-interests.

The Concept of Democracy

According to Munck (2014) Democratic Theorists, who grasp the idea of majority democracy as their beginning stage, consider the key supposition that vote based system is a political idea that is supported by the qualities or goals of opportunity and political fairness. That is, they depend on the idea of majority rules system embraced in this re-imagination and take vote based system to be an element of political frameworks that typify the estimations of political opportunity - residents must have extreme command

over the issues that are resolved through the basic leadership process - and political uniformity - should all natives have equivalent load in settling on lawfully restricting choices. Additionally, they are quite compelling here, giving a detailed depiction of government basic leadership establishments that concur with this suspicion by depending on formal and casual extrapolation of the primary standards.

The term democracy, derived from classical Greek, means governance by the people “Demos” (people) and Xratos (rule or power). From the outset, it was a disputed concept, historically arising from the struggle against authoritarian rule, oligarchy or social injustice. In other words, it was democratic politics that produced democratic institutions. However, the institutions we associate more with modern elections free of democracy, political and civil rights protected by the rule of law, etc., were partly formed through the efforts of dominant groups to restrict and regulate popular participation. They wanted to make sure that democracy did not interfere with the functioning of emerging capital markets, and they did so by sharply distinguishing the public sphere of politics and administration from the private sphere of the economy and family life (Wood, 2005).

Gberevbie (2014) argues that the concepts of democracy and good governance can be explained differently by people all around the world. Nonetheless, there are some basic points that should be taken into consideration when describing a country to be democratic or not. Dahl (1989) argues that in order for a society to be considered as a democratic one should have a high level of civil liberties; political pluralism; and political participation that lets people to choose their representatives in free and fair elections. Babawale (2006) argues that “it is doubtful whether one can validly talk of democracy in the absence of participation, competition and the guarantee of civil liberties”(p. 35). Badru (2005)

describes democracy as representing, above all else, an expansion in residents' political correspondence and value as far as their participation in the society. He contends that democracy is an arrangement of government that empowers both the leaders and the residents to be aware of what is required, and achieve it for the improvement of that society as far as political, social and monetary advancement. According to Gberevbie (2014) the individuals in the democratic society must be given the opportunity to freely participate in the electoral processes and to vote for the candidate of their own choice without fear and anything opposite to this is regarded anti-democratic. One of the key points in democratic institutions is that this system emphasizes the majority rule as opposed to totalitarian rule by the few.

Oddih (2007) contends that democracy is a ruling framework that advances social improvement since it can give people the privilege to be a piece of basic leadership forms either straightforwardly or through their chosen agents. Mimiko (2007) concurs with this thought and contends that democracy is required on the grounds that it empowers advancement; simplifies governance, particularly in pluralistic communities; and this is in accordance with the human rights and basic freedom of citizens. As indicated by Chavan (2013) democratic organizations depend on reason and are humanistic. These establishments advance rational decision-making procedures on humanitarian actions with the point of amplifying the advantage of as many people as possible.

The Concept of Totalitarianism

According to Rao (1974), the term totalitarianism is the opposite of the purpose of volunteerism and is linked to Lenin's theory of revolution. A situation, in which, power is in the hands of a small group of individuals who rule tyrannically. Therefore, it is the

opposite of a democratic system where power is in the hands of the majority of the people.

Borowski (2014) defines totalitarianism as a type of social system (usually a single state), the main objective behind which is to seek dependency and strict control over all aspects of social and individual life. It is also characterized by forcing individuals to submit to the rule of collective power as much as possible, as well as to a particular type of political gnosis that involves dividing reality into two parts - one good, one that includes supporters of a particular regime, and another that includes the enemies of the regime. Totalitarianism is linked to dictatorship, severe restrictions on civil liberties and individual liberty, the abolition of freedom of expression and religion, restricting the inviolability of private property, and repression of individuals opposed to the totalitarian form of government.

Totalitarianism was thought of as an idea as mirroring a positive undertone during the 1920s by Italian fascism. The idea became dominant in Western anti-policy rhetoric during the Cold War so as to feature the apparent likenesses between Nazi Germany and other fundamentalist authorities from one perspective, and Soviet socialism on the other (Caute, 2010; Defty, Guilhot, 2005; Reisch, 2007; Seigle, 1998).

Hannah Arendt (1951) Nazi and the state socialist systems are new types of government and not simply refreshed adaptations of the old despots. As indicated by Arendt, the foundation of the aggregate call for tyrant systems is their ideology, giving one agreeable and obscure response to the riddles of the past, present and future. For instance, for Nazism, all history is the historical backdrop of ethnic clash. While for Marxism, all history is the historical backdrop of class battle. When this speculation is

acknowledged, all state activities can be advocated by looking for nature or the law of history, supporting the foundation of a dictator state mechanical assembly.

The end of the religious authority in the 18th-century meant the liberation of the human conscience; religious ethics were replaced by secular and social morality. The afterglow of the notion of class society which came as a result of the rise of the individualism meant the loss of privileges, but in the meantime brought a totalitarian temptation with it. If the empiric is an ally of freedom, and the dogmatic spirit prefers inclusiveness, the abstract man's idea, detached from the historical formations to which he belongs, may become the force of totalitarianism. These three currents have merged into the idea of a homogeneous society in which man lives on a single plane. The only recognized criterion for judgment was social benefit, as expressed in the idea of the common good, which was said to be a visible and tangible purpose. Modern totalitarian democracy is a dictatorship based on the enthusiasm of the masses, and thus it differs from the absolute power exercised by the right-wing divine king, or by an oppressive tyrant. Leftist totalitarianism differs from right-wing totalitarianism in its focus on the human problem. Although the first starting point was and still is human, its cause and salvation and right-wing autocratic schools refer to the collective entity (state, nation or race). The former orientation [trend / ideology] is individualistic, atomistic and rationalistic, even when the class or party is elevated to absolute goals. Right-wing dictators can only see historical, racist and organic formations in their minds, and exploit the totally alien concept of individualism and rationality (Borowski, 2014).

Totalitarianism is not the exclusive domain of political scientists. It cannot be defined only as a system of institutions. The years 1989-1991, without a doubt, showed that the

institutional systems created by totalitarian regimes might sound official, but in reality they were merely empty shells or house of cards on the verge of total collapse. The existence or collapse of totalitarianism depends, on the one hand, on the total will of the disciplined elite, inspired by a Christian message, but on the other hand the ability of this elite to impose on the population its ideological power, based on ideological control over ideas and feelings. The most important and notable characteristic of totalitarianism is the existence, first, of mechanisms that create an unusual and unconscionable discipline of the elite; second, ideological control over the spiritual life of man (such as those dictating to people what they think), trying to govern their emotional life, and establishing the code of conduct (Walicki, 1996; as cited in Borowski, 2014).

Chavan (2013) argues that totalitarian institutions have sprung up from the irrational instincts existed in human beings. These institutions follow a biased decision making procedures about human action with a purpose of offering the greatest good to a limited group of people. Chavan continues to say that these institutions are totalitarian, authoritarian and dictatorial in nature.

Lord of the Flies as British Society

Lord of the Flies cannot be separated from the social and cultural conditions. According to Swingewood (1972) “literature is a direct reflection of various facets of social structure, family relationships, class conflict, and possibly divorce trends and population composition”(p. 13). According to this theory of Swingewood, a literary work is seen as social documentation of social condition and situation when the work is written. The writer may express his own experience; it becomes the portrayal of his age and his society because a literary work sometimes portrays real life. As Swingewood

(1972) pointed out that “The most popular perspective adopts the documentary aspect of literature, arguing that it provides a mirror of the age”(p. 13). Based on this, it can be argued that literature is considered as a portrayal of social condition showing society and social life.

Oldsey (1983) argues that Golding was influenced by his own involvement in the war and this influence is obvious in his novel. In one of his articles, Crawford (2002) discusses the harsh criticism that *Lord of the flies* directs at both Nazis on one side and the British society on the other. The young characters in the novel are like Nazis in their dressing, appearance and actions. They represent the only “beast” that commit and try to kill the three outsiders: Simon, Piggy and Ralph. The festival and the “act of eating pig meat could include anti-Semitic references” (Crawford 2002). This Topic was also referred to by Davis and Saunders (1983). They argued that when the weak characters Simon and Piggy were targeted by Jack’s group, this attracts consideration regarding the rough and ruthless example, which depicts the class organized and tormenting social request in the British society. Moreover, they said the English class framework encourages division and will not grasp the outsiders. Boyd (1990) was interested in Piggy’s apparent lower-class whose way of talking is mocked by Jack ,who is on the top of hierarchy line with a good education and the position of a leader. Piggy’s existence on the airplane with the other boy’s was strange for Reilly (1988). For him, Golding is not simply portraying the ascendancy of the boys to savagery but tries to depict the British society as a real shame and that our so called civilization is no more than a routine and when people regress to savagery in a State of Nature , this means that they are bad even in a well-organized society; they act only out of reflex.

The Concept of Savagery

Collins Dictionary of Sociology (2000) defines Savagery as one of the stages of human development identified in early theories of social evolution. According to Montesquieu the three main stages of social development were: hunting or savagery; herding or barbarism; and civilization. The concept gained currency in the 19th century by distinguishing between simple- primitive and complex, modern societies in evolutionary theory. The term was inevitable because evolutionary theory held that social development also involved a civilized process. Thus savagery was meant to convey a state of brutal backwardness, which was the opposite of civilized morality, reason and taste of the privileged classes of Europe. Simple societies were not savage in the way Europeans understood the term. This concept had its political uses in the era of colonial expansion, but its adequacy as a description of non-European pre-industrial societies cannot withstand events such as the 1914-1918 war.

The concept of savagery, in the early 20th-century, was used by anthropologists generally to refer to some specific groups of people. According to Wright (2000) this was not an insult but was only a stage in the orderly history of human culture. Wright, goes on saying that all human beings were once savages, but later some of them got a cultural promotion to a stage called barbarians and then to civilization.

Savagery and savage, as a concept, turned out to be widespread during the period of discoveries in both the scientific field and the open language of the general population as a depiction of the occupants of outside lands. According to McNeill (2005) the term savage came to be connected more firmly than the term brute to the people groups of the grounds of exploration and discovery, remarkably Africa and North America. Along

these lines it appears, savages turned into the more extraordinary diverge from humanized society.

According to Mill [1836] 1977, primitive individualism was the hallmark of the savage societies. The barbarism was built as an autonomous and isolated leadership. Mill's contribution to tradition was to formulate primitive individuals as a failure to cooperate, unwillingness to compromise or to abandon their independence. Self-sufficiency of the beast means that he works solo, even if he is together with others, but not in a concert. This deliberate independence has thwarted any consistent work in harmony and thus deprived them of the benefits of long military campaigns or large-scale engineering projects. As we noted, According to Mill[1836] 1977, the primitive communities were not considered ethnically inferior; rather, they were seen as loose groups of ravenous individuals who still lied to their independence. "The savages of New Holland never help each other, even in the most simple operations; and their condition is hardly superior, in some respects it is inferior, to that of the wild animals which they now and then catch" (Mill, [1848] 1965,p. 117). Mill claims that the reason for their lack of social progress was the restriction on their status to their institutions, customs and personalities. Mill ([1848] 1965) makes a satisfying comparison between civilized and savage life claiming that whatever be the attributes of what we call savage life, the opposite of these, or the characteristics which society puts on as it loses these, establish human civilization. In this way, a savage clan comprises of a bunch of people, meandering or daintily dispersed over a tremendous track of the nation: thick populace, thusly, staying in fixed residences, and to a great extent gathered together in towns and cities, we term civilized. In savage life, there is no trade, no agriculture, no industries, or alongside none: a nation wealthy in the products of farming, business, and fabricates, is

called civilized. In savage gatherings, every individual movement is for himself; aside from in war (and that being said all around defectively), we only occasionally observe any joint tasks carried on by the association of many; nor do savages, as a rule, discover much joy in one another's friendship. Wherever we see people acting together for some basic and specified purposes in huge gatherings and getting a charge out of the delights of social intercourse we call them civilized. In savage life there is no law or organization of equity; no efficient work of the aggregate quality of society, to protect people against damage from each other; everybody confides in his own quality or shrewd, and where that comes up short, he is by and large without asset. We in like manner call a people enlightened, where the game plans of society, for ensuring the people and property of its individuals, are adequately flawless to keep up harmony among them.

