

Constructing Identities and Modeling Leaderships in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954): A Primitive-Civilized Binary Context

Mohammed al-Hiba
Albaydha University, Yemen.

Corresponding Author: Mohammed al-Hiba, E-mail: alhibam@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18 June

Accepted: 10 Oct

Volume: 1

Issue: 3

KEYWORDS

Identity Constructs,
Leadership Models,
Primitive, Civilized,
Hunting, Masking,
Liminality

ABSTRACT

To this day, William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* has never ceased to surprise critics and researchers alike with the profundity, richness and novelty of its ideas and concepts. A huge body of studies and research papers have addressed a wide array of concepts ranging from primitiveness, civilization, symbolism of characters, power; alienation from culture and civilization, to the subversion and loss of faith in humanity and the vulnerability and decline of civilization in the face of savagery. Some studies have touched upon the concepts of leadership and identity, but slightly and as peripheral ideas. However, no study—to the researcher's best knowledge—has treated the concepts of identity construction and leadership modeling as its key concern, or individually addressed them from a similar perspective. Hence, the current research paper investigates the concepts of identity constructs and leadership models together, and not only within the context of the primitive-civilized binary opposition, but also within a common and comprehensive frame of reference. Besides, it detects and analyzes various values, beliefs, and attitudes germane to the concepts under study, and the overall mechanism within which they operate as a unified whole to construct identities, model leaderships and become characteristically defining factors.

1. Introduction

Genealogy of Leadership/Royalty

At the origin of humanity were two kinds of people: those devoted to agriculture and animal husbandry and those who had to protect them because ferocious wild animals threatened to eat the women and children, destroy the harvests, and devour the herds, et cetera. Hunters were required to protect the agricultural community from wild beasts. Then a time came when the hunters had been so effective that there were no more wild beasts. The hunters consequently became useless and, disturbed by their uselessness, which would deprive them of their privileges as hunters; they transformed themselves into wild beasts and turned against those they were protecting. They in turn attacked the herds and families they should have been protecting. They were the wolves of mankind. They were the tigers of primitive society. Kings are nothing else but these tigers, these hunters of earlier times who took the place of the wild beasts prowling around the first societies. (Foucault 97)

Thus, then, we can trace up, among races in different degrees of civilization, every step, from the treatment of woman as a mere chattel, to the sacred idea of matrimony as it exists among ourselves; and we find clear evidence that the gradual change has been one of progress, and not of degradation. Civilized nations long retain traces of their ancient barbarism; barbarous ones, no relics of previous chivalry. As the valves in the veins indicate the direction of the circulation; so can we trace the gradual progress of respect for women, which is one of the noblest features of our modern civilization. (Lubbock 339)

Any one might take wild guesses imagining the nature and beginning of the human race. People would also wonder about the strategy, form and density of first human settlements. Man has down the centuries attempted to understand and be familiar with such perplexingly intriguing issues. People across time and space have relentlessly conducted continuous research, archeological excavations, scientific expeditions, and produced numerous religious and philosophical exegeses and considerations hoping to find out answers. Thus far, the findings of such bulky and

astonishing body of human effort are available for interested individuals and institutions alike, and many of us could probably be acquainted with them already.

Within that context, leadership as a form of governing has long existed from the beginnings of man and all the way through the entire human history. In addition, leadership models have represented a central concern in the endless human quest for knowledge, progress and prosperity. Human communities and races have all along known the necessity and worth of leadership. Hence, leadership, improving it, “and the study of it, has roots in the beginning of civilization. Egyptian rulers, Greek heroes, and biblical patriarchs all have one thing in common—leadership,” (Patterson 1). As a matter of fact, the need for leadership “among both primitive and civilized peoples is one of common observation,” (Mumford 218). Primitive or civilized, ancient or modern, leadership remains a shared human concern then and now and at all times.

In that order, models of leadership and forms of governing have tremendously changed—possibly improved—in the course of time. Different races and cultures might have different forms of leadership, yet all of them would change their forms of governing or improve them over time. The need for leadership originates in man’s belief and common understanding that human communities whether primitive or civilized cannot survive without leadership. After all, leadership is “a function common to all the different stages of the social process, from its simplest and most primitive to its most complex and highly developed manifestation,” (*ibid*). These forms of governing and models of leadership have—as illustrating examples only—developed from primitive to tribal, to feudal, then to royal; and then varied from aristocracy to autocracy to oligarchy and eventually to democracy.

The nature of the beginnings of man and of human leadership might still be a debatable issue. However, we have probably come by now to accept the assumption that the first human leadership and communities—a position supported by Foucault and many other writers—were savage and primitive who in time became civilized. Such writers argue “that man was at first a mere savage, and that our history has on the whole been a steady progress towards civilization,” (Lubbock 328). Out of commonsensical understanding, I could also argue that primitive people had to organize a communal effort to protect themselves against the threats of wild animals and other human communities, thus forming the first models of leadership. Still, Foucault and those other writers, suggest that primitiveness and savagery is an innately instinctual quality of man. Hence, the beginnings of human leadership is primitive, but that model of primitiveness would very likely resurface every now and then.

