

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

Pedagogická fakulta

Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

PETR VYSKOČIL

III. ročník – prezenční studium

Obor: český jazyk – anglický jazyk

ASPECTS OF EVIL IN WILLIAM GOLDING'S NOVEL

LORD OF THE FLIES

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Milena Vodičková, Ph.D.

OLOMOUC 2011

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracoval samostatně a použil jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

V Olomouci dne 20.6. 2011

.....

vlastnoruční podpis

Table of Content

1	Introduction	5
2	God, Man, and Evil	7
2.1	Evil in history	8
2.2	Philosophical approaches	11
2.3	Modern theology	13
3	Moral cognition	15
4	William Golding.....	19
4.1	Childhood.....	19
4.2	War Time	20
4.3	Lord of the Flies	21
4.4	Past and Future.....	21
4.5	Later Works.....	22
5	Lord of the Flies	24
5.1	Ambiguity of Lord of the Flies	24
5.2	Game and Death.....	27
5.3	Three viewpoints – Jack, Ralph, Simon.....	29
5.4	Narcissism, adaptation, sadism	31
5.5	Self-denial and bloodlust.....	34
5.6	The Beast.....	36
5.7	Violence, power, security.....	38
5.8	Baal-Zebub	40
5.9	Guilt.....	42
5.10	Destroy the shell!	43
5.11	Double-edge	44
6	Conclusion.....	46
7	Works Cited List.....	48

Abstract

Evil – its purpose and meaning – is one of the most questionable phenomena in the world. Some of questions and answers connected with evil are examined even before Lord of the Flies, which is a major work of William Golding, is approached in this thesis. The novel can be read as an adventure story but it also depicts the nature and condition of a contemporary man. Aspects of evil in the novel are analyzed in this thesis, mainly from the point of view of humanistic ethics. The emphasis is put on characters in the novel – Jack, Ralph, Piggie and Simon. They represent various kinds of human psyche and their struggle with evil.

1 Introduction

In this thesis we would like to do some literary study. But as the topic suggests it will be necessary to explore the theme of Evil first. That is why we want to digress from the course of mere literary study, and look at what Evil is and where it comes from.

The topic of Evil or moral cognition has been occupying mankind since the very first philosophers tried to comprehend the world. A brief history of the concept of Evil will be observed in the chapter *God, Man, and Evil* – limited by the fact that this is not a historical study. These days, the problem of Good and Evil is relevant because of the fact that people have for the first time in history means of mass destruction. At the same time, mankind is for the first time in history mostly freed from any kinds of authority which would enforce its will on them. The importance of freedom in moral judgement will be highlighted later especially in the chapter *Moral Cognition*. The course of a literary study will be approached in the chapter *William Golding*, which summarizes major novels and life events of this writer. The last and most important chapter *Lord of the Flies* will show aspects of Evil in the novel. This chapter is closest to a traditional critical study but also completed with knowledge from the field of psychology and humanistic ethics.

The aim of this thesis is to recognize aspects of Evil in *Lord of the Flies*, considering the fact that disciplines such as theology, philosophy, psychology, and ethics cannot be overpassed.

What distinguishes humans from animals is certainly well-known. It is the ability to recognize ourselves as human beings, as something different and special. Nobody can claim that he/she is similar to animals because by stating so one would negate such a statement. That is simple reasoning. No animal can say: I am an animal. That is an obvious fact but we think it is important to repeat it again and again because Darwin came up with his evolutionary findings (*On the Origin of Species*) some people tend to see humans as something bestial.

But what defines man? That is probably The Question and this question is, paradoxically, the thesis statement of this work.

The sequence of the chapters in this thesis also marks the method of how I compiled and processed the whole topic.

Last but not least, the author presumes that the topic has some wider connections with paedagogical professions, but not only with them, generally speaking, every parent and tutor should be familiar with the fact that his/her actions and attitudes influence our progeny.

2 God, Man, and Evil

Firstly, if we want to comprehend the matter – the perspective of man - we have to start from the very beginning. Myths and the Bible (all quotations from the Bible in this thesis are cited from King James Version) could help us.

Then God said, “Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals, and over all the creatures that move along the ground” (The Bible Online, Gn, 1,26).

The Old Testament says that a human being is born in God’s image. But what likeness is it? If God is *Alpha and Omega*, how could a man be so low and without divine powers if he was created in God’s image?

To explain this more deeply, we can take advantage of the work of Erich Fromm on the Old Testament, where he says that a man is rather a quasi-god. But strictly saying not God! And he/she cannot be. What is the meaning of that? What is – again – the likeness of men with God? The conclusion is that man can say what is good and what is evil, in other words, a man can tell what to do and what not to do, deciding on moral basis, and thus a man should try to be like God – as much as possible. Which means a man should be good, loving, merciful and just (Fromm, 1993, p. 50 – 52).

There might be some cynical opinions on the value of life. There might appear questions such as: Is life really worth living?

But this is not our issue. Our springing point is that we love Life with all its pleasures and all its sufferings. From this point, we can say that our life is a gift given to us. If we admit that we were given life, then we must acknowledge that there was something, or somebody who gave us the life. The answer is – a mother with a father). Another question would be: Who gave life to them? And the string goes back to the first people. Then – if we want to – we can go back to the very first living being. How did it become alive? Our opinion is that from non-living Nature no life could arise without an essence of Life. Thus we come back to our God. This is not a plan we could read in a book. This

is a concept we were able to feel out of the order of things. This cannot be discussed any further, so that we can keep our thesis purposeful and coherent.

Paradoxically, we will explain how a man consciously differentiates between good and evil later, because this concept is bound to modern sciences focussing on human psychology.

Now, we are still meditating over the Bible. But even now we say that there is something we call Evil.

We do not have to go far back to our history to reveal an intimidating act of evil. During the Second World War evil things happened. Is there still anybody who can and shall deny it?

Extermination camps are a historical fact. If we are, although with difficulties, able to understand the theory of guilt and punishment, then we are certainly not able to accept the idea of innocent children and human beings dying and suffering. This happened in the extermination camps. How does theology cope with such horrible events?

2.1 Evil in history

Firstly, we shall summarize a brief history on the notion of evil in our history.

The crown jewel of Judaism, Christianity and Islam is their faith in One God who created everything (The Bible Online, Iz, 45,5 – 45,7).

But this was also a controversy. Before G.W. Leibniz paved the way to the idea of theodicea in 18th century there, there was deliberation on the topic of Evil.

Manicheanism was the first significant movement which said that there are two metaphysical principles – Good and Evil – which are in eternal struggle. This was a true challenge to all thinkers who held on to the Bible. Manicheanism detached evil from God (God was the good principle) and His creation. The answerback came in 325. There was Nicene council, a huge ecumenical gathering, where bishops of Christian

religion stated a confiteor that they believe in One God who created *all* (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 57 – 59).

In 447, Pope Leo I. wrote a letter in which he stated that Evil is no principle because God created all Good. In other words, that Devil and other demons were created good but they defected. Centuries later, in 13th century, there were movements that claimed that the ultimate Evil lies within body and material sphere and that this sphere is a product of Devil. Again the authorities of Christian religion answered that all Evil comes from defection. In other words, that Devil produces none (Gross, Kuschel, 2005. p. 59 – 61).

In these replies of Christian authorities we can see cautiousness and discretion. The dogma of those ages was too strong to talk openly about such matters. Such a dogma actually does not impeach the idea of God creating the possibility of 'defecting', as they call it. But this is not so a huge problem as it seems. Without this possibility a man would not be free. Although there are Commandments, God gives us the possibility to act as we feel, but also he gives us the possibility to act against our feelings - conscience. Perhaps the best expression of this idea lies again in the Bible:

*"For this commandment which I command you today
[is] not [too] mysterious for you, nor [is] it far off.
"It [is] not in heaven, that you should say,
'Who will ascend into heaven for
us and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?'
"Nor [is] it beyond the sea, that you should say,
'Who will go over the sea for us
and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?'
"But the word [is] very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you
may do
it*

(The Bible Online, Deuteronomy, 30:11 – 14).

It is a strange thought for a Christian, Jew, and Muslim to think that God did not create all. On the other hand, we can understand, it is a tricky thing, saying that God created

Evil, and wanted to. Such an idea can picture God as a self-willed and maybe even demonic power.

In this aspect, the Old Testament and Jews are much more sincere and humble. In the Book of Job there are many statements that come from God, and say: *Behold now behemoth, which I made with thee* (The Bible Online, Jb 40,15).

Is this not a clear declaration? Behemoth is a mythical being connected with destruction. If this is not enough, we add another verse:

Only I am the LORD!
There are no other gods.
I have made you strong,
though you don't know me.
Now everyone from east to west
will learn that I am the LORD.
No other gods are real.
I create light and darkness,
happiness and sorrow.
I, the LORD, do all of this
(The Bible Online, Iz 45,5 – 7,).

With this knowledge what else do we want to know? Do we want to ask why God created even darkness and sorrow? Do we want to say, it could be better? I do not think so. Even if we did, what does it change?

But there are other viewpoints.

Israelites bow before the will of our Creator and they do not doubt God created all. But they also understand that there are some situations which cannot be left aside. In the Czech language, we say the New and Old Law. But originally, it is the New and Old Testament, which could be re-articulated as Covenant. Jews understand it – there are always two or more parties who must abide by a covenant. In Psalm 88, there is a mourner who accuses God of his illness from which he suffers from the very birth. The mourner understands, God inflicted the misery on him, and says God is unjust. By

including Psalm 88 into the Old Testament Jews imply, it is a proper way to pray in this way, if one suffers due to nobody's fault. Thus they say that there are situations when a man can demand justice and mercy from God – in prayers (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 51 – 52).