According to Smith (1976) savage hunters were self-sufficient individuals whose simple needs were met without the need for cooperation. Although authors like Adam Smith denied the state of nature proposed by Hobbes (1962). It is understood that savages living under hunting do not have a regular form of government and live in accordance with the laws of nature.

The Concept of Civilization

Bagden (1993) argues that the concept of development started from the European discourse on civility in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, where it suggested the considerate ethics of urban life to country impudence.

Historically, the concept of civilization is a comprehensive term for human development and achievements. It is also a concept that describes an organized society to distinguish it from other organized societies. The concept of savagery, on the other hand,

is formulated to compare with the concept of civilization, used to refer to inferiority and / or a lower level of organization and technological development. According to Starobinski (1993) civilization served as a unified concept or a concise way of referring to both individual and collective refinement and the end result of that process was the state of civilization. Bagden (1988) contended that by this term, Europeans could depict themselves as not quite the same as different people groups both inside and outside Europe. While this differentiation can be found regarding the accomplishments of urban communities, business, economics, written law system, the arts, science and discourse, it can be a pointer of life in sovereign states, with formal government. Human advancement turned into the procedure by which individuals gained a refined soul, to a great extent in light of the helpful impacts of the police - great laws and compelling open request. (Febvre, 1973; Starobinski, 1993). Thomas (1994) argues that in colonial contexts, the notion of civilization provide the means by which indigenous peoples can be represented as minimal, and Europeans as principal agents.

Havilland et al. (2007) define civilization as a complex society described by urban advancement, the social class forced by the “cultural elite”, representative correspondence frameworks, (for example, writing frameworks), and the alleged partition from and control of the natural environment. Moreover, according to Wright (2011) civilizations are firmly connected and regularly connected to other financial qualities, including centralization, the steadiness of both people and other living creatures, the specialization of work, and socially dug in philosophies of advancement and greatness, archaeological building, tax collection, and reception Society on agriculture and extension. Wei (2011) argues that historically, civilization is often understood as a larger and more advanced culture, unlike smaller, supposedly primitive cultures. Similarly,

some scholars have described civilization as necessarily multicultural. In this broad sense, according to Mann (1986) civilization is incompatible with decentralized tribal societies, including nomadic pastoral cultures, Neolithic societies or hunters' collectors, but also contradict cultures within civilizations themselves. As an infinite name, civilization also refers to the development of society to a central class structure.

Civilizations are organized in densely populated settlements divided into hierarchies with urban and rural residents, engaged in intensive agriculture, mining, small-scale industrialization and trade. Civilization focuses on power, and human control extends over the rest of nature, including other humans.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The Modern Economic Theory of Self Interest

The modern economic theory of self-interest is founded on the notion that individuals in their economic relations are motivated only by self-interest (Murove, 2005). As the content of this interpretation suggests individuals will promote the well-being of society by pursuing their goal, relying more on self-interest than on altruism. This theory also claims that self-interest and selfishness are the cause of prosperity (Murove, 2005). The theory of self-interest is considered one of the theories that led to much intellectual controversy among ancient philosophers and theologians. According to Russell (1991) and Gorman (1979) Plato and Pythagoreans discussed the concept of self-interest under the political theory of the community of property, where the ideal political community had everything in common. However, no one should forget that the main focus of Plato was not self-interest or community of property, but the ideal state. In this context the idea of community of property was explained to the Guardians. The idea of community of property was known to the Greeks. Possibly, it dates back to the era of the philosopher Pythagoras (6th century BC). Pythagoras established a community of pupils based on the principle that friends should have everything in common. In his society, men and women were treated and recognized equality. All members of this community were supposed to give up their possession of society in pursuit of a common lifestyle. Even scientific and mathematical discoveries were treated as collective. The community of property founded by the Pythagoreans was facilitated by the fact that his followers believed in his divinity. Peter Gorman (1979) argues that this belief in the divinity of Pythagoreans “promoted the

ideal of *harmonia* or the unity of all minds in the society whereby no disputes arose concerning the laws and philosophical ideas taught. The fact that the members of the society shared all their belongings also contributed to this ideal” (p. 121). Murove (2005) stated that “with in such a community, the pursuit of Self-interest in economic affairs would have been seen as abhorrent” (p. 15).

As for ancient Judeo-Christian, Schumpeter (1986) argues that their debate concerning self-interest was almost the same as the ancient Greeks' in the sense that common ownership of property was the center of their discussion rather than the private ownership. Self-interest, as was found in the writings of the Church fathers such as St. Ambrose of Milan, Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Augustine, it was referred to as the greedy sin. This sin of greed was typical of man in his fallen state. The ideal society for them was their common material property, a practice that became equal to the common good versus self-interest. From the above, it can be said that both the ancient Greeks (especially Plato) and the ancient Jewish Christians seem to share the idea of a future society based on shared ownership of property. Rhys (1906) argues that for both, Platonists and the Pythagoreans, the call for the community of property was not just to “get rid of poverty or to assist the poor” but it was because of a metaphysical reason which was founded on the assumption that multiplicity is evil; hence, it must be abolished by unity.

According to Murove (2005) self-interest in humanitarian and political activities was an integral part of the early economic and political modernists, as evidenced by the works of Mandeville, Hobbes, Hume and Adam Smith. In the writings of these thinkers, the prosperity of wealth depended on the freedom of individuals to pursue their own

interests. In this regard, self-interest has become the only source of motivation in the management of the human economy. The constant impulse in the late, recent economic discourse of self-interest depends on the idea that people think and act according to their own interests. This is the main reason why the late economists believe that society will flourish when people are left alone to pursue their own interests. Late modern economic theory claims that individuals act only after calculating costs and benefits, according to Murove (2005).

According to Tollock and Mackenzie (1985) the theorists of the modern economics claim that self-interest acts as a human motivator that helps us maximize our facilities. No relationship can be regarded as economic unless it achieves maximum economic benefit. The late modern economic theory claims that humans are greedy because they can satisfy themselves only after the maximum consumption of all they consume (Murove, 2005). This reduction of human economic motivation to maximize benefit eliminates any other incentives in human economic behavior. In this view that maximizes self-interest, one is dehumanized because other motives tend to be greedy. Murove (2005) argues that if human economic motivation is reduced to increase benefit, this will inevitably lead to social inequality, rampant environmental pollution and the depletion of resources on which future generations depend. If humans are only self-interested, it becomes difficult to argue with the need to take an ethical, inclusive view that has an interest in the natural environment. Ikerd (1999) argues that the contemporary liberal ideal of the infinite accumulation of wealth through the individual pursuit of self-interest reduces the needs of future generations and the well-being of the natural environment.

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) is the source from which the self-interest theory in modern economics is derived. In his book, Smith argued that “economic relations are about appealing to each other's self-interest or greed”(p. 423). According to Smith, when people appeal to each other's self-interest, they get what they want more than when they appeal to each other's generosity. Moreover, Smith noted that the self-interested actions of people are good in the sense that they lead to performing a balance in social, economic, and political equilibrium, which is more wanted than when we consciously decide to give shape to these realities through regulations. Murove (2005) argues that there is a problem with this Smithian theory because it is based on unsystematic pursuit of self-interest that suggests an “anarchic view of society in the sense that there is a lack of concern for what self-interest would do to the whole social order”(p. 2). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines anarchy as “a situation in a country, an organization, etc. in which there is no government, order or control”(p. 49). From this definition we can conclude that individuals are totally free and living in accordance to no laws or orders. Jenkins (2015) argues that anarchy carries negative connotations because it is synonymous with chaos and disorder. It is a term which comes as opposed to the principles of our modern societies which are based on law and order. The lack of authority, structure, laws, and orders consequently will lead to confusion, wild behavior, and disorder. In other words, we can say that in such situations human beings are unable to control themselves, maintain order, and to live peacefully with each other. The above mentioned about anarchy reminds us of the “State of Nature” of Thomas Hobbes.

In his *Leviathan* (1651) Thomas Hobbes argues that human being in situations where there is no authority and orders are in a state of war with each other. Each individual

fights for themselves and everyone becomes enemy to others. When there is no authority human loss trust in each other and they become in a situation resembles a war. For Hobbes, the law of nature cannot prevent humans from revenge upon each other. People can only act as civilized when there is a supreme power to enforce them (Hobbes, 1982). Thus, if there are no rules and laws individuals will follow their selfish desires to save themselves and will exploit the others who are under their control for themselves. If individuals are only interested in their self-interest, this automatically will make them neglect the interests of the others and the society at large (Murove, 2005).

Plato's Political Theory of Social Unity

According to Ryhs (1906) in order to uphold his political theory of social unity as a fundamental ethical value for consistent social existence, Plato uses the human body as an example to state the type of solidarity he has in mind: "Then when one of the citizens experiences any good or evil, the whole State will make his case their own, and will either rejoice or sorrow with him" (p. 160). Plato was against the idea of individualism and he thought that individuals are supposed to see their wellbeing as connected to that of the community within a fellowship of ownership of property. For him individualism or private ownership was the reason behind the social discord and unrest. The private ownership was evil because it's achieved at the expense of the whole. This idea of Plato is also applicable to the rulers who are supposed to be more concerned with the wellbeing of their people of subjects. Plato had this for the rulers: "... [N]o physician, so far as he is a physician, considers what is advantageous for the physician, nor enjoins it, but what is advantageous for the sick; for it hath been agreed that the accurate physician is one who taketh care of sick bodies, and not an amasser of wealth" (p. 20). Here Plato wanted to

say that the rulers were not supposed to be self-interested in their office; rather, they were supposed to work for the collective interest of the whole community.

Contrary to Plato's theory of ideal state, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E) has a long discourse on friendship in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (Basic Works of Aristotle 1155a-1172a). Murove (2005) argues that Aristotle in dealing with the matter of "friendship" and "self-love", quotes a series of proverbs concerning friendship: "one soul, what friends have is common, equality is friendship...Hence he [a friend] should also love himself most of all" (p. 17). Aristotle is expressing his idea saying that for individuals to have the sense of love for others, they must first love themselves. As he put it, "Therefore the good man should be a lover of self (for he will both himself profit by doing noble acts, and will benefit his fellows), but the wicked man should not; for he will hurt both himself and his neighbors, following as he does evil passions" (p. 17). Aristotle doesn't refuse the idea of being self-interested but he thinks that it should be neutralized by caring for the wellbeing of others.

African Humanism

The philosophy that attempted to express the social, economic, political and religious vision of African humanity was known as the philosophy of negritude (Senghor 1964). The philosophy of negritude was a reflection of French-speaking African scholars such as Leopold Senghor and Aime Cesaire on the meaning of being black in a world dominated by Western values. The philosophy of negritude aims to rebuild African values by rediscovering or celebrating the core values of Africa. For Senghor, negritude is an expression of the revival of African collective identity as well as a new worldview derived from African core values and experiences (Irele 1965; Senghor 1964). Cesaire

(2000) claims that African humanism is the antithesis of the West Capitalist civilization and the affirmation of traditional African values. Césaire's philosophy of negritude is aimed at the critique of modernist humanity that has divided people into racial groups as well as dealing with them differently. Césaire named this tendency "pseudo humanism" because of its narrow and unbridled attitude towards human rights. In other words, true humanity was supposed to be universal (Eze, 1998).