Nevertheless, others argue to the contrary; they suggest that first man and first human leadership were no different from the people of today and even equally civilized: “civilized races, say we, are the descendants of races which have risen from a state of barbarism. On the contrary, argue our opponents, savages are the descendants of civilized races, and have sunk to their present condition,” (*ibid* 330-31). Other writers might propose a compromising position—a position I, too, hold—arguing that “savagery [is] in all of us”, and because of that “civilization is a thin and fragile veneer,” (Dalrymple 26). Such middle-position might demonstrate more acceptability and endurance given the sad and tragic realities of the human history, both primitive and civilized. Whatever the case would be, we could still imagine what a primitive life looked like, and arrive at certain assumptions.

We could thus assume that the life of the primitive man lacked almost all sorts of knowledge and facilities of living. Primitive communities would have been lacking in all or most aspects of the modern life of today: “no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of time; no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short,” (Hobbes 78). For that reason, too, the life of a primitive leader, and by extension the primitive subject, has mostly been correlated with hunting “especially among primitive peoples,” (Mumford 217). Likewise, most of the information we have today on primitive human communities has come largely through hunting groups. Turning from noble protectors to hunting predators, asserts Foucault, those primitive people established the very first forms of governing and models of leadership. Crude and primitive in nature, leading figures embraced primitive and unpolished methods to govern a human community. Violence, intimidation and terror epitomized the basic tenets of primitive governing and leadership.

In view of that, a primitive model of leadership would resort to force and power for its legitimacy and mere existence. This model employs terror and intimidation in its course of governing. It is also linked to primitive lifestyle activities such as hunting, painting, masking and other primitive rituals. A civilized model of leadership, on the other hand, would represent the ultimate outcome of the constant attempts and efforts of the human mind at reforming and improving forms of governing and models of leadership. It exemplifies the accumulation of human experiences, successes and failures, and all cherished and valuable understandings and constant modifications of governing that humanity has conclusively reached. Unlike the primitive model, civilized leadership should be characterized by consent and choice for its validity. It should also seek to cultivate the human mind and ensure the welfare and wellbeing of its people.

Civilization principally aims at cultivating the human soul and lifting it up beyond its primitively savage side. It takes considerable time and untiringly tremendous efforts to do that. Civilization hopes to crown its efforts of nurturing man with success, though sometimes it fails. Across space and throughout history, man has manifested and sustained an inclination and a proclivity to sink down to their lower, animal, and primitive self, and even seems to have a liking for it. But, here comes civilization with different codes; it attempts to regulate such primitive instincts and/or control them.

It remains worth mentioning to note that the argument here over primitiveness and civilization is chiefly concerned with the construction of identities and modeling of leaderships. It thus explores—with reference to the text at hand—general and shared human values as demonstrated in human attitudes, individual and collective character, and in commonsensical values of living. It detects, discusses and analyzes the diverse and various values, beliefs, attitudes, strategies, practices, doctrines germane to the concepts under study, and the overall mechanism within which they operate as a unified whole to construct identities, model leaderships and become characteristically outlining factors. Accordingly, the current research study does not promote itself to any sort of judgmental positions from which it ascribes primitiveness to that particular race or civilization to that peculiar nation. Nor does it evolve and develop with prior impressions, bias or personal prejudice of any sort.

For one thing, the history of the human race might inform us of “a primitively civilized race” (Lubbock 335), or of primitive peoples who might have manifested certain—probably great—degrees of civility, and of civilized nations who might have committed savage atrocities. In this regard, I could maintain that the western imperial powers have during the last four to five centuries demonstrated such position in theory and—sadly—in practice as well. They have placed their European nations “at one end of the social series and savage tribes at the other, arranging the rest of mankind between these limits,” (Tylor 26). Like I said earlier, the argument here still runs and develops within a larger and an all-inclusive frame of reference that is expected to neither exclude, make exceptions, nor point fingers or assign titles.

Furthermore, we all know for a fact by now that “the atrocities of the Holocaust were not committed by some primitive tribes but by civilized Europeans,” (Ponižilová 43). In broader terms, it might feasibly seem that William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* is a warning against “a retreat from the top-heavy intellectuality of the modern [civilized] age to the primitive and spontaneous,” (*emphasis added*. Eagleton 37). It is a warning to the entirety of humanity. The primitive and the savage in us, regardless of the degree of our primal or civil state, could and would reemerge. That is why, I still could assume, William Golding in *Lord of the Flies* perceptibly asserts that the primitive and savage deeds committed in the novel come from a bunch of supposedly civilized English boys. Therefore, to argue that even “among the most civilized nations there are traces of original barbarism” (Lubbock 332), is a claim I find myself inclined to maintain and side with.