The evasiveness of Christian authorities throughout the history we mentioned before could be explained by forgetfulness. In the New Testament, Jesus Christ is crucified, but he is then resurrected. The message is clear. No matter how much you suffer, if you are a good and loving person, you will have eternal life and justice. Thus all evil in this world is justified by God Himself. That is why accusing God of unbearable suffering is not for Christians. And that might be the reason why Christians tend to controvert the phenomenon of evil. The reason is simple enough: If we are not to receive compensation for all our sufferings and troubles in this world, many people tend to think they would not get it anytime and thus they try to constitute their own justice (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 55).

2.2 Philosophical approaches

The controversy much likely comes from the topic itself and its complexity. There are some significant philosophers, we would like to mention so that our insight is complete. By doing so, we also try to round off the historical outlook because these philosophers personify the most significant movements in religious thinking in European region. The doctrines of all named teachers will be cited from *Bůh a zlo* by Walter Gross and Karl-Josef Kuschel.

The first one was Augustine (354 – 430). Augustine was the intellectual father of the idea of the Original Sin. He said that all men are sinners because they are begot in sin (sexual intercourse). He also said that Evil is only lack of Good, and that Evil only accentuates good. Thus he denies substance to Evil. He also emphasizes all his thoughts with predication, that only – only – through Jesus Christ one can be redeemed (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 66 – 70).

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) adheres to Augustine, and adds some more comments. He accepts evil as a by-product of a higher Good whereas God does not want evil. As

for God as the creator of Evil, Thomas says that Evil was created by God but God is not a malefactor, God is not guilty. If God inflicts pain, this pain is only a punishment for not obeying the Law. Always a man bears the guilt (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 73 – 78).

We could perceive this explanation as some kind of verbalism. But it consists of many resourceful thoughts (e.g. from the Bible, Aristotelian logic, etc.) which we cannot and do not want to present here because it would make another thesis. Although ingenious, this theory ignores one important question: How is it possible that even innocent people suffer (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 76)?

Our list would not be entire without John Calvin (1509 – 1564), it was he who disclaimed his foregoers and entitled their doctrine as rubbish. In his own teachings he goes back to Iz 45, 7 rigorously. He says that although God causes good and evil, a man is still responsible for his/her deeds. The fundamental question is not what a man did or could do, it is what he/she wanted to do to fulfill Lord's will. Punishment is then a God's way to enlighten a transgressor – evil is God's instrument. To put all possible protests against such a teaching to silence, Calvin says that the will of God is divine and thus inconceivable for a man (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 80 – 82).

Thinkers as Pascal, Descartes, Montaigne represent the Enlightenment which begins in 17th century with revolutionary discoveries in sciences. Kepler and Galilei disclosed vast cosmic space, and besides there was also a crisis in European politics and society (Thirty Years' War). In 1710 Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646 – 1716) published his *Théodicée*. Although he comes very near to the ideas of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin, his basis is very different. He wants to explain the universe and God and His Goodness with intellect. He does not use the Bible or other methods. Everything else follows in these bounds: God created this world, this world is the best possible world, evil belongs to the perfect harmony of this world because God has predicted everything that would have happened and arranged the world according to His divine knowledge (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 83 – 87).

Leibniz was praised for his work that was truly a masterpiece of intellect and reason. But as rationalized evil did not lose momentum and pain, it then destroyed the rational construct. French Revolution and other shocking events instead suggested the Book of

Job where Job's friends, trying to justify evil in the world, are proven to be wrong and suffering and remonstrating Job is given the truth (Gross, Kuschel, 2005 , p. 88 – 89).

2.3 Modern theology

These ideas served men approximately till the end of 19th century. In 20th century, suffering of people became unbearable and it resulted in unprecedentedial atheism. But that is not our issue, we are still interested in what modern philosophers and theologists have to say.

The classical approach to God contemplated Lord with three main attributes: almightiness, goodness, understandableness. Jewish philosopher Hans Jonas reflected in 1984 that it is impossible to conserve this approach. He then elaborated on a marginal Jewish trend of thought called *cimcum*. It is based on the idea of suffering and self-sacrificing God. God gave up his almightiness in favor of His creation and thus it is now time for men to give. God's almightiness will be regained at the end of time together with the crop of time and men now cannot expect God to intervene (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 153 – 157).

Christian theologist Jurgen Moltmann amplifies this thought with the symbol of Cross. He says that God suffered together with His son Jesus Christ and that God suffers together with men and thus all suffering is metamorphosed. God's almightiness lies in his love, and by this love God gives men freedom. Suffering is price for this freedom (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 165).

These ideas tried to approach the mystery of evil and suffering from other perspectives. But there is a suspicion that these ideas do not answer questions, on the contrary, more questions seem to appear:

The first one is theological: Is it not only an esthetic perspective on Evil and suffering? These theories may be profound but they consequently elevate suffering as something noble and divine. Were concentration camps noble? Was Auschwitz a proper price per freedom? I do not think so (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 166).

Another objection comes from psychology. Briefly, for a man there is no consolation in the idea of God who is equally miserable. And it is also absurd according to the Bible and its parts we cited before. For Christians there is one more part of the Bible which seems important for this issue (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 167).

For though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him by the power of God toward you (The Bible Online, 2K, 13,4).

It is the weakness of men and the power of God, not vice versa. Thus there are two ideas we want to construe from the Bible and its interpretation:

Firstly, God is Almighty, God is not weak.

Secondly, God does not sin, God is just and holy.

If we link these ideas together with God's responsibility for Evil we then get an enigma. There is nothing else we can add to this issue. It is not a man's competence to understand or even justify God's actions (Gross, Kuschel, 2005, p. 195).

That is acceptable so far if we can be humble. It is crucial to be aware of the fact that we are not implying that it is necessary for a human being to agree with every line of the Bible to understand our standpoint. It is not even crucial to believe in God in the terms of the Bible. But we assume that everyone understands basic physics and logics and thus we can say that something cannot be created from nothing. If someone said that there was nothing, and suddenly something appeared then all our efforts would become hollow.

That is why we are going to support mythical statements from the Bible with simple observations of nature and nature of men, as Rousseau says, the Nature is the best teacher (Rousseau, 1926, p. 128).

The aim of these chapters was to depict the vanity of trying to explain the reason why exists Evil. It was also important to emphasize the factual oneness of the world which

would be disrupted by the idea of duality. It is an opinion of the author that such a duality would destroy human perspective of the universe and would lead to moral perversion as seen in Lord of the Flies.

3 Moral cognition

In this chapter we want to explore mechanics and principles how a man is able to do moral judgements.

We now know that we have been given life. We also assume that there is something we call Evil and that the prime quality of men is freedom. To somebody it might seem weird that we put freedom ahead everything else. Where is love? Where is law? Where is sexuality? Where is instinct?

Let us explain it a little bit further. As Rousseau, Locke and Ihering claimed, we deny any moral principles that would be hereditary (Brentano, 1993, p. 22).

Thus, we have our Man only with minor instincts and probably love to life. This can be accepted as well; whenever we imagine a child that is raised in a proper way, such a child is smiling and playing, such a child is enjoying every second of its life with enthusiasm. There is nothing happier and more loveable than early childhood – unspoiled (Rousseau, 1926, 104-106).

Such a child is also free to observe the world without any given moral principles, without prejudices. It is then clear that in cognition a child is free. If a child is free in cognition it is logical that it is free in making opinions (unless there is somebody who manipulates with the child).

Although we may be saturated with prejudices there is still some truth we are able to acknowledge. For example Pythagorean theorem is in our universe always true. Recognition of this natural law is not hereditary, neither is it a prejudice because it is logical and logic does not have its own will – logic then cannot make a mistake if it is used properly by a creature of will (Brentano, 1993, p. 22 – 23).

It is a suitable moment to unfold our idea of a creature of will – a man. Talking about will, we have to understand that this is the essence of our issue. Without free will (the fact that a man is free is our basic postulate) this debate about ethics and morality would be nonsense. Will is then the subject of ethics and purpose is the object (Brentano, 1993, p. 25).

But is this subject of ethics – a man – really capable of free determination?

Some people say that it is only a matter of habit. People get used to society and its traditions and they gradually become moral according to social norms. But we cannot agree with this because also bad habits develop this way, for example mammonism which is also based on the habit of collecting as much money as possible without any other reason (Brentano, 1993, p. 23).

It is also a common blunder that it is only fear of punishment on one hand and expectation of gratification on the other hand which make a man moral. But then also a sycophant would be moral, performing commands for his/her master and expecting a reward (Brentano, 1993, p. 23).

If the answer is not a habit or a command from an authority, we have to find it somewhere else.

There are some commands of another character which are rather similar to the commands of our logic. Commands of our logic are naturally right and it would be foolish not to obey them. For example, $1+1=2$ is obviously right. On this basis we can distinguish also ethical and moral commands. If we prefer these natural-moral commands we then make for morality (Brentano, 1993, p. 24 – 25).

Now, our subject and object of morality become important – without subject there would not be anybody who would or would not be moral. Without object there would not be an opportunity for the subject to make decisions (which is, paradoxically enough, the best state of affairs for some people, especially the Buddhists). It is clear that the subject is *me*. But what is the object? What should a man crave for?

The only appropriate answer would be: Seek for the best of attainable possibilities (Brentano, 1993, p. 26)!