All human cultures have an understanding of the essential elements that are fundamental to man. In the prevailing economic theory, as developed in the Western world to this day, the prevailing understanding is that man is a self-interested being. African humanity called for understanding man as a relational and sociological element (Mazrui et al., 1999; Moquet, 1977).

The implication here is that humans derive their humanity in the context of relativity with all that exists (Moruve, 2005). In African humanity, the individual is understood first and foremost as a social being. This understanding of the individual as a social being is clearly illustrated in the African moral doctrine *Umuntu ngomuntu ngabantu* - the human being is a human being because of other human beings (Ramosé, 1999; Samkange and Samkange, 1980; Shutte, 2001). In the ethics of Ubuntu, the idea is that an individual's identity and well-being are mediated through society. African humanity believes that human beings are bound by their nature - endowed with an inherent nature of belonging to each other in society. This human belonging extends from the past to the present and into the future. Thus, human behavior and originality depend more on relationship than on rationality exclusively. Human beings are associated with

grandparents, those in the present society and those who will be in the future (Murove, 2005).

According to African scholars Senghor (1964) and Kaunda (1967) African humanism is an inherent vision of Africans towards human nature. In this aspect of African humanism, the idea is that Africans place great emphasis on the importance of human life. The importance of human life is sometimes expressed in people's behavior towards each other. The advantage of caring for human life or the value of another person is expressed through greeting, speaking and sharing the material property of the individual with others in society. People are not evaluated according to what they have or own, but because they are people. African humanity expresses a general attitude towards life in general. African humanity was also defined as based on the African collective spirit. In the economic sphere, the idea is that a real person is someone who wants to share his material possessions with others in society. The full humanity of African humanity is attributed to a person who was more generous to his brethren than humans to a selfish person (Nkrumah 1968; Nyerere 1968a; Touré 1979). Thus, a selfish person becomes the antithesis of all those qualities that are perceived as the most precious attributes of human personality. According to Gyekye (1997), African humanity is a traditional African ethic that emphasizes human well-being.

A common theme that passes through African humanism is the idea that man is linked and intertwined. In other words, the welfare of the individual is inseparable from the welfare of society. This individual association with society is expressed in the African concept of *Ubuntu* - humanness - as well as in the concept of the community process. In African humanism, *Ubuntu* or humanity shows that there is no schism between the

individual and society because the individual is human because of the existence of others. From the perspective of the process, the individual is a society - a term that refers to the derived nature of human existence. If this is the true nature of human existence, self-interest must be rejected as a serious mistake that can harm societies because it raises the level of individual gratification beyond the attention of society (Dandala, 1996; Hartshorne, 1950; Ramose, 1999).

My critique of the theory of self-interest in Golding's *Lord of the flies* depends on rational ethics that generate the idea that an individual's well-being is rooted in his belonging to society, and that there are no facts that can exist outside that sense. For this purpose, one of the crucial tools used in this thesis is African humanism. This tool offers us a rational moral model that focuses on the interdependence of everything that exists. Under such a model self-interest becomes fake, if not satisfactory (Bujo, 1997; Hartshorne, 1950; Kasenene, 1994).

We also need to recognize that what it means to be a human is something that an individual derives from society because there is simply no separation between the individual and society. It is this inherent lack of division between the individual and society that should prompt us to reject self-interest on the grounds that it is satisfactory. Human well-being, in the light of African humanism, must be nourished through the development of virtues such as loyalty, courtesy, tolerance, patience, generosity, hospitality, and a desire to empathize with others. In other words, virtues rather than vices are the main reason for the well-being of our humanity. Since no one can be someone outside the community, it also means that self-interest erodes our humanity (Kenya, 1953; Menkiti, 1977; Ramose, 1999).

Given the fact that our humanity has contributed to society as well as those who existed in the past, the individual's interest must be linked to the interests of others in order to contribute positively to those who will be in the future. If an individual's being contributed by those who existed in the past and constantly shared by others present, it also means that an inherent moral existence is a kind of existence that promotes solidarity in society. Community solidarity requires that individuals be in a position to express an active interest in each other's welfare in a way that can be harmonious and mutual understanding with society (Gelfand, 1973; Hartshorne, 1974).

African Humanism and Lord of the Flies

According to Murove (2005) one of the main ideas conveyed in African humanism is that humanity is linked to all the other things that make up existence. In this sense, man is seen as connected to the natural environment, ancestors, God and other individuals in society. Humans cannot be considered perfect human beings unless they prove themselves in their community rather than being self-interested. In *Lord of the Flies*, the characters fail to preserve the unity of their community by following their own selfish interests of playing and hunting. They abandon the rules and the duties assigned to them such as keeping on the signal fire and building shelters. They disconnect themselves from their society. They abandon Ralph's camp, the symbol of a united and organized society. They also lose their humanity when they kill each other. All these problems come up as a result of the implicit commitment of children to the norms of self-interest over the norms of society. Thus, children prefer to fulfill their personal wants rather than cooperate as a united society. Accordingly, the two main characters, Jack and Ralph, represent respectively for the norms of individuality and society. Jack prefers to enjoy and satisfy

his bloodthirsty hunting desire, while Ralph walks through a rescue plan for the whole group, a task that can only be achieved through collaboration. However, despite the fact that Ralph's way of serving the group is more reasonable, it needs teamwork and sacrifice on the part of the boys, but instead they give up their societal duties in favor of fulfilling their selfish interests in playing trivial games and hunting.

According to Senghor (1964) and Kaunda (1967) African humanism was defined by some African scholars as a deep-rooted view of Africans about human nature. From this prospective of African humanism, it becomes obvious that Africans place great emphasis on the value of human life. The value of human life is sometimes expressed in people's behavior towards each other. The advantage of showing care for human life or the value of another person is expressed through greeting, speaking and sharing the material property of the individual with others in society. People are not evaluated according to what they have but because they are people. African humanity expresses a comprehensive attitude towards life in general. In *Lord of the Flies*, the characters lose their humanity. One of the main reasons that lead to this dehumanization is the boys' failure in preserving each other's humanity. Golding uses symbolism to portray the situation of the boys in which they no longer recognize themselves from the pigs they are hunting and murdering for nourishment and game. For example, after chasing the main active pig, the boys re-established the chase in a dedicated step, using Maurice as an option in the restricted pig. This scene is merely a performance, yet the total motivation of the youth towards the excessive evil becomes more interrelated, and the similarities between man and creature are heightened. Iliadou (2013) argues that “[Golding] creates a quit clear thesis on the concept of Evil. More specifically, the evil described by Golding is the evil that feeds on pride, rage, envy, and hunger for power”(p. 16). It can be argued

that the kind of evil and inhumanity described by Golding, is the one that transforms humans from their humanity into being wild ruthless creatures who have desire to destroy humans and the natural environment in order to reach his selfish goals.

The Analysis Strategies

The Historical Approach

Historicism is a critical literary movement that takes into consideration the textual analysis of literary works from a historical prospective. It has been an influence tool in various disciplines of thinking, recently has got a renewal in the modern literary criticism (Hamilton, 1996). A kind of criticism tool, surveys literary works within their assorted and interconnected historical context. When analyzing a text, historians think of the cultural and social circumstances that affected the text and revealed it. They sometimes appreciate the influence of literary work on readers in later eras to the one in which it was written on. In doing so, their goal is to understand how the studied meaning and social significance of the work evolves over time. History scholars study not only the impact of social, cultural and historical conditions on the work but also the reception and importance of this work past and present (Murfin & Ray, 2003).

According to Deyab (2016) the historical method is an analytical tool that uses history to explain and analyze literature. Since its inauguration in the 1990s by Stephen Greenblatt, a new historical has become an important tool in the study of literary works by considering the text and its historical background.

According to Deyab (2016) Greenblatt and the other supporters of this approach have recognized the significance of the historical context “because they believe that literature is highly engaged with the history of its own time”(p. 75). Keeseey (2002) argues that “the poem’s real meaning is always in the past ... and the search for that meaning is a search for the author’s original intention”(p. 8). To clarify Keeseey’s words further, there are two things that can help us understand a literary work the author’s age and his mind, because literary works reflect not only the ideas of the author but also the place in which the author lived. To achieve this, we must be aware of the social and intellectual background of the writer. Thus, to analyze and understand a literary work, we need to consider the heavy connection of sophisticated and often conflicting social forces that existed at the time of writing the novel. These contradictory social forces are clearly discussed in the work and it has a significant influence on the form and orientation of the text. Deyab (2016) argues that according to new historians, it is important to consider the historical social context of post-World War II literature when analyzing written literary works during this period. New historians are aware of the importance of the historical and cultural context on a critical understanding of the text that is why they seek to find out the broader historical context by surveying how the author's post-war times affected the literary work and how the literary work reflects the writer's time. According to Murfin and Ray (2003), historical is a kind of literary criticism that emerged in the years of 1980s, in response to the text-only method adopted by official new critics and the critics who affronted the new critique of the 1970s. New historians, such as officials and critics, recognize the significance of literary texts, but they also investigate the text from a historical angle. Most of the critics between the years of 1920s and 1950s concentrated on the historical content of the literary work and their explanations were based on the

interaction between the literary text and its historical context such as the writer's life and his intentions in writing the work, accordingly, the new history is not new

According to Parvini (2017) new historical articles often feature unbalanced links between various cultural products and literary texts. Modernity is at the same time an echo of new criticism that has been replaced by recognition of "old" historicism, often embodied by E. M. M. Tillyard, which defines itself against it. This historical approach was an important approach of literature, especially in the works of Shakespeare and early period literature. This trend began in the 1980s and the new criticism was immediately replaced as the new orthodoxy in early modern studies. This hegemony came despite various assaults by women's rights scholars and cultural and traditional material against them.

Lai (2006) argues that due to the unpredictable and opposing connection between text and context, there has been a long debate about the disciplinary limits between history and fiction. Accordingly, the historical backdrop of artistic hypothesis can be considered, as it were, a progression of hypothetical fights between textual and contextual, influencing like a pendulum, with brief triumphs to some side, mirroring the wavering between scholarly heroes and the social heroes context. The prevailing type of writings - the new American analysis, Russian structuralism - the progress from the 1920s to the 1970s would appear to be happy with the triumph of writing over history dependent on lack of concern to realities. By dismissing the voice of history, which is only a progression of archives that record a reliable arrangement of target realities, scholarly investigations appear to have restricted exchange between literature and history.

According to Cox and Reynolds (1993) the shift toward history that has occurred in

American literary studies in the past decade has produced a set of criticisms that have given different names such as New History, Critical Historical, Historical Criticism, and of course New Historicism. However, any attempt to classify this diverse collection of historical criticism is a formidable task, but history is heavily influenced, making a very textual view of historical understanding.

According to Spivak (1990), question marks increasingly fell around the full movement of rhetorical formation in new Historicism, as it tended to become a clearly “codified” system and a sacred empire of literary theory. In addition, many critics and cultural negatives attack the ambiguity of the historical position of the new policy. Some literary historians refuse to call the new history because they believe that a single doctrine cannot be applied to the “heterogeneous” and irreducible body of the historical project. After these criticisms, Derrida, at a conference, thinks it is ironic that “the conflict between New Historicism and deconstruction can now be narrowed to a turf battle between Berkeley and Irvine, Berkeley and Los Angeles” (p. 155).

Lord of the Flies in Historical and Cultural Context

The significance of the historical approach in connection to *Lord of the Flies* lies in the way that the historical context is a profoundly significant technique in our life and in writing. Historical context is the manner by which we can review our recollections and stories. The historical context refers to the social, religious, financial, and political conditions existed during a specific time and spot. In general, it is the time and place where a situation occurred and these details enable us to interpret and analyze literary works or past events. Since the context of the novel or any other literary work means the circumstances at the time of its writing - the social, historical and literary factors that

influenced what the author wrote. Thus, the most appropriate approach to use in analyzing *Lord of the Flies* is a historical one.