Constructing Identities and Modeling Leaderships: Deliberating the Primitive and the Civilized in *Lord of the Flies*

The relation of leadership to the development of personality or the consciousness of self arises as a result of the part, which the individual plays in society, and of the reactions of others to his activity. (Mumford 221)

As an ideal type, charismatic authority is characterized by individual leadership on the basis of divine or exemplary qualities that are not, in their locale, considered accessible to the ordinary person. These qualities have, in so-called primitive societies, taken the form of magic, prophecy, therapy, legal wisdom, and leadership in the hunt and in war. (Kazi 155-6)

As a shared human phenomenon, the concept of leadership has accompanied man throughout history. It has thus gone through a long, continuous and fluctuating journey of transformation and development. Through this journey of evolution, leadership has always necessitated a kind of mutual relationship between leader and following individuals or subjects. Yet, the nature of the evolution of leadership seems to suggest that the leader-follower relationship has long been “a mutually—if perhaps unevenly—beneficial relationship,” (Jelmer W. Eerkens 8). As mutual, this relationship requires and entails two sides; leader and subject. As unevenly beneficial, on the other hand, the leader-subject relationship would bring about certain imbalanced, very likely unfair realities that will not only regulate the nature of this relationship, but help build particular identities as well. Thus, a leader as well as follower's identity would prospectively be constructed within the context of this relationship.

Moreover, the leader-subject relation is on both ends necessarily a relationship of the ‘self’ to the ‘other’. Therefore, the identity of the leader and the following individual “is built between [this] relationship of the Self and the Other,” (Meuronen 10). Likewise, these identities are “not just a feature of ‘me’ and ‘us’ but also the relation between ‘us’

and ‘them’”, because “it is important to know who is a part of our group to be able to make the distinction of who does not belong in it,” (*ibid*). In *Lord of the Flies*, both Ralph and Jack play the role of leader. Their identities as leaders and the identities of the other boys as their followers are constructed within the context of such relationship between leader and subject, and therefore between ‘self’ and the ‘other’.

In view of that, both leader and subject will interchangeably be the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ in their relation to one another. Their identities would be built within this perception of ‘self’ and the ‘other’, as “the concept of the ‘Other’ is closely linked to the concept of self-identity, because self-knowledge needs something to compare itself to,” (Harle 10). On a two-way criterion, leaders and subjects “use the ‘Other’ to form [their] own identity as well as the identity of those who are a part of [them], [their] group,” (*ibid*). It is almost like a circle of open ends with the leader and subject as its meeting and parting points at the same time. Once the leader represents the self, the following individual will be the other. When the case is reversed, the same is true for the subject as well.

Additionally, for a leader and a following individual, civilized or primitive, constructing identities and modeling leaderships does not come from or originate within. Instead, it comes from and originates in the outside; or in Foucault’s words, it originates in and comes from the “practices of the self,” (*qtd. in*. Kazi 153). Gareth Edwards, too, asserts that building identity comes “from practice, it comes from the work that you do,” (*qtd. in*. Harter 102), which clearly converges with Foucault’s contention. Such views and assertions on building the identity of an individual, more particularly a leader individual, happen to show more meeting than deviating points because “what you intend now will over time become part of who you are: to a large extent, identity emerges from practice,” (*ibid* 102-4). External elements, I would argue as well, whether in the form of leader-subject relationship or various influences are what mostly shape our realities, and thus construct our identities.

Besides, some writers suggest that training a leader-to-be is a life-long tradition across communities and races. They back their argument by “the historical record”, that “demonstrates that intentional preparation of young adults for leadership has been undertaken for centuries in just about every culture, ..., [as] a ritual process to be undertaken before one is equipped to lead,” (Harter viii). For one thing, to prepare a leader is to subject them to outside influences and practices. I do assume then that training an individual for future leadership is an external element that plays a vital role in preparing a leader and building a leader’s identity. Training is also a factor that operates within a particular relationship between the trainer and the trainee. Likewise, preparation of a future leader creates a relationship of/between the ‘self’ and the ‘other’, which is one of other determining practices in constructing an identity as mentioned earlier.

On broader perspectives, leadership would be perceived as “an effort of influence and the power to induce compliance,” (Wren 13). However, there remains an important distinction between a civilized leader and a primitive one. Jack, as the primitive model of leadership, values power above choice and compliant obedience over choosing. With relation to leading, Jack values in a leading figure qualities that indicate strength and courage. Although these qualities remain necessary requirements of a leader whether primitive or civilized, they are, and should not be the only ones. In light of that, Jack forcefully nominates himself on the ground of possessing such qualities. For the same reason, Jack prides on his superior physical strength and audacity.

When the boys disagree over selecting a leader ‘chief’, Roger and some other boys could observe Jack’s imposition of power and are already intimidated by him. They cautiously suggest voting: “Let’s have a vote”, whereas Jack considers it a “toy of voting,” (Golding 15). He does not seem willing to accommodate other qualities like education, voting or approved selection. He greatly inclines to have a belief in a leader “born with innate strengths that can assist in the overall betterment of the community,” (Fraser ix). Jack deems himself that leader despite the fact that not all the boys approve, and have already elected Ralph, which conveys a primitive philosophy. Hence, as a primitive model of leadership, Jack comes by force and rules through intimidation and fear.