To answer if and how a man can say what is good and what is the best we have to explore some areas of psychology. According to many philosophers and psychologists (the first one was René Descartes in his *Meditations on First Philosophy*) there are three psychic phenomena:

The first one is the phenomenon of *ideas*. These *ideas* are presented to ourselves by our senses. The second one is the phenomenon of *judgement*. The difference between *ideas* and *judgement* is the fact that by the latter we accept or deny some *idea*. For example, if we say the word God, we express our *idea* but if we say God exists, we express our *judgement*. The third one is the phenomenon of *evaluation*. In this third phenomenon a man decides on the scale of pleasure and displeasure, love and hatred, hope and fear (Brentano, 1993, p. 27).

The latter two classes are obviously different from the first one; there is a free act of choice. This means that whereas no *idea* can be wrong or evil, *judgement* and *evaluation*, which usually follow an *idea*, can be. Moreover, the class of *judgement* is related to truth, as for truth there is always one option right and one option wrong, this is decided by logic. For example, we all agree on the fact that $1+1=2$, logic tells us that any other option would be wrong. This principle is also valid for *evaluation*. We can like or dislike an *idea* but only one of the two options is right and good (Brentano, 1993, p. 28).

There is truth and untruth. As Rousseau states, all our mistakes spring from our *judgements*. If we were not to make *judgements* we would not be mistaken ever. The more judgements we make the more mistakes we are likely to make. The more a man knows the more he/she is prone to misjudgements (Rousseau, 1926, p. 261 – 262).

Rousseau also gives us advice how to judge correctly: The best way is to make our *ideas* as simple as possible. To prevent misjudgements, it is also useful not to overload our memory with studying books by hearth but to cultivate our reason and logic instead because if we use memory more than reason, we are sentenced to other people's thoughts and thus to other people's prejudices (Rousseau, 1926, p. 262 - 265).

Basically, we can find the same procedure of making mistakes in the class of *evaluation*. Whether it is a bad habit, delusion or perversion, people tend to love things which do not deserve it, money for example. But what things do deserve to be loved? The answer is again very simple and thus it should be truthful: We say that things which are to be loved are good. The good things are similar to the truth; the truth is truthful itself thus good things are good itself. That is the very essence. The problem comes in the moment when we realize that each person loves something else and thus we cannot agree on the good things. But such 'personal' loves concern only phenomena which come under the name *lesser evaluations* or *lesser judgements*. On the contrary, there are *higher evaluations* or *higher judgements*. These are the right means of learning the truth and good. A proper example of such a *higher judgement* would be a statement that all men long for knowledge by nature. In this statement a *higher evaluation* is included; all men's delight in evidential knowledge. If somebody claimed that he/she loves fallacy, we would validly say that such a love is a perversion. It is not a matter of taste anymore. Such experience of higher love gives us an insight into knowledge that there are things that are undoubtedly good and worthy of love and these are grand because ingenuous (Brentano, 1993, p. 29 – 30).

The aim of this chapter was to describe basic mechanics and fundamental errors which are in the process of deciding what is Good and what is Evil. Ideas presented here are based on the fact that a man is born free of prejudices, which is man's natural state, and it is during his/her life when prejudices are learnt. It was also proven that moral judgement is open to all because it is natural.

4 William Golding

This chapter is a biography of Golding's. The author does consider it necessary to offer an exhausting biography with all nuances because it would make for another thesis. That is why there is only one main source in this chapter which grants all basic information that are constitutional for this chapter. My thanks belong to *Educational Book and Media Association*.

William Golding spent his writing life cultivating the topic of his first novel, *Lord of the Flies*, for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize. Golding's pessimistic tale of man's struggle between his civilized self and his darker nature made him famous at least on the academic field, although his talent was a subject to much discussion. *Lord of the Flies* is considered together with George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four* as a novel that demands analysis. Other books, *The Inheritors* and *Pincher Martin*, are also surveys on the limits of a civilized man (EBMA).

William Golding is sometimes described as mythical and spiritual, a writer who used his novels as portraits of people in odd and extreme circumstances. Golding's legacy was appreciated by the Nobel Prize committee, which commented awarding Golding the literature prize in 1983 (EBMA):

"for his novels which, with the perspicuity of realistic narrative art and the diversity and universality of myth, illuminate the human condition in the world of today" (The Nobel Prize in Literature 1983).

4.1 Childhood

William Gerald Golding was born on September 19, 1911, in Cornwall. His father, Alec Golding, was a respected teacher at the Marlborough School and William was rather expected to study at Marlborough. Alec Golding also wrote textbooks on botany, zoology, physics, etc., and was interested in music as well. Mother, Mildred, was a suffragette. These influences worked upon young William but it seems that father's influence was the stronger one (Medcalf, 1975, p. 11).

In his pre-school years William spent his days in the family circle. The family lived in an old house in Marlborough near a cemetery, which Golding remembered several times and is likely to make an impression on the young man. He enjoyed reading the classics, for example *Odyssey*, as well as modern titles as *Gulliver's Travels*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and the novels of Jules Verne and Edgar Allan Poe. He was only twelve when he decided to write his first book. It was supposed to be a twelve-volume novel (Medcalf, 1975, p.12-13).

Golding attended Marlborough School, Brasenose College and Oxford. Firstly, he intended to study science, which was probably father's demand, but after a few years he realized his mistake and started studying literature. He developed a peculiar taste for ancient and Anglo-Saxon themes and topics. At Oxford he started recording his experiences and writing first poems. In 1934, one year before finishing his bachelor studies, Golding's *Poems* appeared. Although not of much literary value, these poems depict Golding's concerns as a student. They are, for example *Non-Philosopher's Song*, a sonnet in which Golding describes the difference between head and heart, as well as *Mr. Pope*, an anti-rationalist poem (Medcalf, 1975, p. 14-17).

4.2 War Time

As an Oxford graduate, Golding devoted himself to creative activities as writer and actor. In 1939 he married Ann Brookfield and then he became a teacher. They moved to Salisbury, where he was teaching English and philosophy at Wordsworth's School. He settled down to family life and had two children (Medcalf, 1975, p. 20).

After German occupation of Poland Golding served in the Royal Navy. It is said he was present in the battle where *Bismarck* was sunk. He was also in Normandy witnessing D-Day landing. These experiences hugely affected his view-point (Medcalf, 1975, p. 31).

In 1945, Golding again started teaching at Bishop Wordsworth's School. He focused on ancient Greek literature. He also returned to his writing passion. At first he was unsuccessful. He wrote a few novels which are now forgotten and lost. According to Golding's own words, these attempts were to fail because they were written in order to please publishers and public. Then, he decided to write a story of boys suffering wreck on an abandoned island (Medcalf, 1975 p. 33).

4.3 Lord of the Flies

After twenty-one rejections, the first publisher to accept *Lord of the Flies* was Faber & Faber. There were a lot of adventure stories, for example Ballantyne's *The Coral Island*, that share the same setting and basic plot, even names of two main characters, Ralph and Jack, but otherwise *Lord of the Flies* is a different story. *The Coral Island* is a book for children which should present the Victorian ideology and that is why characters in the book survive and even become stronger. But Golding's novel depicts the fragility of what we call civilization (EBMA).

After publishing the paperback edition (1959), the novel was more accessible and became famous with students. It was the interest of students that brought broad attention to the novel. Teachers discussed the book in literary classes and critics wrote expert theses (EBMA).

4.4 Past and Future

Golding continued teaching till 1960. During this period he wrote his second novel, *The Inheritors*. A tribe of undeveloped Neanderthals is forced to fight *Homo sapiens* who use advanced weapons. It is evolution which kills peaceful, primitive way of living. There is a thematic connection between *Lord of the Flies* and *The Inheritors*: corruption and fall of men. But *The Inheritors* bid a new viewpoint, *Lord of the Flies* tells the story of children becoming wild, regressing, which is the reason of killing and moral decay, whereas *The Inheritors* illustrate that even progress (and not only in evolutionary terms) can cause evil. In both cases it is the fragility of human morality facing weapons and means of destruction, too tempting to refuse them. *Lord of the Flies* and *The Inheritors* indicate Golding's so called primitive period. This period was finished by publishing the third novel, *Pincher Martin* (or *The Two Deaths of Christopher Martin*). The story is about a naval officer whose ship is torpedoed and then he is flooded onto a rock where he resides for days. He tries to keep his wits but delirium takes possession of him and he wanders through his past. At the end the reader finds out that *Pincher Martin* has been dead from the very beginning (EBMA).

The thoughts of the dead sailor are shown in the form of flashbacks, which relate to each other. The symbolism of number 6 is used here to depict a process of Creation. The character tries to create himself a God in 6 days. The book is partly autobiographical (EBMA).

The same method of flashbacks is used in *Free Fall*, Golding's next novel. The main character Sammy Mountjoy is a prisoner in a Nazi camp and waits for his execution in a dark cell. But unlike Pincher Martin, Sammy refuses all theological and theoretical systems and cries for help. In this act of accepting the real world and refusing speculations he finds atonement. Sammy does not seek for any comfort, he acquiesces with his free fall and is directly introduced to Hell, Purgatory and Heaven (EBMA).