Some scholars have referred to the relationship between fiction and history. For example, Joseph Conrad (1921) in *Notes on Life and Letters* has referred to this relationship saying that “Fiction is history, human history, or it is nothing...fiction is nearer truth...and a novelist is a historian, the preserver, the keeper, the expounder, of human experience”(p. 8). According to Deyab (2016), like Joseph Conrad, William Golding believes in the existence of this relationship between both literature and history. According to Deyab (2016) for Golding history is derived from fiction. Golding asserts that historical and political issues are connected through fiction whether this fact is discussed frankly or not. Deyab (2016) quotes Golding saying the following about historians:

Courteous historians will generally concede that since no one can describe events with perfect accuracy written history is a branch of fiction. Similarly, the novelist who deals with “before now” must pay attention, respect or not, to history. He is faced with a spectrum. History lies at one end—infra-red perhaps-and what is thought of as fiction occupies the opposite end-the ultra-violet...He must admit to writing history with the same good humor as a historian shows when admitting that he writes fiction (p. 9).

Accordingly, accepting that recorded history is a part of fiction, William Golding can be viewed as one of the main authors who blended history with fiction. Truly, Golding himself served in the Royal Navy as officer of rocket launchers and took part in the war on Normandy during World War II. Golding was stunned by his capacity to hurt his fellow individuals when he was serving as a Royal Navy fighter (Chavan, 2013). As leader, he requested the decimation of German boats, submarines and German troops

from the ocean during the D-Day landing. Golding's knowledge in World War II made him consider the purposes for this staggering war. As per him, one of the primary purposes behind these wars is the presence of tyrants as leaders. So as to advise us about the perils regarding oppressive eradication, individuals are requiring a fair framework as opposed to tyrants. For him, it is basic that individuals gain from their past to improve their future.

Golding's *Lord of the Flies* cannot be regarded as just a fictional work produced by Golding's imagination, but as a product of the historical context of his era. This is because it contains some historical references that bridge the gap between the imagination of the story and the reality of its time. Despite the fact that Golding himself did not explicitly mention that his story occurred under World War II, it is obviously assumed by the novel's references to a clear historical context. For example, the boys in the novel are moved to a remote island due to the war in England. Moreover, the novel was set against the backdrop of a nuclear war, reflecting a time of concern in the 1950s about the threat of the atomic arsenal. For example, at the beginning of the novel, a character named Piggy refers to an atomic bomb (p. 14).

According to Chavan (2013) in his endeavor to discover a clarification for a wide scope of decimation which spread all through the world amid the Second World War, Golding presumed that it was basically because of the counter social frame of mind of the authoritarian people; a position, which was the fundamental driver of the considerable number of demonstrations of viciousness and demolition that occurred in that staggering war. In spite of the fact that allies have figured out how to vanquish Hitler, there will dependably be the individuals who need power and control and appreciate slaughtering.

The shadows of Hitler and Mussolini are as yet falling on the historical backdrop of the world, and their inheritance is terrible, similarly as their years in power were pulverizing, prompting the World War II - a savage clash “between totalitarian and democratic powers of the world” (p. 1516). Golding couldn't avoid depicting the risks of those tyrants, who undermine the harmony and unity of the world. He draws in the post war's discussions about the best kind of government that ought to win on the planet. He brings up the issue of which is the kind of governments which according to him are best to govern the world. In World War II, law based nations and oppressive nations had faced each other over the globe. *In Lord of the Flies*, the progressing strife among Jack and Ralph is likewise intended to represent the unremitting conflict among dictatorship and democracy governments, in real life, which has substantially risen after the Second World War (Deyab, 2016). As Chavan (2013), argues “Jack is the dictator, the hedonic, who wants the world his way and succeeds on the fear and insecurity of the ignorant boys” (1518); whereas Ralph represents the leader “of goodwill and common sense” (Golding, p. 35). Accordingly, Golding shapes the needed values in our world and warns us of our vices that bring destruction to the our world.

According to Deyab (2016) as a result of his experience in the World War II, Golding in his *Lord of the Flies* hints to the political systems that emerged during that destructive war which rapidly spread in many countries. According to him, there were two distinguished political systems preceding the war: the democratic system, on one hand, and the dictatorial one, on the other. Chavan (2013) argues that “the conflict between the said ideologies pushed the world in the vortex of the World War II in which Golding participated in action as an officer in the Royal British Navy” (p. 1518). This can imply

that Golding's *Lord of the Flies* is a product of Golding's direct participation in the World War II.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

Presentation of self-interest in Lord of the Flies

This chapter reveals how the concept of self-interest reflects on characters. An in-depth exploration of the concept shall be conducted by studying the characterization, portrayal of situations, analysis of dialogues and estimation of the expressions.

The impact of the World War II was huge on changing Golding's view about human race and the acclaimed civilized societies. According to Reiff (2010) "years [of the war] destroyed any idealism Golding may have held about the rational or beneficent nature of human beings"(p.24). Golding believed that civilized societies spontaneously should produce civilized human beings. He says "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" (Golding, 1965, p. 87). In order to prove that he is wrong, he put together a group of highly educated British schoolchildren, the oldest of whom was 12 and younger on a desert island. Almost immediately the battle of superiority revolves around the boys. Violence and death follow up. As a result he concludes that mankind is experiencing an awful illness and his point as an author was to look at that sickness and awaken the awareness of individuals. Love and philanthropy have stopped to have any significance in the present day. Man has tumbled to the dimension of creatures in the heartless quest for his needs. All life's qualities have been covered all the while. There is little regard for goals, shared friendship or feeling of individual inclination. We highly esteem the possibility that we are a refined, modern and edified race, in contrast to the locals and

clans. Be that as it may, in truth, we are no superior to them. Vain and glad, we breed disdain, lecture the good news of truth and practice a real existence of lie. We are false even to ourselves. We are not ready to think back and remember our means. We are defenseless. We should figure out how to be modest and unadulterated of heart. We ought to vanquish our own shortcomings, defeat our feeling of pride and feel for ourselves. We have the ability to balance our dread and threatening vibe with affection.

In order to make his view more clear about human savageness, Golding gives a detailed explanation of what he saw in the World War II “I had discovered what one man could do to another” (Golding, 1965, p. 87). For him to kill another person with a gun or blowing him-up is something natural in a war. He argues that “I am not talking of one man killing another with a gun, or dropping a bomb on him or blowing him up or torpedoing him”(Golding, 1965, p. 87). The everlasting agony and torture people were experiencing under some totalitarian regimes was his big concern. “I am thinking of the vileness beyond all words that went on year after year in the totalitarian states” (Golding, 1965, pp. 87-88). He goes on saying that “It is bad enough to say that so many Jews were exterminated in this way and that, so many people liquidated — lovely, elegant word — but there were things done during that period from which I still have to avert my mind less I should be physically sick”(p. 88). This was something bad but what were worse than this were the people who were following the instructions of such regimes and perpetuating atrocities against some other people of their kind. Those perpetrators were brought up in civilized, well-educated and well organized societies. Such people were the only hope that we expected them to save the race of human beings on this planet:

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. I do not want to elaborate this. I would like to pass on; but I must say that anyone who moved through those years without understanding that man produces evil as a bee produces honey, must have been blind or wrong in the head. (Golding, 1965, p. 88)

The passage above reveals Golding's pessimistic view about the educated human and the civilized societies. Golding doesn't exclude the English society; he satirizes its weakness towards the atrocities perpetuated by the Nazis. According to Paul Crawford (2002) Golding in *Lord of the Flies* applies a fantastic and carnivalesque modes of Menippean satire to shake post-war English complacency about the deeds of the Nazis, particularly the Holocaust. This is one of the reasons that Golding put some children who were the product of his own educated and civilized society in his novel to affirm his view that human beings whether they come from a civilized society or not they can be savages. Paul Crawford (2002) points out that if we interpret Golding's narratives as conveying one idea, that our inner is impossible to change and is predisposing to evil, while leaving aside any valid features we may have and insisting only on human flaws, it means that Golding is not only pessimistic about human nature, but also frustrating with regard to the ability of mankind to progress.

Golding disapproved the prevailed political systems of his time especially after his participation in the second World War. So, this made him to ask some questions about the prevailed concepts and political systems of his time. He was one of the earlier thinkers whose ideas were tempered by harsh realities and who has lost his optimism in the world after Nazism and Stalinism. Golding also was one of the Socialist who had always rejected viewpoints valuing individual Self-interest and competition as main

motivation factors of human behavior in all societies at all times. This makes him to asks questions such as “Why, then, have [the political systems] never worked? How did the idealist concepts of primitive socialism turn at last into Stalinism? How could the political and philosophical idealism of Germany produce as its ultimate fruit, the rule of Adolf Hitler?”(Golding, 1965, p. 88). Socialism is a social or economic system which calls for public ownership rather than private ownership of property or control of property and natural resources. Socialist people do not live and work in isolation but in cooperation with one another. The stress is on the wellbeing of the society as a whole rather than individuals privately. The fundamental belief in Socialism is that “human nature is not fixed but formed. If people are selfish, depraved, or vicious, it is because social conditions have made them so. Change the conditions, he argued, and people will change; teach them to live and work together in harmony, and they will do so” (Dagger & Ball, 2019). So, Golding asks why such a good system, that he was one of the supporters, turns into Stalinism: terror and totalitarianism.

During the first few chapters of *Lord of the Flies* by William Golding, there are many conflicts that rise on the island. According to Joeng (2008) “conflict embraces personal loss and societal destruction; its many features are not limited to physical violence”(p. 8). With internal and external conflicts, Golding explains how important the structure is to society and how the lack of such a structure could easily fall. Therefore, it is clear that intergroup conflict is the key element of the novel where the perspectives and ways of the antagonist and his allies are found to conflict with that of the protagonist and his allies. Here *Realistic group-conflict theory* (Coser, 1956; Levine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif, 1966) applies perfectly well which “states that intergroup conflicts are rational in the sense that groups do have incompatible goals and are in competition for scarce resources”

(Campbell, 1992, p. 287). The “snake thing” and the fear it generated represented the internal conflict presented within the boys. “Tell us about the snake-thing” “Now he says it was a beastie” (p. 27). Golding added this to show the reader what general emotions are felt on the island. By presenting the boys with a fear of something they had not proven to exist, Golding gives a reason to show the reader an emotion felt by the characters and gives them insight into those character's experience on the island. This is significant because without internal conflicts a story or novel such as *Lord of the Flies* will not reflect characteristics of a totalitarian and other regimes. With only a character's actions portrayed without any emotion, the story will lack reality in that it will not feel as if it could actually happen, and the reader will become bored.

Another conflict which happens on the island is the fire, resulting from the anarchy and chaos of the children who are only seeking to have fun and not thinking about any consequences. “Small flames stirred at the trunk of a tree and crawled away through leaves and brushwood, dividing and increasing”(p. 34). The fire represents the chaos and anarchy led by the boys that results in killing an innocent boy. Golding used this to show that with the absence of order only chaos can rule which resulted of pursuing our own self-interests. Piggy exerts all his efforts to let the boy know what they are up to is irrational and will have bad consequences but he is belittled and ignored by all the boys. “I got the conch! Just you listen! The first thing we ought to have made was shelters down there by the beach. It wasn't half cold down there in the night. But the first time Ralph says 'fire' you goes howling and screaming up this here mountain. Like a pack of kids!”(p. 35). Accordingly, Piggy can be considered as the voice of rationality and order in a society that is led by anarchy.