Jack follows intimidating and forceful tactics to get what he wants. His leadership “brings with it a model of leadership that wields an enormous power in all communal affairs,” (Farhoudi 194). He insists on seizing the position of a leader by force and without the consent of all the boys, thus splitting them into two groups between him and Ralph. When Ralph and the boys with him start a fire, Jack immediately turns savage ordering the boys with him to attack Ralph’s group and take fire: “we’ll raid them and take fire,” (Golding 121). As the model of a primitive leadership, Jack relies upon number superiority and physical strength, not on agreement or understanding. The language itself that Jack uses in giving orders (raid, take, and snatch) does not only convey a demonstration of sheer force, but also reveals the primitive model of leading and tactics followed within a sense of impunity. As long as he is stronger, Jack understands that he can escape responsibility and recoil from accountability. Ralph and the boys with him are not as strong and savage as Jack and his followers are. Hence, it seems that Jack and his boys have a license to do as they wish. They condone themselves with the knowledge that concepts such as responsibility and accountability are not within the island’s (primitive) dictionary.

Forceful power would necessarily result in violence and wrongful unjust deeds. Jack, and almost all primitive leaderships, has taken that savage path. We deem such primitive models as savage “because they usually involve not just land or power but people’s identities,” (Eagleton 49). I could also add that Jack’s savagery has—beside land and power—consumed the lives of his school friends except for Ralph. So far as a primitive leadership and hence a primitive individual can avoid consequences, they do not hesitate to commit horrendous deeds. Jack and his boys exemplify just that sad conclusion. In his book *On the Genealogy of Morality* (1887-2007), Friedrich Nietzsche elucidates the position of the primitive man on wrongdoing. He argues that the mentality and understanding of primitive people rejects responsibility and shuns accountability. The understanding that, Nietzsche further contends, “the criminal deserves to be punished because he could have acted otherwise, is actually an extremely late and refined form of human judgment and inference; whoever thinks it dates back to the beginning is laying his coarse hands on the psychology of primitive man in the wrong way,” (40). In *Lord of the Flies*, Jack apparently thinks and acts within such philosophy, which is a primitive approach.

For civilized human communities, however, leadership is the field of the strong and brave, but of the educated and elected as well. Hence, a civilized leadership would attempt to guarantee the right of choice and voting for their people. Such leadership values consent and rules by approval. A civilized identity would then exercise such right, recognize its binding legitimacy for all, and respect the outcome of that. Ralph in *Lord of the Flies* would stand for a civilized leadership. As such, Ralph never disputes the freedom of choice with will and knowledge. In way of comparison, Jack would represent a primitive model of leadership. The boys following Jack would assumingly manifest the construction of a primitive identity, whereas the boys with Ralph would conceivably exhibit a construction of a civilized identity.

Within a civilized model of leadership, the relationship between the leader and following individuals has some balance. Likewise, within the equation of the self and the other, their identities are built with considerable margins of freedom, knowledge and dignity. Ralph and the boys with him “assemble meetings in which all boys express their ideas by taking turns and share the responsibility by taking on different chores like building huts, hunting, gathering consumable water and kindling fire,” (Mazhar 32). Such margins provide acceptable room for distinctive individual identities for a leader as well as for subjects.

In a primitive model of leadership (Jack and his group), certain primitive rituals such as masking, painting and hunting govern the relationship between the leader and his following subjects, or between the self and the other. A primitive leadership usually aims at constructing a masked, colored and fluid identity. Hence, a primitive identity is strange, unidentified and alien: “Jack planned his new face. He made one cheek and one eye-socket white, then he rubbed red over the other half of his face and slashed a black bar of charcoal across from right ear to left jaw,” (Golding 53). Such estrangement would hide the true identity and produce some other one that is different, fake and distant. More importantly, this alienation and strangeness of a primitive identity even makes it more appealing and desirable. When Jack finishes disguising himself, he looks at himself “in astonishment, no longer at himself but at an awesome stranger,” (53). Such paints and masks produce a stranger but awesome identity, one that speaks to the lower instinctual sides of the boys and thus appeals to them.

In addition, hiding behind veneers of various sorts provides a primitive identity with a mask that “liberated [it] from shame and self-consciousness,” (53). Jack’s coloring masquerade immediately attracts Bill and the other boys who follow Jack: “Bill started up laughing,” (53). Similarly, primitive masking creates a free identity; free in the sense that masking creates an irresponsible, instinctive and immoral identity. People have observed that “of all of humanity’s contrivances, the mask creates the greatest freedom; it enables the extension of the will into the immoral, simultaneously freeing the individual from the moral conscience and personal responsibility,” (Bender 161). Though characterized by a lack of moral conscience and personal responsibility, these primitive practices in the broader context of relationship of ‘self’ and the ‘other’ generate a zero identity (my expression). Simple but defining, the “mask creates a false identity that confuses and hinders attempts to determine responsibility and administer justice,” (*ibid*). Having an identified identity entails responsibilities and attach consequences, whereas having false or no identity is the equal translation of absolute freedom, a license or free card from responsibility, blame and consequences. Such primitive masking or zero identity appeals to both a leader and a following individual as “the mask compelled them [all],” (Golding 103). Moreover, hiding the identity of an individual through masks of colors, paints, and other similar disguises such as race, ethnicity, sect, and the like, unleashes the savage and primitive impulses and fancies of an individual.