Dean Jocelin believes that he has a mission – to build a 400-foot spire above his church. Although he is warned by his master builder and laughed at by townspeople, he keeps struggling and constantly finds himself neglecting his spiritual duties and overseeing the laborers. In the end the church collapses under the tower and Dean Jocelin found guilty and dangerous. This is the plot of *The Spire*, Golding's fifth novel. The novel is a masterpiece of Golding's allegorical language and imagination, it shows ambiguous meaning of his works. *The Spire* can be read as an entrancing story or as a dissection of human nature. *The Spire* also reminds of Tower of Babel, or, universally, human striving for divine, for reaching the heights while inevitably grounded to earth (EBMA).

4.5 Later Works

The period of 1965-1969 in Golding's literary life is characterized by the decrease in number of published titles and also in quality of his writings. He wrote no novels during those years and only a few of novellas and short stories. A collection of three novellas, *The Pyramid*, was rather a disappointment even to Golding's keen admirers, the stories depict mere living in a town of Stilbourne. *The Pyramid* does not contain a fable or an allegory, it is a realistic book. Another collection of novellas from this period, *The Scorpion God*, was also mildly accepted. The stories are set in ancient Egypt and offer a plot which is close to *The Inheritors* (EBMA).

In 1979 Golding returns back with his major theme – the nature of good and evil. Golding was inspired by Milton's Hell in *Paradise Lost*, even the title of the new novel, *Darkness Visible*, is derived from *Paradise Lost*. As in *Lord of the Flies*, Golding is again a moralist, he believes in good and evil, and he depicts it in the very tissue of the novel. In *Darkness Visible* Golding is rather Biblical, from the very beginning the reader is apprised with flames, fire, mutilations, agony. There is a boy walking out of the flames of burning London, the boy is called Matty and he is attended with religious

visions. In contrast to Matty, who represents the principle of light, stand Toni and Sophy, twins who abandon morality and succumb to hedonism and demonic powers (EBMA).

The years of 1981-1983 were fruitful for William Golding. In 1981 he was awarded the Booker McConnell Prize for *Rites of Passage*, a novel which began a trilogy that was finished in 1989. This novel again goes back to the theme of *Lord of the Flies* – evil and human beings. The novel tells a story of a paragon, Mr. Colley, who is ruthlessly satirised and laughed at by his ‘comrades’ on a ship. He is also confused by his strong homosexual feelings toward a sailor, Billy Rogers. Colley dies of shame and humiliation at the end of the story. The story is told as a shipboard diary by Edmund Talbot, a young aristocrat, who offers a lively picture of the nineteenth-century society (EBMA).

In 1983 William Golding won the Nobel Prize for *Lord of the Flies*. Since that he was exposed to the strongest criticism to date. Another novel, *The Paper Men*, telling a story of an ageing and successful novelist who is confronted with an arrogant biographer, was by many critics found to be deprived of the qualities that make Golding’s works exceptional. After that it seems that all Golding’s efforts are seen as a lapse (EBMA).

Ten years after winning the Nobel Prize, the eighty-one-year-old Golding died of a heart attack near Falmouth, England.

5 Lord of the Flies

Every chapter of *Lord of the Flies* is a part of a whole. Every chapter has its clarity and fits into the narration, the author does not conceal the apparent structure although the structure can sometimes seem too much manipulated. Some critics find it disturbing and say that it is the predictability that deprives the novel of its momentum. On the other hand, some find it rather impressive, every chapter is like a vision which can be heard, touched and seen. And each vision contains its meaning which can give rather a lucid account of it. Not only it is a fascinating adventure, it is also an opportunity for our contemplation and more profound look into the depths of human psyche. The clarity and quality, however, is still open to discussion (Kinkead-Weekes, 1967, p. 15).

5.1 Ambiguity of Lord of the Flies

It is usual that we read in many critical studies that in *Lord of the Flies* there is strong symbolism, that the conch is the symbol for society and civilization, that Jack is the symbol for a hunter and totalitarian powers, that Piggy is the person who represents reason, Simon is a saint (Hilský, 1992, p. 48-49).

Such an interpretation is rather tempting for its clarity, it is tempting but not entirely right. It is not implied here, that Martin Hilský does not understand the profound meanings of the novel, it is rather implied that Golding's novel does not encourage such conceptualization. In other words, Golding's novel is much more complicated and lifelike. The very structure of the text, its verisimilitude can evoke clear concepts and images on one hand, but on the other hand, it is too much realistic to escape to the world of ideas (Kinkead-Weekes, 1967, p. 17-21).

To speak plainly, a closer look onto the first chapter and finding the shell, can give us a piece of advice on how to orient oneself in the novel. The first chapter is called *The Sound of the Shell*. In the beginning, the shell has no purpose, Ralph notices it from a sheer curiosity and Piggy remembers that he has seen such a thing in his homeland. Although there is the inevitability, there is no symbolism so far. The two boys are attracted to the shell because of its shape and beauty no man could ever make. Golding's symbols are more complex than it seems. The two boys take the shell from a

lagoon and muse above it, they explore it and then Piggy gets the idea of blowing it. Even then they are amused by farting noises coming out of the shell. Golding's novel is especially physical, its symbols are symbolic but always physical, they do not float in a land of castles in the sky. But then something happens. Ralph blows the shell and the sound breaks through the air of the island. The first meeting was summoned. The peace was broken. Beasts and birds are scared by the sound. And again – it is not a symbol, not even the shell which destroys the peace, it is a human-being establishing a relationship with the physical world which signifies a *Paradise Lost*. In fact, the shell does not mean anything. It is a thing. But later when the boys refer to the fact they hold the shell, when Piggy confronts Jack-The Chief with it, the shell turns into a symbol – a symbol of society they created. And then, in the very moment the shell is broken, it again becomes a thing, in fact, it becomes nothing, it is shattered, destroyed, no human relationship can touch it in any way. If we would think – the shell is civilization – we would never be able to understand the true meaning of the novel.

The conclusion is that the symbols and characters in the novel are ambiguous. Jack is in one moment a terrifying beast, in another he is only an ashamed boy. It is always the nature of relationship by which boys touch the physical world what matters, their state of mind that provokes actions that shape the reality (Kinkead-Weekes, 1967, p. 19-21).

Although we cannot capture all these details which permeate throughout the novel, it is an important viewpoint for reading the novel properly.

Such a viewpoint of Golding's, which was described above, in which every situation meets a person and the person meets the situation – and the result forms the person and the world, is most radiantly depicted in *I and Thou* by Martin Buber, a significant humanistic philosopher of 20th century. Some of his thoughts will be presented here to provide a more profound picture of how a man communicates with the world:

There are two basic words in human language, I-Thou and I-It. I-Thou is the word for a relationship – for live in the world by the whole human being.

I-It is the word for experience, for history, for relationships that are perceived from distance. I-It refers to a materialistic world that surrounds a human being. The It cannot be lived through, It can be observed, It can be calculated, It can be distinguished.

But the word I-Thou cannot be divided. This is the relationship in which a whole being is living. In I-Thou relationship, we cannot experience anything, meaning we cannot distinguish one thing from another – everything is a part of one world – and that is why a human being perceives everything, undivided, unspoiled.

I-Thou is the word for human perspective on creation, life, beauty.

I-It is affected with decay but is not, in fact, evil itself.

Only a human can enter such relationships and realize them.

Without It a human being cannot survive in this world. Without Thou a human being is doomed to die, to fall into nothingness. These two relationships exchange in cycles. I-Thou relationship is passing and is replaced by I-It.

Such a necessity can be confusing for some people and, being deprived of the exquisite I-Thou relationship, they tend to fall in despair. But they do not realize that in despair they are doomed to It, only realizing such a poor situation can reverse a human being again into rejuvenating I-Thou.

Many people that lived through the Thou, tend to keep it, own it, but Thou cannot be grasped, only It can be grasped, handled, and It does not revive a human being (Buber, 1995, p. 7 – 29).

In the moment Ralph takes notice of the shell, he is captured by its beauty, oneness, in this shell the beauty of the whole world is hidden. He is in the I-It relationship. Later, when boys hold the shell and demand the right for speech, they do not refer to the shell itself – it is only an It – but to the very first meeting they summoned thanks to it, where they realized they are a society, where they – for a moment – felt the joy of Thou, the joy of mutuality.

The I-Thou relationship accompanies nearly the whole first chapter. Boys wake up in a paradise, with all its glamour, unspoiled beauty, palms, trees, sea, sun, it is nearly a dreamy world they came in. The delight of oneness continues: boys constitute their society – laws, leader, assignments. But the dreamy world seems more like a game. The game is derived from the world of adults and although there are some disagreements

between Ralph, Piggy and Jack, it is all so new and large that these disagreements can be easily overcome. After all, it is a game. Then they explore the island. The exploration is joyful although exhausting, there is still something new and glamorous.

'The cause of their pleasure was not obvious. All three were hot, dirty and exhausted. Ralph was badly scratched. The creepers were as thick as their thighs and left little but tunnel for further penetration. Ralph shouted experimentally and they listened to the muted echoes' (Golding, 1954, p. 29).

5.2 Game and Death

But the darker aspects are still present. If we think carefully we can notice that being on the island is an act of liberation. What did they liberate from? From the world of adults. They do not have to obey adults, they are allowed to realize themselves and behave properly (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 21).

As Fromm states, the act of liberation is essential in the process of adolescence. To free oneself from supremacies of all kinds is the prerequisite to be an adult. But the more a man is free the more lonely he/she feels, which can cause an attack of anxiety or even an urge to submit oneself back to a supremacy. The only cure to those anxieties is, again, an act of liberation. It is an act of liberation from one's narcissism, which means to free oneself towards the World in a spontaneous act and relationship (Fromm, 1993, p. 25).