Jack's obsession with the kill is a conflict that the author incorporated to confirm Jack's insanity, or rather, gave the reader a better understanding of Jack's personality and his motives towards fulfilling his personal desires. "He tried to convey the compulsion to track down and kill, that was swallowed him up"(p. 47). With this, the reader was given a reason for Jack to act as he did, with no mercy and no consideration for those around him. By adding this simple statement the author conveyed Jack's feelings and desires as well as gave the reader some sort of understanding of his actions. According to Alnajm (2015) Golding does not want to portray the antagonist Jack in *Lord of the Flies* as bad, as for Golding Jack is a human who only wants be a leader but only his anger and violence trend makes him to look like an evil bearing character. At first, Jack is ready to help the elected leader, Ralph, to establish order "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" (p. 192). For him he is an exception and rules can't be applied to him. He only wants to have rules to practically use his anger with punishing others "We'll have rules!" he cried excitedly. "Lots of rules! Then when anyone breaks 'em-- Whee--oh! Wacco! Bong! Doink !" (p. 25). Here we can suggest that even if there are rules humans cannot see peace and stability unless they curb their selfish desires. In his study, Alnajm (2015) points out that Golding believed that "the evil nature of man is curbed only when he is under discipline"(p. 99). But, in *Lord of the Flies*, there are rules and they are followed by all the boys except when a leader, a man of authority like Jack breaks them. This implies that human should be careful when choosing a leader or a particular ideology.

Golding like Aristotle believed that all human are self-interested. Van de ven, et al., (2007) argue that "Self- interest focuses on ME—my selfish nature that drives me to acquire resources and things that maximize my individual interests, to have control,

autonomy and distinctiveness over others, and to exploit or compete with others as an instrumental means to achieving my self-interests”(p. 20). Golding believes that man has lost his ethics and principles by possessing technology and material. So no matter what intelligence and technological advances we have, there will always be something inside us that makes us unhappy. People have become at the top of the power in the nuclear age and are able to make the impossible with its power possible, but this feeling that draws us towards greed and power stripped us of our humanity. Greed and power cannot be linked to the traits of civilized human beings because we have learned from our past that we can only survive through solidarity and cooperation. when we get power we lose our rationality and we become governed by instincts of self-preservation only. According to Swenson’s(2000) theory of human nature: humans have always wanted to get knowledge and then power in order to be able through these two concepts to fulfill their selfish desires of conquest, control and manipulation. Swenson gives an example of this through Adam and Eve, the first couple on earth, whose sons Cain and Able confronted each other ending in Cain killing Able. For Swenson, this was the beginning of the story of man and his wants for “conquest, control, and manipulation.” Thus, man wants to be a God-like on earth. Golding regards the desire for power and destruction as inherent and justifies it by saying that humans simply follow certain patterns in their behavior, and inherited it from their predecessors. The boys in *Lord of the Flies* make this very clear, as they copy their parents' behavior: compete, fight, and even kill each other for power.

Character portrayal played a crucial role in Golding’s *Lord of the Flies* in order to bring out the concept of self-interest. In our everyday life we do come across people who are selfish and self-centered and rarely do we see people who are ready to work from the bottom of their hearts for saving and helping others. This side of human beings can be

discovered in situations where there is a need for cooperation and collaboration among members of a specific group or society. In William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, the group of the young school boys who were stranded on a remote island without adults or system is a perfect situation to examine the hidden selfishness inside human beings. We suggest that the selfishness and greed in human beings is the reason behind his evilness and savage. Thus, one of the main matters Golding tackles in *Lord of the Flies* is the role of individuals in community. All the disputes that arise on the island among the boys in *Lord of the Flies* come as a result of the failure of the boys to accomplish their tasks. The boys were divided into groups and each group was given some responsibilities. For example, some of the boys were supposed to keep the signal fire, others were supposed to hunt to feed the society and the rest were supposed to build shelters. This division of tasks and the responsibilities reflect the rationality and awareness of the boys. Till this moment the boys were aware of the importance of togetherness and community. The climax of fall comes to them when they abandon all the norms of collectivism and prefer their selfish wants of playing and having fun. Their games step by step leads them to commit crimes such as burning and killing. Here, Golding warns us of the destructive consequences of our selfish desires and invites us all to be rational and take a lesson from our past to build a bright future together.

In groups, each team member has individual responsibilities and collective responsibilities. If a team member does not care about their share of responsibilities, this will cause problems for the entire group. For example, in their situation the boys in *Lord of the Flies* needed to put all their personal matters, dreams and trivial games aside and work together to find a way of survival. They did that for a while everything seemed planned and they had a well-organized system and if they kept on that system they would

for sure be saved. But the jealousy, greed, lust for control, and selfishness inside them prevailed and collapsed the whole society. Joseph Campbell (1992) argues that “the totality – the fullness of man – is not in the separate member, but in the body of the society as a whole” (p. 383). Accordingly, it can be said that individuals must be aware of their place in society and do their best to communicate with others. It seems to be difficult for most people to put their personal interests aside and devote themselves to the common good of their group. But this is the purpose of naming some people as a group or community. Iliadou (2013) argues that “*Lord of the Flies* emphasize the importance of institutional order and communal contribution. However, in *Lord of the Flies* the spirit of cooperation failed to function as a unifying force amongst the children” (pp. 7-8). For example, Jack and the other boys failed to keep on signal fire and building shelters because they were busy with hunting and playing.

Power was another prevailing theme found in *Lord of the Flies*. When the boys saw themselves alone on the island without adults, they felt the need to have a system of their own. They held an assembly and decided to vote for a chief. The voting act refers to the principles of Democracy. But as the novel progressed two systems of powers, democracy and totalitarianism were seen. Golding's experiences in the World War II, which could be seen as a struggle between these two different forms of power, helped him to write his novel the way it is and explained the reason behind the importance of this theme. Golding showed in *Lord of the Flies* that political power was a driving force for humans. The two aspects or power systems he examined in his novel were; democracy and totalitarianism. The island began as a democratic establishment with a chosen head, Ralph. Ralph held gatherings, set principles and built up lawfulness. The weaker individuals from society, Piggy and the Littluns, were protected from the harm. “There aren't any grownups. We

shall have to look after ourselves” “And another thing. We can't have everybody talking at once. We'll have to have 'Hands up' like at school”(p. 25). The conch represents the democratic rule according to which all children should have an equal chance in participating in ruling the society. Munck (2014) defines Democracy as a political idea on which esteems or standards of political opportunity and equity are fed. That is, they depend on the idea of majority rule of government embraced in this procedure of reconsidering and take popular government to be an element of political frameworks exemplifying the estimations of political opportunity - people ought to have extreme power over the issues distinguished through basic leadership - and political correspondence - should all people have equivalent load in settling on lawfully restricting choices. Moreover, they are of particular interest here, providing a detailed description of government decision-making institutions that agree with this assumption by relying on formal and informal extrapolation of the first principles. However, Ralph clarified that as leader he will decide who actually gets to speak. Although all these activities for boys reflect the society they are now cut off from - a noteworthy society, whose own collapse is witnessed by the war - the children ultimately did not succeed in maintaining a viable and viable microcosm. What Golding wanted to say about the democratic system in the *Lord of the Flies* is that its institutions and rules will make sense and will only be effective if the people who made them and the citizens who agreed to them become truly concerned about the greater good and if they only understand why these elements are established in society and how they work (Smith, 2011). At the beginning the boys were aware of the fact that if each was assigned a task and they all worked as a group, they would survive until they were rescued by the adults. They did that for a while especially because they knew that they would simply not stay alive unless they cooperated with one

another. The boys also were aware of the fact that they should select a leader. Thus, they choose, Ralph, who showed his ability to lead them by blowing the conch. It is true that Ralph showed particular promise at the beginning, but the boys fail to find out whether Ralph possessed the leadership qualities that would make him a suitable and efficient leader in his position. They choose him for one thing: "they obeyed the summons of the conch," "partly because Ralph blew it, and he was big enough to be a link with the adult world of authority" (p. 50). Their choice of Ralph came from their admiration of his appearances and not because of his skills. Later, the boys would regret their decision but when it was so late.

The other political system Golding refers to in the *Lord of the Flies* is totalitarianism. As it is evident, the main purpose of political systems is to provide safety for its people and provide them with the best chance to live and enjoy a prosperous life. The totalitarian system fails to provide any kind of safety and prosperity to people because they control and dictate people's lives and make decisions that best serve their system. Throughout history, all totalitarian regimes were formed because of the once obsessive desire to gain power and control everything. According to Borowski (2014) Totalitarianism is a kind of social framework, the primary target behind which is to try to control exacting reliance and severe power over all parts of social and individual life. It is likewise described by driving people to submit to the standard of aggregate power however much as could reasonably be expected, just as to a specific kind of political gnosis that includes separating reality into two sections - one great, one that incorporates supporters of a specific system, and another that incorporates the adversaries of the system. In *Lord of the Flies*, Jack the antagonist of the novel becomes a totalitarian leader who strikes fear in the hearts of the boys to have control over them. He practices all the tactics of the

totalitarian regimes to widen his power and to assign himself as the only leader on the island. He harasses and threatens the other boys to humiliate and demoralize them. "And you shut up! Who are you, anyway? Sitting there telling people what to do. You cannot hunt, cannot sing ..." (p. 70). Here it can be seen that Jack is criticizing Ralph's ability to be an effective leader and verbally abuses him in an attempt to discourage him. Jack is doing this to make Ralph step down from his position as a leader so that he can take control over the boys. Right from the start, Jack was convinced that he should be leader. "I ought to be chief," said Jack, "because I'm chapter chorister and head boy. I can sing C sharp"(p. 16). He used verbal and physical violence to get what he wanted and eventually formed a breakaway tribe electing himself as the chief. He ruled this group with fear and terror. "The chief was sitting there, naked to the waist, his face blocked out in white and red" "Tomorrow," went on the chief, "we shall hunt again" He pointed at this savage and that with his spear"(p. 61). By the later stages of the novel, Jack lost his name and simply became 'the Chief'. He issued orders without any discussion or alternatives. His war paints and the spear were his symbols of power and he used them to keep his tribe in order. Golding describes Jack's way of ruling as if he is a Nazi leader. For example, the description of Jack's party of boys matches that of Nazi soldiers (Golding, 1954). This implies that Golding is referring to the existed ideologies and leaders of his time. Jack is described as "mixture of all the western dictators of the 20th-century. Jack's red hair symbolizes communist dictator Stalin. His "crumpled and freckled" face looks like that of Mussolini. His blue eyes is a reference to Hitler. Jack is a combination of communism, fascism and Nazism"(Chavan, 2013, p. 1521). Another example that shows Jack's totalitarians characteristics of creating fear in boys happen in an argument with Piggy. "The bolting look came into his blue eyes. He took a step and stuck his fist into Piggy's

stomach”(p. 70). This quote shows that Jack not only creates fear in the other boys by verbally threatening them but also uses violence to construct a powerful sense of fear among the boys. After this scene Piggy does not confront Jack about anything because of the immense fear he has of Jack verbally and physically abusing him. As the novel progresses Jack's ability to inject fear in the lives of the boys becomes extremely effective. “I am scared of him...if you are scared of someone you hate him but you cannot stop thinking of him”(p. 72). It is clear from this quote that Jack is another copy of Hitler. Adolf Hitler said Humanitarianism is the expression of stupidity and cowardice. Hitler was able to convince thousands of people to believe in his inhuman and destructive ideology. Humanism is the care and compassion for others and Hitler defined it as stupidity, ultimately saying that it is better to look out for one self rather than looking out for others. According to Sathyaseelan (2016), Jack is nothing but another copy of Hitler. He is a bloodthirsty and a totalitarian leader. Like Ralph, the quality of his leadership comes not from his superior character but from his ability to intimidate his followers into implicit obedience. Jack develops his authoritarian state and military regime. He creates a common enemy in order to unite fishermen and his aesthetic policy by placing some paintings on the face and corona. He is a small Hitler who proclaimed the Jews as a common enemy and united Germany under the banner of fascism. Jack soon follows the method of exterminating his friends and follows a holocaust in which Piggy and Simon were brutally murdered. For Jack “Fair is foul and foul is fair”. Piggy's comment on Ralph makes it clear “Which is better – to be a pack of painted Indians like you are or to be sensible like Ralph is” (p. 259). This is an important quote, not only because it is the last time Piggy speaks; it is the voice of the mind that speaks directly to the corrupt mind. Piggy exposes the extent of Jack's terrible and pernicious tyranny through a peaceful

protest where he compares the two leadership styles and discovers the extent of tyranny.