Hunting and masking might appear shallow and peaceful entertaining practices. Nonetheless, they are decisive primitive rituals that get involved in creating identities, speak to the lower sides and liminal zones of man and in due course awake the savage animal in people. In addition to the power of masks in creating false identities that confuse and hinder attempts to determine responsibility and administer justice, hunting plays an equally defining role. It not only invites and promotes the exercise of “savagery and terror”, but also makes “reason and order leave their place to

[these practices],” (Mazhar 32). Besides boosting violent and bloody attitudes, hunting turns into a primitive code and basic ritual of communal significance. As soon as the children get the taste of hunting, “they are frequently caught by sudden fits of communal hysteria, and seek to vent their pent up aggressive instincts by means of hunting animals, or even murdering their fellow children,” (Farhoudi 191). The boys no longer hunt for food or sports; they hunt because they are hunters. Jack dedicates his whole attention to hunting as a priority. In *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology* (1960), Joseph Campbell illustrates that hunting is a core principle of the primitive life. For centuries rather millennia, he further argues, “the primitive man”, has always been “the mighty hunter,” (6). Respectively, Jack perceives leading as his incontestable right assuming that he is the most qualified leader among all boys: “this is a hunter’s job,” (Golding 89). Jack and the boys with him hunt because this is who they are now; primitive people whose survival depends on and their identity is shaped by hunting.

For a civilized leader and their people—Ralph, Piggy, Simon, Eric, Samneric, and others with him—they realize “only too well the liberation into savagery that the concealing paint brought,” (155). Civilization can get painted, but resists that because painting is a gateway to savagery and primitiveness. Ralph clearly supports this civilized position: “we won’t be painted because we aren’t savages,” (155). Accordingly, the struggle and sacrifice does not lie in being painted and masked. Quite the contrary, it lies in resisting it, for to resist masking is to resist sinking into savage primitiveness: “Ralph, symbolizing the civilized world, never yields to a method he perceives as fundamentally savage,” (Mazhar 36). Ralph recognizes the true meaning of coloring, masks and ritual hunting. He knows that these are not harmless amusing practices, but intrinsically primitive rituals and codes with dire consequences.

It remains due to note that Ralph and the boys who follow him have not wronged Jack or his boys in any way to deserve his savage retribution. Their only sin is that they stand for diversity, difference, and for the voice of reason. It is true that they have objected to Jack’s abduction of power and leadership, but it is equally true that Jack might have spared them if they have lost their distinctive identities, blended in, and followed him and turned into his amorphous primitive subjects. The killing of Piggy and Simon “symbolizes the obliteration of intellect and reason from the island. Intellectuality and religion are killed” as well, (Kirtipur 53). Ralph and the boys with him are a different polyphony and have individual identities, which is a serious threat to primitive analogous polarity.

A civilized leadership would aim for higher goals. It would prioritize the safety, welfare and cultivation of the people. In addition, a civilized leadership is far-sighted as it attempts to ensure, safeguard and bring about more sustainable objectives. Ralph cares more about fire and thus rescue, whereas Jack is more interested in hunting and feasting. Within such context, there grow and flourish individual identities and responsibilities: “Ralph’s group prioritizes the members’ common interests over the personal interests of any single individual,” (Farhoudi 194). There is no central figure around which everything else revolves. The leader, Ralph, as well as every single individual enjoy a relationship that helps them maintain individual identities with individual responsibilities to one another and to the group as well.

Ironically, the whole concept of leadership is usually correlated with liminality: “no liminality, no leadership” (Harter xii), because “liminality for leadership is preparation for a lifetime of entering, tolerating, and exploiting the experience of liminality,” (*ibid* x). A primitive leadership would operate totally within such liminal zones. Hunting, masking, feasting and having fun would not go anywhere beyond being activities of a liminal nature. Similarly, such activities happen to be key concepts of primitiveness and primitive people, too.

Functioning within liminal zones, a primitive leadership with its savage attitudes appeals to the satisfaction of the immediate senses and desires of people. More often than not, a primitive leadership is associated with “the expression of some of the elemental social impulses and interests,” (Mumford 224). It then works within the liminal limits and requirements of the human psyche and addresses the primal needs and desires. Primitiveness does not address the mind or cares about the cultivation of soul. The novel assumingly advances this primitive model of leadership through Jack: “We hunt and feast and have fun. If you want to join my tribe come and see us. Perhaps I’ll let you join. Perhaps not,..., he paused and looked round. He was safe from shame or self-consciousness behind the mask of his paint,” (Golding 125). Ultimately, for a primitive leader and individual alike, leadership “was based on feasting”, and “reinforced in group ceremonies,” (Jelmer W. Eerkens 15). A primitive life would, by and large, revolve around such liminal, primordial activities, which are some key primitive creeds across space and time.