The only liberated character in the novel seems to be Ralph. Everywhere else we can see only a partial liberation – Jack and his choir reminds us of an army, arrogance and violence brought from the adult world. Moreover, boys accept their situation as a game which involves irresponsibility that causes further complications and tensions. If boys were liberated, they would not think of their lives as games but as reality, but many memories of the adult world still nourish their idea of being playful children. This is obvious especially when a rock falls down 'like a bomb'. Bombs are fun. But when we connect these allusions with the dim idea of where the boys come from, the reader can be less assured that this is only a game (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 22-24).

The end of their game comes with events of the second chapter, *Fire on the Mountain*. Jack's authoritarian call for more and more rules – which imply punishments – are still unanswered because the true authority is unquestionably Ralph. But the idyl is coming to its end with a littlun with a strawberry mark who represents a terrifying part of their psyche; snakes (which is an obvious reference to Eden in The Bible). Nightmares and visions are presented in a meeting, the littlun testifies of his nightmares and nobody denies it. Nobody responds to Ralph's and Piggie's assurances that everything will be alright. They are scared. Their fear goes away when they have a goal – fire and smoke.

But the irresponsibility of boys, which is bitterly observed by Piggie, comes to a tragical end. The littlun with strawberry mark disappears in flames that get out of control. This is the time when all references to hell, death, bomb, drum-roll, jaguar, etc, acquire relevance.

“That little un-’ gasped Piggie - ‘him with the mark on his face, I don’t see him. Where is he now?”

‘The crowd was as silent as death.

“Him that talked about the snakes. He was down there-“

‘A tree exploded in the fire like a bomb. Tall swathes of creepers rose for a moment into view, agonized, and went down again. The little boys screamed at them.

“Snakes! Snakes! Look at the snakes!”’ (Golding, 1954, p. 50).

This is the point of no return. Even the bravest man feels uncertain when facing death. Now, this thesis has come to the point when I am about to uncover what I consider as true Evil. This opinion is based on Biofil ethics. These ethics are based on the fact that every human being has the right to live a dignified and productive life. But life is always uncertain. It is a bitter truth when we say that death is our only certainty. But some people (such people tend to control everything around them, they are destructive and sadistic, they treat everything as non-living things, they are usually highly narcissist, they also have a perversion of regression – coming back to a state when they were non-living and non-human) are too scared to live so that they tend to love their only certainty – death. It is the sickest perversion, which can occur because such a person keeps him/herself alive but his/her only object of admiration and love is death.

When we apply the mechanism of moral cognition on these facts, we come to this conclusion: there are two basic types of movements in human psyche – necrophilia and biophilia. Both of them are a response to the reality of living. But biophilia is moral because it is natural – grand - and consistent with what we find beautiful and worthy of love (Fromm, 1996, p. 36-68).

An interesting conclusion, which occurs to me every time I think about these phenomena, is the fact that there are three types of love in the life of men and the fact that a human being needs to love something in order to survive. The three types of love are these: biophilia – love for life, necrophilia – love for death, narcissism – love for self. The only one of these is considered as holiness in its extreme state – Biophilia. For us, Biophilia is then a synonym for Goodness.

The second chapter is then the end of irresponsibility; the boys have to respond to the reality – life, fire, fear, death – and that is why the third chapter shows us profound differences between characters (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 27).

5.3 Three viewpoints – Jack, Ralph, Simon

The very beginning of the third chapter, depicts how Jack is formed in his very self. He is hunting but at some point he finds himself hunted. He fully understands the horror of the island. Such weakness – weakness of a man facing nature – develops in Jack the tendency to obtain more and more power – to feel powerful and secure.

‘The silence of the forest was more oppressive than the heat, and at this hour of the day there was not even the whine of insects. Only when Jack himself roused a gaudy bird from a primitive nest of sticks was the silence shattered and echoes set ringing by a harsh cry that seemed to come out of the abyss of ages. Jack himself shrank at this cry with a hiss of indrawn breath; and for a minute became less a hunter than a furtive thing, ape-like among the tangle of trees’ (Golding, 1954, p. 52).

He develops instincts and that is the way of a regressing human being, because instincts are animals’s own. He does not consider the possibility of going back home, his only

goal is to fulfil his task – hunt and obtain meat – and when he fails several times, his need for self-assurance grows stronger.

The very opposite to Jack is Ralph. His moral task is to secure littluns, to build a home and make sure all of them get rescued. The more the two boys leave each other, the more antagonism appears (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 28-29).

The reason why a return to instincts is a regression and, in fact, inhuman, is the fact that animals are dependent on instincts – the more undeveloped the more dependent – and that means that a human being is a human being only if he/she has liberated him/herself from those instincts. It is again a matter of freedom. An animal is controlled and kept alive by those instincts but a human being is free, which means liberated from them. But such a freedom is ambiguous. A human child is dependent on its parents and it takes quite a time to develop into a free man. On one hand, freedom is a source of various anxieties and insecurities because a man has many troubles keeping him/herself alive, but on the other hand, it is such a biological weakness of mankind which is the prerequisite for a true human culture (Fromm, 1993, p. 26-27).

Simon is another character which deserves attention. When he is presented in his natural state – loneliness and contemplation – he walks through the forest to his hideaway. He walks through the forest which is alien to him. He notices that life comes from decay and disintegration. Simon, in fact, is able to comprehend both Ralph's and Piggie's viewpoint on one hand, and Jack's viewpoint on the other hand – the beauty and the creepiness of the forest, Good and Evil (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 30).

And not only to comprehend; he is wise and sensitive enough to accept both of them as one reality. Simon is far from being a saint (although he is saintly) as it is sometimes stated because he is still a child. His sensitivity is closer to a poet and, in the end, he is definitely the bravest and the most enlightened boy on the island (Bradbury, 2001, p. 348).

5.4 Narcissism, adaptation, sadism

Before the fourth chapter, *Painted Faces and Long Hair*, will be discussed, there should be a quick review of what has been said about true morality so far. In the chapter *Moral Cognition*, I tried to prove that it is a human ability to tell what is right and what is wrong and the mechanism of doing so was described. The description was finished with a statement that we can tell that something is grand because it is ingenious. Some paragraphs later, I stated that life is grand, together with some other phenomena, such as cognition, creativity and mutuality. That has been said so far and I hope no further discussion about it is necessary. But the process of coming to the true morality is a bit more complicated and could raise doubts. There is an explanation which should reassure readers:

After being born, a child is in the state of nearly a complete narcissism which is in fact a self-love. In this state, we cannot talk about any kind of morality. With cognition of the world, a child loses its narcissism because it enters relationships with the world – it gives its love to the world. Loving certain things is the process when a child becomes familiar with the world and develops morality. Extremely self-loving people are then childish and not able to create satisfying relationships with other people and things and activities, moreover, childish adults then cannot decide and act morally although they are experienced enough to do so. These inabilities can result into denial of life (Fromm, 1996, p. 68-109).

Furtherly, extreme narcissism prevents a person to enter relationships with the world (I-Thou), such narcissism is a result of either a feeling of inferiority (e.g. disregard which results in reversion into self) or the result of a stunning fear of the unpredictability of life. A narcissist person is then lonely, frustrated, and usually destructive and psychotic and that is why he/she is not able to and not allowed to share the beauty of creation. A narcissist person also needs to own things, even human beings, to feel that he/she has the power to control the world and to put it to equally miserable situation. It is a folly and if the person realizes the frightening vanity of destruction, he/she can decide to commit suicide which is the most selfish act – a single moment of controlling his/her life completely. But these are extreme instances which serve us to understand some mechanisms of human psyche. Usually, there is a person who is a mixture of these tendencies. Sometimes a man is fearful and obsessed with death and decay and

sometimes he/she is brave enough to face the world with a smile (Fromm, 1996, p. 69-109).

An adult – fully moral - person is then a human being who is able to free him/herself *from* narcissism to the utmost boundary – but of course not completely because a human being needs a crescent of self-love to keep him/herself alive - and thus free him/herself *towards* the World in a loving and creative relationship (Fromm, 1996, p. 102).

In other words, an adult is a liberated person who then can (and in fact must) make moral decisions and be responsible for them. But to what extent are boys in Golding's novel liberated? To what extent are they morally responsible and thus evil or good?

In the fourth chapter we can see what they are like and it also enables us to see what man in general is like. When Percival starts crying because he was thrown some sand in his eyes, Maurice – who did it – feels that he has done something wrong but this feeling is induced by the memory of his parents who punished him before for a similar act of wrong-doing. The morality is then based on memories (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 31).

Moreover, when Johnny, another littlun, notices this, he also throws some sand on Percival and makes him cry again. It seems now that it is Golding's opinion that a man is an immoral being whose morality could be easily replaced with morale which is socially forced upon a man.

It is also said that Golding considered human beings only as evil-doers. And although it is an unexceptionable feature of Golding's poetics (evil-stricken man who spawns only misery and destruction), this thesis is not going to ensue this course (Hilský, 2002, p. 106).

This thesis is meant to offer a dynamic insight into man's morality, it does not settle for the Original Sin:

It would be a huge mistake to say that society (family, etc.) does not influence a human being but, as we said before, true morality cannot be forced upon man. A social climate influences and shapes a child, telling him/her what is considered to be right and wrong and what is normal. But relationship between man and society is not static, it is

dynamic, there are mechanisms that are common to all men and these - when a man is liberated from supremacies - create the true morality common to all men. Human nature is then dynamic, it means that the nature of a man can change throughout the time and although it is affected by society, it is not definitely driven by society (Fromm, 1993, p. 18).