That's why Piggy was killed by Jack and Rodger, but now everyone knows the truth.

Golding uses Piggy, one of the characters that seems more rational than the rest, to tell us more about the two political forms. Then, he leaves the reader to choose or select the best model to follow. Piggy linked order and democracy with Ralph and used words such as “sensible”, “rules”, and “agree”. Then, he linked the other leader Jack with disorder and totalitarianism, used words such as “pack”, “savage”, “hunt”, and “kill”.

Collective interest in Lord of the Flies

The boy's in *Lord of the Flies* fail to commit to the principle of collectivism. In their situation they are supposed to work together to get themselves out of their trouble. They should be more responsible and work more to the common good but when they fail the results is their death.

Golding uses the conch as an instrument to call for social unity in *Lord of the Flies*. The conch is used to gather all the boys on the island and becomes the cornerstone upon which the society is built. “We can use this to call the others. Have a meeting. They’ll come when they hear this” (p 16). Here it can be argued that Golding believed in Plato’s political theory of social unity. Plato considered the political theory of social unity as the fundamental ethical value for consistent social existence. Plato uses the human body as an example to state the type of solidarity he has in mind: “Then when one of the citizens experiences any good or evil, the whole State will make his case their own, and will either rejoice or sorrow with him” (Rhys, 1906, p. 160). Plato was against the idea of individualism and he thought that individuals are supposed to see their wellbeing as connected to that of the community within a fellowship of ownership of property. For

him individualism or private ownership was the reason behind the social discord and unrest. The private ownership was evil because it's achieved at the expense of the whole. This idea of Plato is also applicable to the rulers who are supposed to be more concerned with the wellbeing of their people of subjects. Plato had this for the rulers: "... [N]o physician, so far as he is a physician, considers what is advantageous for the physician, nor enjoins it, but what is advantageous for the sick; for it hath been agreed that the accurate physician is one who taketh care of sick bodies, and not an amasser of wealth" (Rhys 1906, p. 20). Here Plato wanted to say that the rulers were not supposed to be self-interested in their office; rather, they were supposed to work for the collective interest of the whole community. Reading Greek literature and learning Greek must have put in Golding some of the principles of ancient Greek philosophers. According to Carey (2010), "Greek was of profound importance to Golding's thought and writing. Greek literature became a passion [to him]..." (pp. 1-3). This can imply that Golding was aware of all the ethical values concerning society found in the Greek philosophy.

A common theme that passes through *Lord of the Flies* is the idea that man is linked and intertwined. In other words, the welfare of the individual is inseparable from the welfare of society. The call for connection of individual to society is expressed in the symbol of the conch. The conch also protects the boys' society from the chaos and anarchy. It works as a symbol of balance and preserving the rights of the citizens on the island. "I'll give the conch to the next person to speak. He can hold it when he's speaking" (p 33). Ralph, the democratic leader, uses it to make sure that all the boys are given an equal chance to express themselves. Here it can be argued that Golding is portraying to us the beautiful picture humanity reflects when there is unity and common sense. This concept of interrelatedness was expressed in African Humanism. In African

humanism, *Ubuntu* or humanity shows that there is no schism between the individual and society because the individual is human because of the existence of others. From the perspective of the process, the individual is a society - a term that refers to the derived nature of human existence. If this is the true nature of human existence, self-interest must be rejected as a serious mistake that can harm societies because it raises the level of individual gratification beyond the attention of society (Dandala, 1996; Hartshorne, 1950; Ramose, 1999).

My critique of the theory of self-interest in Golding's *Lord of the flies* depends on rational ethics that generate the idea that an individual's well-being is rooted in his belonging to society, and that there are no facts that can exist outside that sense. For this purpose, one of the crucial tools used in this thesis is African humanism. This tool offers us a rational moral model that focuses on the interdependence of everything that exists. Under such a model becomes self-interest fake, if not satisfactory (Bujo, 1997; Hartshorne, 1950; Kasenene, 1994:). A common theme that passes through African humanism is the idea that man is linked and intertwined. In other words, the welfare of the individual is inseparable from the welfare of society. This individual association with society is expressed in the African concept of *Ubuntu* - humanness - as well as in the concept of the community process. In African humanism, *Ubuntu* or humanity shows that there is no schism between the individual and society because the individual is human because of the existence of others. From the perspective of the process, the individual is a society - a term that refers to the derived nature of human existence. If this is the true nature of human existence, self-interest must be rejected as a serious mistake that can harm societies because it raises the level of individual gratification beyond the attention of society (Dandala, 1996; Hartshorne, 1950; Ramose, 1999).

Self-interest as Savagery in Lord of the Flies

Golding's novel is a sharp literary masterpiece that provides a profound comment on the overall humanitarian situation, as well as a luminous approach to post-World War II trauma. In the *Lord of the Flies*, the novelist begins a journey within the human spirit to explore all the dark caves that lead people to selfish behaviors and atrocities.

In his novel, Golding blames the underhanded propensities of men and the viciousness he creates. It outlines a cruel truth about mankind and its social appearance. Development is only a mask in Golding's eyes, a socially adequate falsehood that keeps us from executing each other when it isn't, while savagery is a particular element of human and profoundly established in the human mind. "He [Jack] capered toward Bill, and the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness"(p.72). Power is showed by scorn, outrage, envy and desires for vengeance. These dangerous qualities can be effectively found in Golding's characters, for example, Jack Merridew, who is driven by desire and hunger for power to the detriment of everybody on the island, and even himself. More disturbing is the fact that the previously mentioned harmful traits are not only found in fictional characters. Adolf Hitler, Joseph F. Stalin and Benito Mussolini are just three examples of the real life of Jack-Meridew, whose hunger has left our modern history stained with blood and remorse of terror.

The importance of the *Lord of the Flies* as a literary work lies in its capacity to manage issues that lie at the core of humankind. Golding set out to dive into human instinct and find its actual embodiment. All the more explicitly, the inquiry he strives to answer is whether man is good or evil in his nature. Thus, he attempts to analyze a human

being who is the product of the ongoing conflict between the good and the evil instincts inside the human soul. In his search he finds out that human are power-hunger and self-interested in their nature. It is a sort of pitilessness that transforms individuals into brutal creatures that won't stop until their adversaries are disposed of from the substance of the earth. Similarly, Golding shows mercilessness as a fundamental piece of our humankind, since it is our shortcoming that makes us human. Golding accepts the idea that our savagery can only be suppressed under discipline. Thus, Jack's brutal nature is suppressed through disciplined school life, and a hesitant moment in the killing of the besieged pig. "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. 23). At the beginning of the novel Jack's cruelty going against nature was stated. Jack's narrow mentality, his physical greed, his eagerness to power, revealed the essential qualities that led to murder and destruction. Even the description that the narrator gives him reflects that he is ugly and full of devilish actions: he is "tall, thin, and bony: and his hair was red beneath the black cap. His face was crumpled and freckled, and ugly without silliness. Out of this face stared two light blue eyes, frustrated now, and turning, or ready to turn, to anger" (p.1). Jack focuses on hunting and separation from the order that Ralph devised to satisfy his happiness. Golding does not intend to portray Jack as fundamentally evil, indicating that Jack was born of anger, violence and action and wants to be a leader.

Many critics and readers consider Golding as a pessimist and some go farther to call him a fatalist. They also consider *Lord of the Flies* as the work that reflects Golding's faith in the savage nature of the human heart. As Stephen Medcalf (1975) argues, "for Golding, the [savagery] tree grows in the human brain, in human consciousness, and [its] emblematic and conceptual reduction are dangerous manifestations of the Fall" (p. 21). In

other words, Golding warns that the real danger lies in denying one's recognition of the nature of brutality. Thus, the writer and readers participate in a discussion about the nature of human savagery. Moreover, the need to move away from the image of enlightenment of man as essentially pure and good becomes clearer. According to Alnajm (2015), *Lord of the Flies* is a reflection of what Golding saw in the World War II. War saw him the real nature of human mind and his capacity of savagery. Golding may thought that we human were betrayed by the war leaders and that war did not give us "fighting, nationalism, politics and freedom" but it corrupted human nature. According to Golding's point of view, the most troubling kind of savagery is that it can attract most people toward it, because most people are attracted to joys of life and hatred of rational thinking.

This idea, that savagery is an integral part of the human spirit, is clearly contrary to the views of the famous philosophers of the eighteenth century, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Locke. To be more specific, Rousseau (1998) discusses the validity of human nature and accuses society of being the tool that transfers the people into being savages and loss their humanity. According to Rousseau, "Man is born free and everywhere is in chains." In this sense, the individual is presented as innocent by nature or even naive; easy prey to a harsh society that tries to compromise human humanity with every opportunity it gets. About a century ago, Locke (1960) explained similar beliefs. In his stunning work, *An Essay on Human Understanding*, the human soul is portrayed as a tabula rasa, a white board with the ability to acquire good or evil attributes, depending on the environment in which the individual finds himself. Once again, the social context becomes the determining factor in human personality. Of course, this approach reduces the individual's responsibility, but at the same time distorts society. Of course, the

hypothesis that defends the innate goodness of humanity and the corrupt nature of society creates an irony: how can anyone blame society for the deterioration of human personality when society itself is a human invention? In other words, people are the ones who influence others, and the question of who is corrupted or innocent in the first place is still inconclusive. Accordingly, Golding believed that savagery did not arise from certain political systems or other systems. Therefore, removing a particular system does not guarantee the removal of the savagery. He argues against those who believed that some regimes or political systems created savagery. The savagery according to Golding comes from the very depths of man himself.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to investigate the conflict between Self-interest and Collective interest in *Lord of the Flies*. The idea of this study is based on the assumption that the main cause led to the fall of society in *Lord of the Flies*, is that the majority of the characters in the novel are selfish who contest with each other to accomplish their selfish interests. On the contrary, reflection of collective interest is also found in the character traits of one of the protagonists of the novel who tries to rescue all his fellows from mishap by providing a helping hand whenever needed.

Through the course of this study, it was seen that the impact of the World War II was huge on changing Golding's view about human race and the acclaimed civilized societies. "Years [of the war] destroyed any idealism Golding may have held about the rational or beneficent nature of human beings." (Reiff, 2010, p.24) Golding showed his pessimistic view in the present and the past generations and for him human beings are sick and irrational. Accordingly, it was found that Golding disapproved all the political systems of his time for not being able to stop the atrocities perpetuated by humans against some other human of their kind.

In this study, the characters' situations, dialogues, and expressions were investigated to answer the main objectives of this study. It was found that all the characters in the novel are self-interested and have an inner evil that led them to loss their humanity. The kind of self-interest that was found was a destructive one that destroyed the society as a whole with no merci. The protagonist of the novel through his self-interest acts

represented a totalitarian leader who used the resources and the people to accomplish his personal schemes. The protagonist also used violence and threat to submit the boys and have them accomplish the savage acts towards other boys who were weak and helpless. The self-interest approach portrayed in *Lord of the Flies* represented status of self-gratification and self-satisfaction. It all boils down to the fact that what destroys the society is not the society, but the human within the society. *Lord of the Flies* presents a story that portrays human selfishness. Human can go to extreme to meet their selfish desire. This could result in man's inherent capacities for cruelty, more than cooperation.