From the beginning of his reign, as it were, Jack tantalizes the boys’ instincts of hunting, having fun and coloring themselves for “primitive barbarism [is] based on instinct,” (Chavan 1521). It is always easier to play on lower instincts of an individual than to address their mind or touch their soul. Therefore, when the boys—including Ralph though—have their first hunting experience, they have all felt that “the desire to squeeze and hurt was overmastering,” (Golding 101). Hunting, blood, violence, having fun, and coloring masks have always been primitive rituals, which are alluringly appealing nevertheless. Hence, a primitive leadership nourishes such creeds and feeds them into the minds of its people, and therefore sways influence in building the identities of its subjects.

Primitive leadership tends to be shortsighted, and cares more about meeting and satisfying basic and immediate needs and desires. It tends to direct and quench the innately instinctive desires of its individuals to maintain harmony and peace, because “for the savage people in many places, . . . , the concord whereof dependeth on natural lust,” (Hobbes 78). Nourishing instincts and living low turns them into more animal-like creatures than human beings, as it “strips away all [their] manners,” (Hanash 51). As a result, a primitive identity is constructed within more instinctually animal-like perspectives.

This context of being establishes a kind of relationship between Jack and his boys—between self and the other—that eliminates individuality, diversity and distinctive difference. Accordingly, Jack’s “tribe consists of an absolute central figure and his complying subordinates,” (Farhoudi 194). His model of leadership necessitates polarity, blending in, and communal collectivity. Jack wants to be the only central figure; he “wants the individual to be nothing and the group to be everything,” (Alpers 30). Therefore, “the children with Jack lack any sense of individual [identity, or] responsibility towards their critical situation on the island. They cannot tolerate opposing views, and do not exercise any delays in their exertion of force. Their swift and disproportionate reactions are indicative of the fact that, in terms of mental state, their logical faculties operate at minimal levels,” (*emphasis added*. Farhoudi 191). After all, gratifying lust and instinctive desires is nothing more than a primitively liminal level of being that dissolves identities, confuses responsibilities and hinders justice. Yet again, what is civilization and a civilized identity if not individual, different, responsible and just?

A civilized leadership could both be aware of that and work on improving it, thus promoting itself and its people above liminality. Unlike primitiveness, civilization addresses the mind and soul of its people. That is why civilization is a thoughtfully long, demandingly tiring and mysteriously baffling journey, whereas primitiveness is an appealingly glamorous, unsympathetically selfish and frivolously simplified shortcut. Between Jack and Ralph, and between primitiveness and civility, “there was the brilliant world of hunting, tactics, fierce exhilaration, skill; and there was the world of longing and baffled commonsense,” (Golding 60). Primitiveness provides immediate but simple elemental gratification, while civilization takes time striving to establish some sense.

Striking a comparison between primitive attitudes of color masking, booing and crowding; and civilized sensibility, Piggy struggles to communicate some commonsense to Jack and his tribe: “which is better—to be a pack of painted Indians like you are, or to be sensible like Ralph is?”, . . . , “which is better—to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?”, . . . , “which is better, law and rescue, or hunting and breaking things up?” (162). Still, primitiveness neither responds to the voice of reason nor accommodates commonsense. Jack and his tribe “had backed right against the tribe and they were a solid mass of menace that bristled with spears,” (162). They stick to their lower savagery for it is easier and less challenging to fall down to primitiveness than it is to climb up to civilization.

Interestingly enough but somehow surprising, both primitive and civilized leaderships require knowledge and stand on rules and privilege. Both Ralph and Jack seem to be more knowledgeable and more privileged in a way or another than all other boys are, which is quite significant. They, for example, are the only ones who nominate themselves for leadership, in different ways though. In this vein, Harold Bloom suggests that “the boys who take up leadership roles, Ralph and Jack, appear to be from a privileged background, perhaps educated at public or boarding schools”, thus confirming the idea of knowledge for leadership, (Bloom 104). Yet, the difference between the two lies in the nature of such knowledge and rules, the purpose they serve, and the way each model approaches and deals with such concepts.

As the model of a primitive leadership, Jack, too, possesses knowledge and leads by it. Feasibly, “knowledge and the awe made him [it] savage”, so did the primitive strange appeal, (Golding 36). Nevertheless, a primitive leadership most often than not opts for selective, purposive, and ignorant knowledge. It is a kind of knowledge that is intended to hide facts or turn a blind eye to them. A primitive leadership selects the part of knowledge that would serve their goals and interests, but refrains from other parts of that knowledge. Besides, a primitive leadership would not favor sharing that kind of knowledge with their fellow individuals. For example, while they discuss the possibility of a beast on the island, both Jack and Ralph agree that “there is no/there can’t be a beast in the forest,” (72). Both primitive and civilized leaderships, Jack and Ralph, show that they possess knowledge and have the capacity to act in the light of that knowledge.