The most basic mechanism how a man reacts to changes in the world and to society is adaptation. There are also two types of adaptation – static and dynamic. The static adaptation is of no concern to this thesis because it does not change a man's character (it is for example the fact that boys usually sit on a log instead on a chair). Much more interesting is the dynamic adaptation when character of a man changes (Fromm, 1993, 19).

An example of the dynamic adaptation is when Jack has to face the fact that Ralph is the leader and not him. This fact – because Jack is a narcissist person – brings a feeling of inferiority which leads to anger and longing for power. In this very moment comes the real morality. What he probably knows from his parents is that a real authority should be listened to and obeyed but the influence of his parents is now weak and the mechanism of dynamic adaptation allows him to act morally or immorally.

Now we can understand not only why Johnny makes Percival cry (Johnny is a littlun who is still strongly influenced by the society). We can also understand why Maurice feels ashamed for his deed but such a feeling does not prevent him to act like that.

We can find probably a more fitting example of dynamic adaptation (which is the prerequisite of a dynamic character only which can be moral) in another paragraph where another littlun, Henry, controls some small animals in a lagoon:

'This was fascinating to Henry. He poked about with a bit of stick... He became absorbed beyond mere happiness as he felt himself exercising control over living things. He talked to them, urging them, ordering them' (Golding, 1954, p. 65).

This is a clear illustration of sadism. Sadism, as Fromm understands it, is not concentrated on causing someone else pain, its real goal is to gain a complete

domination over other beings. The reason is that the person is weak and hurt and lonely and cannot bear his/her personality alone. It is a way how a morally weak person overcomes the burden of loneliness and anxiety (Fromm, 1993, p. 84-89).

But Henry is a small child who does not want to hurt anybody, he just overcomes his loneliness by expanding his self to other beings.

Nevertheless, the idea of sadism develops into further meanings with the character of Roger. He is again a sadist whose only holdback to throw a stone directly at Henry is the memory of old times, of old civilization.

‘Here, invisible yet strong, was the taboo of the old life. Round the squatting child was the protection of parents and school and policemen and the law. Roger’s arm was conditioned by a civilization that knew nothing of him and was in ruins’ (Golding, 1954, p. 66).

Such a memory is going to last only days because the civilization which taught him this morality is destroyed, people from this civilization were not moral enough not to throw bombs at each other. And although Roger feels a breath of shame, shame is nothing that could not be overcome (Bradbury, 2001, p. 350).

5.5 Self-denial and bloodlust

Although it was not his original intention, Jack coloured his face and found out that he did not look like himself anymore. He put a mask on and this mask bestowed him another personality.

‘He looked in astonishment, no longer at himself but at an awesome stranger...his sinewy body held up a mask which drew their eyes and appalled them. He began to dance and his laughter became a bloodthirsty snarling...the mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness’ (Golding, 1954, p. 68).

As Spinoza says in his *Ethics*, Good is what helps a human being approach his nature as much as possible – his humanity. Evil is what prevents a human being to approach his nature – humanity (Spinoza, 2001, p. 166).

It is evident that this mask of Jack's helps him not only to hunt but also to feel as a hunter, not as a fragile human being but powerful hunter who can kill and destroy everything he wants.

Generally and in other words, as Fromm says, evil is a *human tragic attempt to escape the burden of humanity* (Fromm, 1996, p. 175).

But Jack does not realize it. He is not even evil yet because it was not his intention to lose his humanity. He puts a mask on because he wants to hunt and provide some meat for the boys. But his perverted nature arises. When he and his hunters return from hunting expedition, he is intoxicated with a feeling of power and ecstasy. He killed and outwitted a living thing.

His bloodlust is explainable. The essence of bloodlust lies in the fact that a person who sheds blood is in a state of complete euphoria. To kill and shed blood is to feel alive. Paradoxically, bloodlust does not serve death itself as it could seem, bloodlust is a way to feel alive at the utmost degree. However, such an act is a perversion because it serves life by an act of killing. To shed blood means to feel powerful and above all. A man who decides to seek relief in bloodlust keeps a strong bond to the nature and by killing he/she undergoes a process of regression into an animal stage (Fromm, 1996, p. 31-32).

But then Jack is confronted with Ralph and Piggy, who humiliate him. He did not keep the fire and a ship passed away without noticing them. There is again a beautiful exhibiton of a dynamic adaptation. His humiliation and frustration erupts and he crashes a lens of Piggy's spectacles.

But it would be unjust to blame only Jack. His zealousness to hunt is rather distracting as for their common aim but Raplh and Piggie are unfair: They are willing to eat the meat and so Piggy's partial blindness is more then a satisfaction (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 34).

5.6 The Beast

In the next chapter, *Beast from Water*, Ralph is able to reflect their situation – the glamour has disappeared and now there is only an urge to keep things going properly. He is also aware of the chimeric nature of the island and in the moment he fully appreciates Piggy's ability to reason, which is a skill he gradually forfeits as things get more and more complicated.

*'If faces were different when lit from above or below – what was a face?
What was anything?'* (Golding, 1954, p. 83).

When a second meeting is summoned, Ralph – besides other things – tries to assure the boys that there is nothing to be afraid of. Jack has overcome his fear by the deprivation of his human perspective, so his world is human no longer. Piggy disagrees and claims that there is no fear and a Beast at all, except a fear of other people but he is booed. Littluns' doubts are ineradicable. In the end, Simon reveals a true nature of their horror:

'Maybe it's only us' (Golding, 1954, 95).

But he is not listened to, not even Piggy is able to understand what Simon has already understood.

But who is *us*? In the beginning, it was stated – thanks to common sense – that Man differs from animals. Now this thought returns to us in an appalling connexion.

As Fromm states, Man is in life but in fact beyond life because he is aware of him/herself. Man is imprisoned in nature and is to obey its laws but, on the other hand, is completely free in his/her thoughts. This self-awareness made Man a stranger in the world, Man is then lonely and anxious (Fromm, 1996, p. 135).

In other words, Man is endowed with imagination which capacitates him/her to imagine all possibilities of how 'evil' things can hurt him (Fromm, 1996, p. 175).

Now we can understand why boys are prone to believe Jack who assures them that he knows how to kill the Beast. And that is also why Jack is now able and allowed to rebel against Ralph with a success.

Fear, the Beast, is everywhere, even in Piggy whose illness grows stronger when he is endangered or afraid (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 36).

A *Deus ex Machina* comes to the scene in the sixth chapter, *Beast from Air*. But rather a perverted one; this god comes as a response to Ralph's wish for a sign but it is not a person who would alter the sequence of things to a happier ending as it usually works, quite the opposite: a dead parachutist drifts down at the mountain and frightens Samneric who abandon the fire.

It is definitely an irony that Golding used there to emphasize the tragical undertone of the novel. Not in the terms of moralizing about wicked children but as a reference to the adult world that failed and taught its offspring such ill manners (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 37-38).

Although the parachutist seems as a forced element in the novel, it follows the irreversible pattern of Golding's. It is the pattern of a myth inside a novel. There is the inevitability of a revelation but, simultaneously, a trustworthy reality – both psychological and factual – which is typical of a classical novel. Golding's firm pattern (every successive chapter expands what has been said or suggested before) provides accessibility and clarity which probably attracted so many readers to the novel. But the pattern is, from time to time, brightly disrupted by imaginative episodes which seem to get out of writer's hand – Simon and his enigmatic dialogue with Lord of the Flies. Such disruptions question every one-sided interpretation of the novel and the ambiguity that was mentioned above, appears again and again and offers a profound and mysterious insight into the perspective of man (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 240-248).

The parachutist is suddenly the Beast and everybody – except Simon – is willing to believe that. The journey to find the Beast is a turning-point for Ralph's point of view. The I-Thou relationship with the boys and the democracy of the conch has gone entirely, he is now stunned when he meets the no-reef-side of the island. The world becomes incomprehensible It. And even worse, his fear makes him see the sea as a sinister monster which breathes throughout eons and mocks every human being. His firm attitudes as for what is right and wrong slowly disappear.

'Now he saw the landmans's view of the well and it seemed like the breathing of some stupendous creature. Slowly the waters sank among the rocks, revealing pink tables of granite, strange growths of coral, polyp, and weed. Down, down, the waters went, whispering like the wind among the heads of the forest...The sleeping leviathan breathed out – the waters rose, the weed streamed, and the water boiled over the table rock with a roar. There was no sense of the passage of waves; only this minute-long fall and rise and fall' (Golding, 1954, p. 117).

5.7 Violence, power, security

Chapter seven, *Shadows and Tall Trees*, finds Ralph weakened. For a moment he gives up his leadership on behalf of Jack and remembers his long lost home. But the reality of the jungle returns to him with a sheer brutality. They hunt a boar and then they imitate the fight. Robert is acting the boar and although they are pretending at first, they then really hurt Robert who screams and struggles and this fight gives all the boys the real excitement, even to Ralph.

According to Fromm, such violence is a kind of compensation for a lack of a productive activity. To some extent, a human being is able to work upon the world and this ability builds necessity because no human being is capable of enduring entire passivity. To act and produce institutes a kind of harmony inside every human being and without this harmony man suffers. But if a human being is deprived of this ability and need to act and create, such a human being chooses between two easiest options which are always destructive – suicide (which is rather a revenge on life that has neglected him/her, and also a desperate moment of total power) or violence (Fromm, 1996, p. 28-29).