One of the main matters Golding tackles in *Lord of the Flies* is the role of individuals in community. All the disputes that arise on the island among the boys in *Lord of the Flies* come as a result of the failure of the boys to accomplish their tasks. The boys were divided into groups and each group was given some responsibilities. For example, some of the boys were supposed to keep the signal fire, others were supposed to hunt to feed the society and the rest were supposed to build shelters. This division of tasks and the responsibilities reflect the rationality and awareness of the boys. Till this moment the boys were aware of the importance of togetherness and community. The climax of fall comes to them when they abandon all the norms of collectivism and prefer their selfish wants of playing and having fun. Their games step by step leads them to commit crimes such as burning and killing. Here, Golding warns us of the destructive consequences of our selfish desires and invites us all to be rational and take a lesson from our past to build a bright future together.

I should stress that my study is primarily concerned with *Lord of the Flies*. Golding's other works will not be taken into consideration. This study cannot be generalized to

Golding's other writings as it picks only *Lord of the Flies* for its evident specialty and type. However, the scope that simultaneously emerges from the present research is that it has totally bypassed other themes that emerge from the novel and are equally significant as that of the one under discussion. Moreover, biblical significance of characterization in portrayal of the themes of self-interest and collective interest has also not been explored in the present study. Hence, future researches on the novel can consider these concepts for further study.

The study appears to support the argument that authentic human existence must be based on a comprehensive idea of society. In such a society that embraces all civilizations, derived from the African connotation of *Ubuntu*, we should imagine our human existence as connected to the existence of others. Our relationship and our interdependence with others must lead us to refuse self-interest because it is destructive to the life and the society. Our humanistic connection to others means the lack of division between the individual and society. This lack of division between the individual and society shows that the interests of the individual are in the interest of society. The association of the interests of the individual with the interests of society implies that it must be present in a way that promotes solidarity rather than existence only in order to pursue the self-interest of the person. It was noted that the concept of society that arises from African humanism reinforces solidarity and unity among humans (Daly and Cobb 1989; Dandala, 1996; Hartshorne 1950; Kenyatta 1953; Menkiti 1984; Prozesky 1995; Ramose 1999; Whitehead 1929).

Recommendations for Further Research

The researchers can focus on analyzing all the characters in *Lord of the Flies*, to examine the concept of self-interest and collective interest instead of concentrating only on the two main characters. In addition to the above mentioned, further research can be conducted through examining the biblical significance of characterization in portrayal of the themes of self-interest and collective interest which has not been explored in the present study yet.

References

- Alnajm, A. (2015). The main themes in Lord of the Flies. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 6, 98-102. Doi: 10.5897/IJEL2015.0788.
- Amason, A. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on Strategic decision making: resolving a paradox for top management teams . *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 123-148.
- Amason, A. C., & Schweiger, D. M. (1997). The effects of conflict on strategic decision making effectiveness and organizational performance. In C. K. W. De Dreu & E. Van de Vliert (Eds.), *Using conflict in organizations* (pp. 101-115). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446217016.n8>
- Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism* [Ebook] (2nd ed.). Ohio: The World Publishing Company. Retrieved from <https://www.azioniparallele.it/images/materiali/Totalitarianism.pdf>
- Babawale, T. (2006). *Nigeria in the crises of governance and development: A retrospective and prospective analyses of selected issues and events*. Lagos, Nigeria: Political and Administrative Resource Centre (PARC).
- Badru, F. A. (2005). Patriarchy and constraints of democratic political space of women in Nigeria. *Unilag Journal of Politics*, 2: 77–101.
- Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: toward a social psychological answer*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Google Scholar.
- Borowski, A. (2014). Confidence in Social Institutions in the Post-Communist Countries. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 25, 7–17. doi: 10.18052/www.scipress.com/ilshs.25.7

- Brief, A., Umphress, E., Dietz, J., Burrows, J., Butz, R., & Scholten, L. (2005). Community Matters: Realistic Group Conflict Theory and the Impact of Diversity. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 48(5), 830.
Doi: 10.5465/amj.2005.18803925.
- Brittan, S. (1988). *A Restatement of Economic Liberalism*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Boulding, K. E. (1963). The University, Society, and Arms Control. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 7(3), 458–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002200276300700326>
- Boyd, S.J. (1990). *The novels of William Golding*. New York: Harvester Wheat sheaf.
- Bujo, B. (1997). *The Ethical Dimension of Community: The African Model and the Dialogue Between North and South*. Nairobi: Pauline Publications Africa.
- Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Caute, D. (2010). *Politics and the novel during the cold war* (1st ed.).
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315126845>
- Césaire, A., Pinkham, J., & Kelley, R. (2000). *Discourse on Colonialism*. NYU Press.
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qfkrm>
- Chavan, P. (2013). Subversion of Civilization in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*[EBooks] (pp. 1517-1518). Maharashtra, India: *European Academic Research*, Vol. 1, Issue 7. OCTOBER 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.euacademic.org>.
- Conrad, J. (1921). *Victory*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Glen Coe, IL: Free Press.
- Cosier, R. A., & Rose, G. L. (1977). Cognitive conflict and goal conflict effects on task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 19, 378–391.

- Cox, J. N. & Larry. J. R.(Eds.). (1993). *New historical literary study: essays on reproducing texts, representing history*. New Jersey: Princeton UP.
- Crawford, P. (2002). *Politics and history in William Golding: the world turned upside down*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press.
- Cropanzano, R., Goldman, B. & Folger, R. (2005). Self-interest: defining and understanding human motive. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(8), 985-991. Doi: 10.1002/job.353.
- Dalrymple, T. (2005). Desert-island reading. *New Criterion* [online] 23 (6), 21-27.
- Daly, H. & Cobb, J.B. Jr. (1989). *For the common good: Redirecting the economy toward community, the environment and a sustainable future*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dandala, H. M. (1996). Cows Never Die: Embracing African Cosmology in the Process of Economic Growth. In R. Lessem and B. Nussbaum(Eds.). *Sawubona Africa: Embracing four worlds in South African management(pp.30-45)*. Sandton [South Africa]: Zebra Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Davies, A. & Saunders, P. (1983). Literature, Politics and Society. In A. Sinfield (ed.), *Society and Literature: 1945 – 1970*. London: Methuen.
- Dawes, R. M., van de Kragt, A. J. C. & Orbell, J. M. (1988). Not me or thee but we: The importance of group identity in eliciting cooperation in dilemma situations: Experimental manipulations. *Acta Psychologica*, 68(1-3), 83–97.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918\(88\)90047-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(88)90047-9)
- Defty, A. (2004). *Britain, America and anti-Communist propaganda 1945-1958: the Information Research Department*. London: Routledge.

- Deyab, M. (2016). A New Historicist Reading of William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture* (Liqua- LLC). 3. 74-96.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., Kahwajy, J. L., & Bourgeois, L. J. (1997). Conflict and strategic choice: how top management teams disagree. *California Management Review*, 39(2), 42–62.
- Etzioni, A. (1988). The moral dimension: toward a new economics. *Wiley Online Library*, 27(4),457- 460. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930270407>
- Eze, E. M. (1998). *African Philosophy: an anthology*. Oxford Blackwell.
- Gadsby, M. J. (1995). Looking at the Writing on the Wall, A Critical Review and Taxonomy of Graffiti Texts, 1-6 Available from:
<http://www.graffiti.org/faq/critical.review.html>.
- Gelfand, M. (1973). *The genuine Shona: survival values of an African culture*. Gweru: Mambo Press.
- Golding, W., Baker, J., & Ziegler, A. (1965). *Lord of the Flies* (p. ix). New York: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- Gorman, P. (1979). *Pythagoras: a life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Guetzkow, H., & Gyr, J. (1954). An analysis of conflict in decision-making groups. *Human Relations*, 7, 367-382. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700307>
- Guilhot, N. (2005). *The democracy makers: human rights and international order*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1814/22379>
- Gulbin, S. (1966). Parallels and contrasts in "Lord of the Flies" and "Animal Farm". *The English Journal*, 55(1), 86-92.doi:10.2307/811152.
- Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and modernity: philosophical reflections on the African*

experience. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hamilton, P. (1996). Historicism. In J. Drakakis (Ed.), *The new critical idiom* (1- 207).

Retrieved from: <https://altexploit.files.wordpress.com/2017/08/the-new-critical-idiom-paul-hamilton-historicism-the-new-critical-idiom-routledge-1995.pdf>

Handy, C. (1998). *The hungry spirit: beyond capitalism – A quest for purpose in the modern World*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/hungryspirit00char>

Hartshorne, C. (1950). Whitehead Metaphysics. In V. Lowe, C. Hartshorne and A. H. Johnson(Eds.), *Whitehead and the modern world: Science, metaphysics and civilization* (pp.25-41). Boston: The Beacon Press.

Hasan Al-Saidi, A. (2012). Savagery and the heart of darkness in William Golding' Lord of the Flies. *Studies in Literature and Language* [online] 4.(1), 129.

doi: <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.jyu.fi/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320120401.2009>.

Haviland, W., Prins, H., McBride, B., & Walrath, D. (2007). *Cultural anthropology*. (12th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.

Heilbroner, R.L. (1972a). *The worldly philosophers: The lives, times and ideas of the great economic thinkers*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Heyne, P. (1980). *The economic way of thinking* (3rd ed.). Washington: Science and Research Associates.

Hobbes, T. (1962). *Leviathan: Or the Matter, Form and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiastical and Civil*. In M. Oakeshott (Ed.). London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd.

Hornby, A. S. (2010). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (8th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

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

- Iliadou, A. (2013). *Humanity Square One: From William Golding's Lord of the Flies to ABC's LOST*. (MA). Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Irele, A. (1965). Negritude or Black cultural nationalism. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 3(3), 320-355.
- Jehn, K., & Mannix, E. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 44(2), 238-251. doi: 10.5465/3069453.
- Jenkins, S. (2015). Benefit of self and other: The importance of persons and their self-interest in Buddhist ethics [EBook]. New Taipei City: *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies*. Retrieved from <http://ir.dila.edu.tw>.
- Joeng, H. (2008). *Understanding Conflict and Conflict analysis* [Ebook]. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/el/1423/podzim2015/MVZ208/um/59326109/Ho-Won_Jeong_Understanding_Conflict_and_Conflict_Analysis_2008.pdf
- Kamarck, A. (2002). *Economics as a Social Science: An Approach to Nonautistic Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3998/mpub.17159>
- Kasenene, P. (1994). Ethics in African theology. In C. Villa-Vicencio & J. W. De Gruchy (eds.), *Doing Ethics in Context: South African Perspectives* (pp.138-147). Johannesburg: David Philip Publishers.
- Kaunda, K. (1967). *After Mulungushi*. Gweru: Mambo Press.
- Kenyata, J. (1953). *Facing mount Kenya*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Keesey, D. (2002). *Context for Criticism* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Humanities.