Nevertheless, while Ralph gladly shares that piece of knowledge with the other boys, Jack would later renege on that knowledge. For Ralph, and for any civilized leadership, there is a deep recognition that “what improves the individual makes possible the improvement of civilization,” (Harter ix). Jack, however, would employ the idea of danger (the beast) because “the possibility of creating our identity must include the presence of danger,” (Schmitt 27). Jack even creates his own dangers and beasts to intimidate the boys and control them: “and I’m the beast,” (Golding 128). He intimidates Simon into submission through the possibility of a beast or through projecting himself

as the beast. Within such mutual relationship of leader-subject and self and the other, a primitive identity that is submissive, intimidated and ignorant is constructed.

Beyond that, a primitive leadership would intentionally ignore certain parts of such knowledge assuming that informing their people of it is dangerous. In *Lord of the Flies*, Jack is just as knowledgeable as Ralph is; yet, Jack demonstrates that he is selective and ignorantly knowledgeable. As a primitive model of leadership, his knowledge is purpose-oriented and thus serves particular goals. Eventually, Jack embodies the knowledge that indicates “the tendencies to lead and to, obey and follow”, which “are instinctive in the societies both of the lower animals and of human Beings,” (Mumford 224). Thus, the boys following him are only informed of hunting and of the benefit of compliantly obeying orders.

To the contrary, Ralph understands that leading is a consensual act of duty, not a forceful one. A civilized leader would share not only knowledge but also counseling and decision making with some other people. Ralph always shares such things with Piggy, Simon and other boys. Once Piggy is dead and no longer available for counseling and sharing, Ralph feels the gap of Piggy’s absence and the need for him: “there was no Piggy to talk sense,” (Golding 177). Therefore, a civilized leadership would leave a room for people to opine and share in decision making as is the case with Piggy and Simon, as its mind and soul in the novel. A primitive leadership, nonetheless, would unilaterally and solely take decisions as it sees fit, and people have to blindly follow.

Jack and Ralph reveal dramatically different perceptions of leadership, survival and knowledge. Such different views become clear in their argument over the conch, fire, hunting, the possibility of a beast, and the matter of leadership as a whole. In terms of dignity and honor, Ralph respects the significance of the conch as a symbol of dignity, discipline, order, and responsibility; Jack disdains the conch and assigns no value to it. Although Jack recognizes the symbolic value of the conch, he calculatedly tends to ignore it: “we don’t need the conch any more. We know who ought to say things,” (89). In this instance, Jack demonstrates a primitively instinctual attitude in leading and acquiring things.

In this regard, Jack does not respect the conch, what it stands for, and does not care about the fire and rescue. Besides, he unashamedly states his right to lead, as he is bolder and stronger. In comparison, Ralph assigns true value to the conch. He also acknowledges such value, respects it, and realizes the consequences of not doing so: “If I blow the conch and they don’t come back; then we’ve had it. We shan’t keep the fire going. We’ll be like animals. We’ll never be rescued,” (80). For Ralph, the conch is their only hope of safety and rescue. It is the last and sole symbol of order, discipline, rules, and of what remains of their humanity on the island. For Jack, on the other hand, strength and bravery are priorities for hunting and for survival. In prioritizing strength and courage over honor and dignity, Jack’s “identity has been driven to identity’s dishonor, lurching into a claim of priority and origination,” (Kazi 163). Once a leadership violates its codes and/or falls short on executing its duties and responsibilities under the pretext of prioritizing other issues, it takes the first step in a long, bumpy and dishonorable road. Though very likely the easiest way out, this path is one of disgrace, shame and ignominy for a leader and following individual alike.

In view of that, dignity and honor represent key codes and qualities of a civilized leadership. In the case of Ralph, the conch symbolizes that dignity and honor. The conch and frequent assemblies the boys used to have epitomize a dignified approach and a form of unanimity, consent and right that they all have to honor. Once the conch and assemblies have gone, dignity and honor have vanished with them, and things have turned savage and primitive: “there was no solemn assembly for debate nor dignity of the conch,” (Golding 177). In addition, Piggy by Ralph’s side is yet another pillar of civility and legitimate leadership. Piggy symbolizes reason, counseling and sharing in knowledge and decision-making. Once Piggy is dead and the conch is no more, Ralph realizes that it is the end of what remains of civility, order and hope. In this regard, Harold Bloom argues, “it is significant that the death of Piggy and the breaking of the conch are linked”, because “now the conflict between the social and the primitive instincts reaches its climax,” (Bloom 7). While Ralph understands that the conch is nothing more than a seashell that can bestow neither dignity nor control, he realizes its symbolic worth and importance for their discipline, safety, and survival. The conch could possibly be the only reminder they have left of order, control and civility as well. The death of Piggy adds insult to injury as it renders any thread of hope nothing more than a passing phantom at best.