When Ralph and Jack go to examine the Beast, Jack turns this journey into a personal struggle between Ralph and himself. The next day Jack summons a meeting and openly tries to displace Ralph and become the leader. When this attempt fails he is humiliated and angry.

'I am not going to play any longer' (Golding, 1954, p. 135).

These words of Jack's reveal the quintessence of his character and attitude towards the island. In fact, Jack has never been able to develop a relationship to the democracy of the shell, his only desire was to hunt, to enforce his power (Bradbury, 2001, p. 348).

The heart of narcissism is again approached. As Fromm observes, a narcissist person is not able to develop relationships with the surrounding world and that is why he/she feels a stunning loneliness. A narcissist person is in fact scared and such a fear must be overcome by a process which causes the surrounding world cease to exist and, in extreme cases, the only real thing is the person him/herself which controls others as objects. If such a person is compromised, he/she tries to either magnify his/her narcissism or (and that seems to be the worse option) tries to change the world so that it does not endanger him/herself and so that it corresponds with the narcissist person's ideas (Fromm, 1996, p. 84-85).

The eight chapter, *Gift for the Darkness*, finds boys divided. Ralph, Piggy and Samneric stay at the huts and assure themselves that they would keep fire and smoke but their fear of the Beast is too strong and they realize they are too few to keep the fire burning. They also vaguely realize that they do not want the fire for a rescue, they want the fire to repel the darkness. On the other side of the island boys feel strong in the Fort, they chase a sow, kill it and sacrifice its head on a spike to the Beast.

Boys are scared, they fear the Beast, they feel weak and vulnerable. Jack is an authority. It is not important whether Jack is really strong or only seems strong, he is nevertheless an authority and the other boys feel secure when they follow him. Such an attachment is an utterance of helplessness which is solved by the act of loss of their will. As Fromm states, a helpless man wants to become a part of something greater, he/she is willing to betray all his/her pride and vigor. Then a man becomes attached to a greater authority and although he/she lost his self, he/she gains a certain level of protection against agonizing uncertainty. Such a person is sheltered against doubts about him/herself, about his/her meaning of life or about who she/he really is and should be. This is the opposite of sadism (Fromm, 1993, p. 80-84).

Such a tendency is depicted when boys perform their dance. The dance becomes a ritual which fences off terror and fear, it gives them self-esteem and an illusion of power

(even Ralph and Piggie feel an urge to join the savage boys so that they do not feel the terrifying loneliness).

But the dance also indicates the things that are going to happen. Firstly, Roger is inside the circle and beaten but this is not permissible for him so there must be someone else. Jack suggests a littlun and although it is said in fun, there is something sinister in it. Roger then becomes a hunter and the circle is not complete, someone must enter to fulfil the inevitability (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 50-52).

5.8 Baal-Zebub

In the third chapter, Simon's hideaway provides him with a view of beautiful butterflies. In the eighth chapter, he can see only killing and the head on a stick covered with flies. Simon is now in the very heart of the story. He meets Lord of the Flies, the Devil.

But unlike the others he does not believe that there is a Beast, that the head on a stick is the Devil. He knows this despite the hallucination which takes possession of him. In this hallucination he in fact talks to himself, not the head, and thanks to this knowledge – that there is no evil external to man – he is able to reach an essential recognition: Evil is inherently in man, in every man (Hilský, 2002, p. 106).

This again brings ambiguity. Not only that Ralph and Piggie (he is half-blind because of his broken spectacles) are proven wrong when they believe in an inherent goodness inside men and if somebody deviates, he/she is just restrained by a higher power and cured by applied sanity, also Jack who confuses evil, destruction and violence for forces that are beneficial to life (and that is why he is willing to sacrifice the head to the Beast), and even Simon is ambiguous. His holiness and vision can be easily questioned by the fact that even in the first chapter the heat of the island made him faint. He becomes delirious if the heat is too much. Was not he only delirious, then? Moreover, such a doubt can be contradicted by the possibility that the vision made him faint as fear makes Piggie's asthma worse. This cannot be conclusively decided (*Lord of the Flies* is not a *thesis novel*) as we cannot decide whether other saints and prophets were or were not delirious or crazy (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 44-45).

But Simon has not come to his end yet. He has been through the abyss and knows that there is nothing like a Beast and that is why he can be good in a world that seems devilish (SparkNotes Editors, 2007).

He climbs the mountain (here is a strong symbolism – Ararat, Sinai, Carmel, etc.) and finds the truth. The dead parachutist, surrounded by flies, is sitting and dead there and repeatedly brought to life by the mechanics of a parachute and after vomiting, which comes out of exhaustion and realization, Simon is able and allowed to break the mechanism and set the parachutist free at last. He realizes that he has to tell others that their idol, the Beast, is:

‘harmless and horrible’ (Golding, 1954, p. 155).

Meanwhile, Jack-The Chief is surrounded by his acolytes, he has already become an idol. A storm is coming and because a home, a shelter, could be useful again, Jack orders boys to dance to make them forget about their fears. In the state of their euphoria, Simon comes out of the forest and scares boys just as he scared littluns in the beginning when he roamed around the huts in the night. Everyone, even Ralph and Piggie, attacks Simon who is thought to be the Beast. Meanwhile, the released parachutist is lifted and carried out to the sea and boys, who notice him, run screaming to the jungle.

In fact, Simon sacrifices himself. In fact, it was nearly inevitable. Simon wants to show the others what the Beast really is and he does. He works as a mirror to the boys who can recognize the Beast in their own faces. On one hand, the parachutist is gone and that is why the boys would never find the Beast they look for. On the other hand, the Beast was just created and objectified – the Beast is them (SparkNotes Editors, 2007).

Simon is dead. But this is not the end of Simon's story yet. Although it is a very sensitive description, we can still see some majestic order in the way how Simon's body is taken away to the sea. His dead body becomes beautiful, even as beautiful as a sculpture but on the other hand Simon's last breath is a physical, naturalistic act which preserves Golding's ambiguity. This secret order of things which accompanies the reader throughout the book, gives a credit to the writer because it is an evidence of his humble grandeur.

The water rose further and dressed Simon's coarse hair with brightness. The line of his cheek silvered, and the turn of his shoulder became sculptured marble' (Golding, 1954, p. 162).

5.9 Guilt

But a fundamental question comes now. Could the boys put up with the fact that they have killed? And what is their share of guilt?

Ralph's honesty and integrity allows him to face the truth but Piggie has only one eye (he is star-blind because of his broken spectacles), he cannot accept the fact that Simon has revealed – that evil is essential to all human beings. Even to him. His tries to justify the last night by his faulty reason, he seeks words which would explain what has happened. But this denial is rather pointless, pathetic. Ralph, Piggie, Samneric, they all subconsciously know that their deeds are inexpiable. Piggie break under this fact and says that there is no point in thinking about it. He is, partly, right (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 54).

Jack's tribe has more efficient but at the same time subhuman techniques how to cope with the guilt. They tranfer the guilt onto the Chief who – by the same mechanism – ensures them that it was the Beast, not Simon. They even extend the might of the Beast when they utter an idea that the Beast has many shapes and forms (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 56-57).

It seems that there are two (or three) basic viewpoints which are demonstrated in the characters of the novel.

Simon represents the first one which is a mixture of a Jewish and Christian wisdom. The Old Testament teaches us that man is endowed with both Good and Evil and thus he/she has to chose between those two. Jack is an extreme instance of this perspective – his heart is more and more hardened because he does Evil and thus he becomes blind. As Pharaoh in the Old Testament did. The result is that Jack (and Pharaoh), in the end, is not even able to repent his sins (Fromm, 1996, p. 15).

With such an idea on one's mind, a sentence from the New Testament makes sense:

Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six (Revelation 13, 18).

Piggie's opinion is rather an extreme to this point of view. His label *accident* refers to the idea that was spreaded by the exponents of Enlightenment: (Evil) Deeds of a man are caused by circumstances only and thus a man has no choice (Fromm, 1996, p. 16).

5.10 Destroy the shell!

Now, when Jack and his tribe is not able to repent, *The Shell and the Glasses* possess no further meaning at all. Piggy becomes a tragic persona who receives an only one response to his plea during the final encounter in front of the Fort: ironic laughter. Morality and reason are of no meaning anymore, the only thing to be respected is raw power. Boys in the Fort face Ralph and Piggie only with curiosity, to them Ralph and Piggie are not even human because they look like some items from the distance and height.

With Simon's death there is no equilibrium. The process was dynamic (just as human nature is) and now is finished – the power over the island is on Jack's side and Ralph (and the shell) is meaningless (SparkNotes Editors, 2007).

Roger releases a rock with a lever and Piggie, with no time to object, falls into the ocean. Ralph runs to the forest to save his life. He is now alone because the twins were captured and taken hold of by terrifying and brutal Roger.

As Fromm observes the mechanism of authoritarian leadership, Jack is now in a state of dangerous narcissism because he has obtained some power and convinced others that he is a god. He is naturally afraid of losing his power because there are potential enemies (e.g. Roger) and thus he has to be more and more rigorous, he has to be a 'better' leader which means he is forced to be more and more dreaded. Jack now faces his fears and

everybody becomes an enemy, especially Ralph. This is a mixture of a paranoia and a legitimate fear (Fromm, 1996, p. 73).

5.11 Double-edge

In the last chapter, *Cry of the Hunters*, Ralph is an outcast. He considers an idea that it all was a game and that he could boldly walk into the Fort and call an end of the game. But he knows that there is no return. In the end, he has no choice. He meets the skull on a stick on a clearing and – full of sickness and hatred – destroys it.