- Kohn, A. (1990). *The brighter side of human nature*. New York: Basic Books. Google Scholar.
- Lai, H. (2006). Religious policies in post-totalitarian China: Maintaining political monopoly over a reviving society. *Journal Of Chinese Political Science*, 11(1), 55-77. doi: 10.1007/bf02877033
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world*. New York: Plenum Press. Google Scholar.
- Levine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Locke, J. (1960). *Two treatises of government*. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press.
- Lux, K. (1990). *Adam Smith's mistake: How a moral Philosopher invented economics and ended morality*. London: Shambhala.
- Mann, M. (1986). *The sources of social power: A history of power from the beginning to A.D. 1760* [Ebook]. Cambridge University Press.
- Mansbridge, J. J. (Ed.), (1990). *Beyond self-interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Google Scholar.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Mazrui, A. A. (1999). Trends in Philosophy and Science in Africa. In A. A. Mazrui and C. Wondji (eds.). *General History of Africa VIII: Africa Since 1935*(pp. 633-677). Oxford: James Currey.
- McNeill, W. H. (2005). *Berkshire encyclopedia of world history*. Great Barrington, Mass: Berkshire Pub.
- Medlin, C.J., (2006). Self and collective interest in business relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(7), 858-865. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.01.020>

- Menkiti, I. A. (1984). Person and Community in African Traditional Thought. In R. A. Wright, (ed.). *African philosophy: An introduction*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Mimiko, F. N. O. (2007). Political and constitutional reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali & R. Olawepo (Eds.), *Nigeria's reform program: Issues and challenges*(pp.303–316). Ibadan: Vantage Publishers.
- Mill, J. S. [1848] (1965). Principles of Political Economy. In J. S. Mill (Ed.). *John Robson*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mill, J. S. [1836] (1977). Civilization. J. S. Mill(ed.). *John Robson*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Moquet, J. (1977). *Africanicity: The cultural unity of black Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Munck, G. (2014). What is democracy? A reconceptualization of the quality of democracy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 23(1), 12. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2299128.
- Murfin, R. & Ray, S. (2003). *Bedford glossary of critical and literary terms*(2nd ed.).UK: Palgrave Macmillan
- Murove, M. F. (2005). *The theory of self interest in modern economic discourse: A critical study in the light of the African humanism and process philosophical anthropology* [Ph.D.]. University of South Africa.
- Neyere, J. K. (1968a). *Ujamaa: essays on socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nkrumah, K. (1968). *Handbook of revolutionary warfare*. London: Panaf Books.
- Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oddih, M. (2007). Electoral fraud and the democratic process: Lessons from the 2003 elections. In A. Jega & O. Ibeanu (Eds.), *Elections and the future of democracy in*

- Nigeria* (pp. 147–185). Abuja: Nigerian Political Science Association.
- Oldsey, B. (1983). William Golding. In B. Oldsey (ed.), *British dictionary of literary biography: British novelists, 1930-59 v. 15*. Detroit: Gale Research [online]
<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CH1200002891&v=2.1&u=jyva&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>.
- O’Neill, J. (1998). *The market: Ethics, Knowledge and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Pagden, A. (1993) *European encounters with the new world: From renaissance to romanticism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pagden, A. (1988). The “defence of civilization” in eighteenth- century social theory. *History of the Human Sciences*, 1(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095269518800100104>
- Parvini, N. (2017). *Shakespeare and new historicist theory*. UK: London.
- Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667029>
- Perry, K. (2009). Intergroup Relations in Lord of the Flies. In K. Panchanathan (Ed.), *The Science of Fiction: Evolutionary Explanations of Hypothetical Human Behavior*(pp. 7-8).
- Prozesky, M. (1995). The philosophical anthropology of Alfred North Whitehead. *South African Journal of Philosophy* 14 (2):54-59
- Rand, A. (1963a). The Objectivist Ethics. In A. Rand(ed.). *The virtue of selfishness: A new concept of egoism*. New York: The New American Library.
- Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Harare: Mount Pub.

- Rao, G. (1974). *Democracy versus Totalitarianism*. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3516250>.
- Reilly, P. (1988). *The literature of guilt: from 'Gulliver' to Golding*. Iowa: University of Iowa Press.
- Reisch, G. (2005). *How the cold war transformed philosophy of science: to the icy slopes of logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rhys, E.(Ed). (1906). *The republic of Plato*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Rousseau, J-J. (1998). *The social contract*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Russell, B. (1991). *History of western philosophy*. London: Routledge.
- Samkange, S. & Samkange, T. M. (1980). *Hunhuism or Ubuntuism: A Zimbabwe Indigenous Political Philosophy*. Salisbury: Graham Pub.
- Savagery. (n.d.). Collins dictionary of sociology,(3rd ed.). (2000). Retrieved April 28 2019 from <https://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/savagery>.
- Sears, D. O., & Funk, C. L. (1990). Self-interest in Americans' political opinions. In J. J. Mansbridge (Ed.), *Beyond self-interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Google Scholar.
- Senghor, L. S. (1964). *On African socialism*. London: Macmillan.
- Schumpeter, J. (1986). *History of economic analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, B. (1986). *The battle for human nature*. New York: W. W. Norton. Google Scholar.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology*. London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul.
- Siegel, A. (1998). *The totalitarian paradigm after the end of communism*. Amsterdam:

Rodopi.

- Simons, T. L., & Peterson, R. S. (2000). *Task conflict and relationship conflict in top management teams: The pivotal role of intragroup trust* [Electronic version]. Retrieved [02 August 1919], from Cornell University, School of hospitality administration site: <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles/719>.
- Smith, A. (1976). An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. In R. H. Campbell, A. S. Skinner & W. B. Todd(eds.). *Adam Smith* (pp. 1-545). Indiana: Oxford University Press
- Solow, R. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1), 65-94. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1884513>
- Spivak, G., & Harasym, S. (1990). *The Post-Colonial Critic*. New York: Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203760048>
- Starobinski, J. (1993). *Blessings in disguise, or, The morality of evil*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Swenson, J. (2000). *On Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Swingewood, A. (1972). *The Sociology of Literature*. London: Mac Gilbon and Keel.
- Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1987). *Theories of intergroup relations: International social psycho logical perspectives*. New York: Prager.
- Touré, A. S. (1979). *Africa on the move*. Panaf Books, London
- Tullock,G. and Mackenzie, R. (1985). *The new world of economics: Explorations into the human existence*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Tyler, T. R., & Dawes, R. M. (1993). Fairness in groups: Comparing the self-interest and

social identity perspectives. In B. A. Mellers and J. Baron (Eds.). *Psychological perspectives on justice* (pp. 87–108). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Google Scholar

Van De Ven, A., Sapienza, H., & Villanueva, J. (2007). Entrepreneurial pursuits of self and collective interests [e-book]. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/sej.34>.

Wei, R. (2011). Civilization and culture. *Globality Studies*, (24). Retrieved from <https://gsj.stonybrook.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/0024Wei.pdf>.

Wood, E. M. (2005). *Democracy against capitalism: Renewing material capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, R. (2000). *The logic of human destiny*. Pantheon Books. www.nonzero.org.

Wright, R. (2011). *A short history of progress*. New York: House of Anansi Press.

APENDIX

Turnitin Report

Turn1111

ORIGINALITY REPORT

20%	15%	2%	9%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	uir.unisa.ac.za Internet Source	8%
2	Submitted to Taibah University Student Paper	1%
3	ikee.lib.auth.gr Internet Source	1%
4	Submitted to West University Of Timisoara Student Paper	1%
5	academicjournals.org Internet Source	1%
6	dspace.cuni.cz Internet Source	<1%
7	www.studymode.com Internet Source	<1%
8	joell.in Internet Source	<1%
9	link.springer.com Internet Source	<1%

10	drum.lib.umd.edu Internet Source	<1%
11	benz.nchu.edu.tw Internet Source	<1%
12	en.wikipedia.org Internet Source	<1%
13	Submitted to Tekura School Student Paper	<1%
14	covenantuniversity.edu.ng Internet Source	<1%
15	Submitted to Savitribai Phule Pune University Student Paper	<1%
16	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan Student Paper	<1%
17	Submitted to Arizona State University Student Paper	<1%
18	Submitted to Arcadia High School Student Paper	<1%
19	Submitted to Mercedes-Benz International School Student Paper	<1%
20	Submitted to SUNY, New Paltz Student Paper	<1%

21	Submitted to Quail Valley Middle School Student Paper	<1%
22	www.euacademic.org Internet Source	<1%
23	www.puchd.ac.in Internet Source	<1%
24	www.britannica.com Internet Source	<1%
25	litera.edu.ru Internet Source	<1%
26	Submitted to Northwood High School Student Paper	<1%
27	repository.unand.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
28	Submitted to Laureate Higher Education Group Student Paper	<1%
29	chemoton.wordpress.com Internet Source	<1%
30	www.encyclopedia.com Internet Source	<1%
31	Submitted to Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Student Paper	<1%

32	ratio.huji.ac.il Internet Source	<1%
33	www.scribd.com Internet Source	<1%
34	epdf.tips Internet Source	<1%
35	"Lord Of the Flies - What Is William Golding's view on Human nature?", GCSE/Sociology, 2003-09-04 Publication	<1%
36	Submitted to Brunel University Student Paper	<1%
37	docslide.us Internet Source	<1%
38	"Leadership Today", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2017 Publication	<1%
39	onlinelibrary.wiley.com Internet Source	<1%
40	Submitted to Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Student Paper	<1%
41	es.scribd.com Internet Source	<1%

42	prezi.com Internet Source	<1 %
43	Submitted to Tarleton State University Student Paper	<1 %
44	nobelliterature.com Internet Source	<1 %
45	Neema Parvini. "New Historicism and Cultural Materialism", Wiley, 2018 Publication	<1 %
46	Submitted to Parkway West High School Student Paper	<1 %
47	Submitted to Caddo Parish Magnet High School Student Paper	<1 %
48	lovetowrite.typepad.com Internet Source	<1 %
49	Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal Student Paper	<1 %
50	Submitted to St. Henry High School Student Paper	<1 %
51	Submitted to Leman Manhattan Preparatory School Student Paper	<1 %
52	Submitted to South Bank University Student Paper	<1 %

53	www.bookrags.com Internet Source	<1%
54	docs.plea.org Internet Source	<1%
55	Submitted to South Side High School Student Paper	<1%
56	Submitted to Coronado High School Student Paper	<1%
57	www.docstoc.com Internet Source	<1%
58	Submitted to Argosy University Student Paper	<1%
59	Submitted to Flatonia High School Student Paper	<1%
60	Submitted to Aliso Niguel High School Student Paper	<1%
61	www.shmoop.com Internet Source	<1%
62	Submitted to Stafford High School Student Paper	<1%
63	Submitted to School of Business and Management ITB Student Paper	<1%
	Submitted to Laurel Springs School	

64	Student Paper	<1 %
65	Submitted to Boyertown Area High School Student Paper	<1 %
66	dlibrary.univ-boumerdes.dz:8080 Internet Source	<1 %
67	everything2.com Internet Source	<1 %
68	Submitted to Vestal Senior High School Student Paper	<1 %
69	Submitted to Spring-Ford High School Student Paper	<1 %
70	Submitted to K12 Incorporated Student Paper	<1 %
71	Submitted to TechKnowledge Student Paper	<1 %
72	Submitted to Deer Park High School Student Paper	<1 %
73	Submitted to St. Basil Academy Student Paper	<1 %
74	www.antiessays.com Internet Source	<1 %
75	Submitted to Decatur Central High School Student Paper	<1 %

76	www.essaypedia.com Internet Source	<1%
77	Alaa, Lateef Alnajm. "The main themes in Lord of the Flies", International Journal of English and Literature, 2015. Publication	<1%
78	Submitted to Dallastown Area High School Student Paper	<1%
79	Submitted to Bath Spa University College Student Paper	<1%
80	Submitted to Napier University Student Paper	<1%
81	Submitted to St. Xavier's College Student Paper	<1%
82	Submitted to University of Edinburgh Student Paper	<1%
83	Submitted to University of Greenwich Student Paper	<1%
84	Submitted to Skyline High School Student Paper	<1%
85	Submitted to Hun School Of Princeton High School Student Paper	<1%

Submitted to Edison State College

86	Student Paper	<1%
87	Submitted to G. Holmes Braddock Senior High School Student Paper	<1%
88	Andrew H. Van de Ven. "Entrepreneurial pursuits of self- and collective interests", Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 12/2007 Publication	<1%
89	Submitted to 66170 Student Paper	<1%
90	Submitted to University of Wolverhampton Student Paper	<1%
91	e-book.lib.sjtu.edu.cn Internet Source	<1%
92	pdfs.semanticscholar.org Internet Source	<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 5 words