The skull regarded Ralph like one who knows all the answers and won't tell. A sick fear and rage swept him. Fiercely he hit out at the filthy thing in front of him that bobbed like a toy and came back, still grinning into his face, so that he lashed and cried out in loathing. Then he was licking his bruised knuckles and looking at the bare stick, while the skull lay in two pieces, its grin now six feet across. He wrenched the quivering stick from the crack and it as a spear between him and the white pieces' (Golding, 1954, p. 196-197).

There is an interesting symbolism in the fact that he appropriates the stick that is sharpened at both ends. It is a double-edged weapon. It is his only defence but it also hurts him, meaning he must become beastly to save his life, he must black out his humanity not to feel the fear and nightmare (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 60-62).

Then the war begins. Rocks fall down as bombs, the island is set on fire, the smoke serves as a means of hunting, not a means of rescuing. Then Ralph loses his senses and runs to the beach in desperate craving for a rescue. Ironically, he finds it,

At the end a reader might feel double-crossed. The reader started with civilized British boys, went through the horrors of savage beasts and finished at the observation of unattended boys who – from the officer's perspective – played war and had fun.

But it is otherwise. When Ralph and some other boys burst into tears of grief and pain, the officer turns away and rests his sight upon a battleship. A thoughtful reader – thanks

to the brilliant technique of Golding's – then realizes that it is Ralph who has become an adult. The officer is a moral child waging wars, it is him who does not realize horrors which dwell inside a human being and must be defeated (Kinkead-Weeks, 1967, p. 62 - 64).

6 Conclusion

In this section I would like to present the knowledge I have gathered so far on the theme of Evil, concerning *Lord of the Flies*. My thanks belong especially to Erich Fromm whose teaching (based on Freud's endeavours on the field of psychology) has granted me an insight into the problematics of Evil.

Speaking of *Lord of the Flies*, one must wonder if the Beelzebub himself – the skull on the stick – represents something universal. Why does it rule the flies? Why flies? And how is it possible that something *dead* reigns over *living* beings? Although free for various interpretations, I think that the answer is in the novel itself. The most frightening thing, the most evil thing is the fact that flies feed on a carcass. But why is it so fearful? I think that the answer is – although they are doomed to bear consequences, men are allowed and able to behave like flies. Men possess the ability to choose the atrocious path of feeding on death. Men possess the ability to reject Life, Existence, Being and accept Death, Nothingness, Decay. The latter was chosen by many tyrants throughout the history, namely Hitler, Stalin, Neron, etc. and has been definitely proven wrong. But there are not only tyrants who are responsible. Such a moral struggle continues in every human being. Golding's novel is thus not only a precise study on human nature but also a warning to all those who have ears to hear and eyes to see.

In this thesis I tried to approach the theme of Evil and it is questionable if my efforts were successful. The basis of this thesis was a thought that every human being can develop his/her morality and thus tell what is and is not Evil. After outlining some basic postulates I tried to apply such a knowledge on *Lord of the Flies*. It was proven that the basic aspects of Evil in the novel are: fear of life, love for destruction, regression to a non-human state, violence, narcissism, authoritarian tendencies.

In conclusion, I would like to quote (in my translation) a short paragraph from the book *Lidské srdce (Heart of Man)* by Erich Fromm which I consider important to understand and repeat:

The constant struggle for a better social ranking and a constant fear of doing a misstep generate an anxious and stressful frame of mind which makes the common man forget what really endangers his/her existence and at the same time the existence of the whole world (Fromm, 1996, p. 60).

7 Works Cited List

Primary sources:

GOLDING, W. *Lord of the Flies*. New York: A Perigee Book, 1954. ISBN 0399501487.

Secondary sources:

BUBER, M. *Já a Ty*. 1. vyd. Olomouc: Votobia, 1995. ISBN 80-7198-042-1.

BRADBURY, M. *Modern British novel*. London: Penguin Books, 2001. ISBN 0140296956.

BRENTANO, F. *O původu mravního poznání: zlo jako předmět básnického zobrazení*. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1993. ISBN 8020603603.

FROMM, E. *Lidské srdce*. Praha: Simon and Simon Publishers, 1996. ISBN 8085637286.

FROMM, E. *Strach ze svobody*. Praha: Naše vojsko, 1993. ISBN 8020602909.

FROMM, E. *Budete jako bohové: radikální interpretace Starého zákona a jeho tradice*. Praha: Lidové noviny, 1993. ISBN 8071060755.

GROSS, W. – KUSCHEL, K. *Bůh a zlo*. Praha: Vyšehrad, 2005. ISBN 8070217103.

HILSKÝ, M. *Současný britský román*. [S.l.]: H&H, 1992. ISBN 8085467003.

HILSKÝ, M. *Od slavíka k papouškovi: proměny britské prózy*. Brno: Host, 2002. ISBN 8072940759.

KINKEAD-WEEKES, M. *William Golding: A critical study*. London: Faber and Faber, 1967.

MEDCALF, S. *William Golding*. Harlow: Longman Group, 1975. ISBN 0-582-01245-7.

ROUSSEAU, J.J. *Emil, čili, O výchování*. Olomouc: R. Promberger, 1926.

SPINOZA, B. *Etika*. Praha: Dybbuk, 2001. ISBN 8090300103.

EDUCATIONAL BOOK AND MEDIA ASSOCIATION. *Golding, William*. [online].

2010. [citace 10.5.2011] Dostupné z URL

<<http://www.edupaperback.org/showauth.cfm?authid=92>>.

NOBELPRIZE.ORG. *The Nobel Prize in Literature 1983*. [online]. 2011. [citace

11.5.2011] Dostupné z URL

<http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1983/>.

SPARKNOTES EDITORS. *SparkNote on Lord of the Flies*. [online]. SparkNotes LLC.

2007. [citace 20.6.2011] Dostupné z URL

<<http://www.sparknotes.com/lit/flies/>>.

THE BIBLE ONLINE. *King James Version*. [online]. 2011. [citace 7.4.2011] Dostupné

z URL

<<http://www.bible.com/>>

Resumé

Cílem této práce bylo postihnout aspekty zla v Goldingově románu *Pán much*. Jelikož je v tomto románu zlo zachyceno téměř výhradně jako produkt člověka, bylo přihlédnuto zejména k lidské a sociální psychice. Ztečným bodem pro uchopení zla v *Pánu much* autoru byla humanistická etika založená na díle Ericha Fromma, který čerpal z odkazu Bible, díla Karla Marxe, díla Sigmunda Freuda, a jiných významných myslitelů. První část je pak úvodem do celé práce.

Druhá část práce se nicméně zabývá problematikou zla tváří v tvář Bohu, jelikož se ovšem nejedná o filosofickou, nýbrž literárněvědnou práci, tato část shrnuje pouze základní poznatky teologického bádání významných myslitelů historie a nabízí také pro srovnání některé poznatky moderní teologie. I přes hutnost a členitost této části a zdánlivou odtrženost od literárněvědného konceptu se autor domnívá, že víra v jediného Boha, resp. Bible, je cenným zdrojem informací pro další bádání na poli zla, potažmo základním kamenem takových snah vůbec.

Třetí část práce je spíše výtkou všem zastáncům etického a morálního relativismu. Zároveň se ale také snaží popsat schopnost člověka dojít morálního poznání, ačkoli ho blíže nedefinuje. Oprávněnost této části vyplývá z celkového konceptu práce – dobrat se alespoň zlomků pravdy na poli dobra a zla.

Čtvrtá část se již přibližuje literárněvědnému bádání, neboť stručně pojednává o životě Williama Goldinga, zároveň také poskytuje základní přehled jeho dalších významných děl.

Nosné téma práce se objevuje v páté části práce, kde se autor již přímo zabývá problematikou zla v *Pánu much*. Pojednává o problematice svobody, morální nedospělosti, regresivních a krvesmilných tendencích člověka, jež se objevují v chování postav tohoto románu. V této kapitole se také potvrzuje základní postulát práce: nadřazenost života a všeho, co životu slouží, nad smrtí a vším, co životu škodí. Přímo i nepřímo je tak v literárněvědných tendencích obhajována biofilní etika, a to tím způsobem, že je vystopováno a vysvětleno zlo v tomto románu. Autor práce si ovšem nečiní nárok na úplný výčet, ani na úplné vyčerpání tématu.

ANOTACE

Jméno a příjmení:	Petr Vyskočil
Katedra:	Anglického jazyka
Vedoucí práce:	PhDr. Milena Vodičková, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2011

Název práce:	Aspekty zla v románu Williama Goldinga Pán much
Název v angličtině:	Aspects of Evil in William Golding's novel Lord of the Flies
Anotace práce:	Bakalářská práce se zaměřuje na analýzu aspektů zla v Pánu much. Nejprve tedy rozebírá lidskou perspektivu zla, možnost jeho poznání. Později se zabývá projekcí zla do konkrétního jednání a prožitků postav v tomto románu.
Klíčová slova:	Dobro, zlo, morálnost, etika, dvojznačnost interpretace, strach, román jako mýtus, narcismus
Anotace v angličtině:	This thesis is focused on the analysis of aspects of evil in Lord of the Flies. Firstly, it examines the human perspective on the phenomenon of evil and man's ability to recognize what is good and evil. Then it deals with the characters of this novel and their deeds and experience.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Good, evil, morality, ethics, interpretation ambiguity, fear, a novel as a myth, narcissism
Rozsah práce:	51 stran
Jazyk práce:	Anglický jazyk