Although Ralph in *Lord of the Flies* seems to be leading within an atmosphere of doubt and hesitation; yet—here comes the irony of it—the “acceptance of uncertainty is an indicator of effective leadership,” (Harter xi). Out of a responsible honesty of a leader, Ralph broods doubts over their chances of survival in the island or the possibility of their rescue. In comparison, Jack might have very likely shown more willpower and decisiveness, but he rules with apparently absolute certainty, which is essentially a deceiving sham. A civilized, or rather responsible and effective, leadership is not supposed to and should not be all about willpower and determination per se.

Honor, dignity and human civility empower you to differ, disagree, protest, object and be vocal in your opinions. People should possess and exercise the same as unalienable rights. Such rights epitomize the creeds and codes of

civilization: "Sammeric protested out of the heart of civilization," (Golding 161). Once such rights are denied or taken away, it is a sign of the rise of primitiveness and wane of civilization. As soon as Jack denies his 'tribe' such civil principles and values, and attempts to take them away from Ralph and his boys, "Ralph stood up [to Jack and his savagery] and walked for the sake of dignity," (87). Ralph's opposition to Jack and rebellion against him to preserve such dignity has almost cost him his life. If people do not/cannot or are unwilling to resist and stand up to primitiveness, civilization and human values could be "paused or defeated by the silence and the painted anonymity of the group," (161). Moreover, out of the models presented in the novel, we now realize that "the demise of Ralph's parliament [of civilization]" results in "the ascendancy of Jack's totalitarian, primitive regime [of primitiveness]", which is "based on savagery, hunting, and primal drives," (Crawford 64). Therefore, primitiveness can do damage to such human values because it operates in the form of a savagely anonymous, analogous, and masked mass.

Concluding Remarks

A leadership within the context of civilization attempts to guarantee equal or fair opportunities for all people. It attempts to accommodate all individuals, and ensures a space of living and participation for all members regardless of their flaws, deficiencies and inadequacies. However, a primitive leadership is selectively inclusive. It excludes the ones it does not desire; the ones it supposes are a liability instead of assets. A primitive leadership excludes the sick, weak, and anyone who might not be a productive agent within its scope of interests and goals. It also fears difference, disagreement and diversity; it always seeks to establish a polarized uniformity and eliminate the possibility of any pluralities.

A civilized leadership welcomes difference and nourishes plurality. Such leadership perceives diversity as a privilege, an upgrading bonus that has to be invested upon and sustained. It accepts and takes in all members within its authority in spite of their variety, difference, and diversity. Within the civilized model of leadership, pluralized, open-ended and unfinalizable subjects' identities and realities, meanings and voices rise. Civilized individual identities would then embody, in Bakhtin's words, "a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world," (Bakhtin 6). Within a primitive model of leadership, in contrast, identities get constructed in polarized, close-ended and finalized ones.

In view of that, I could conclude that Ralph and the boys with him—as a civilized model of leadership and identities—epitomize the plurality, open-endedness and unfinalizability of meaning, reality, identity, voices and of consciousness as well. They would represent a "plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices," (*ibid*). Ralph, Piggy, and Simon, for instance, might assumingly embody the plurality of responsibility, reasoning and religious sacrifice consciousnesses, respectively. Hence, while "Bakhtin's notion of polyphony celebrates the novel's capacity for the representation of a plurality of voices" (Tuglu 124), civilization for me—at the leading or following individual identities—is just like a polyphonic novel. It demonstrates its polyphony through its capacity for the representation and inclusion of pluralities, diversities and differences of all sorts.

Opposed to that, a primitive leadership rejects difference and diversity. It suppresses it, and sometimes disregards it altogether. For a primitive leadership, difference is a threat; it is a risk such leadership is never willing to take. A primitive leadership always seeks to institute congruence and a form of standardized normalization in all fields and for everyone. Primitive identities demonstrate polarized, uniform, identical and analogous constructs that melt in a collective identity of the group. Whereas a construct of a civilized identity manifests individuality, distinctive difference and plurality; collectivity, identical archetypes and polarity are qualities of a primitive identity.

At the end of the day, civilization is as much about living and saving as primitiveness is about killing and destroying. Though easier and perhaps more appealing, the various paths of the different forms of primitive leadership and identity lead to one inevitable destination; destruction and death. All responsible acts by Ralph clearly illustrate a core difference between a civilized and primitive leadership, which is ultimately a difference between life and death.

Works Cited

- Alpers, Benjamin L. *Dictators, Democracy, and American Public Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003. PDF.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Michael Holquist. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1984. PDF.
- Bender, Kimlyn. *An Ethical Compass: Coming of Age in the 21st Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. PDF.
- Bloom, Harold. *William Golding's Lord of the Flies: Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008. PDF.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology*. London: SECKER & WARBURG, 1960. Print.
- Chavan, Pandit. "Subversion of Civilization in William Golding's Lord of the Flies." *European Academic Research* (2013): 1516-1526. PDF.
- Crawford, P. *Politics and history in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press., 2002. PDF.
- Dalrymple, Theodore. "Desert-Island Reading." *New Criterion* 6 (2005): 21-27. PDF.
- Eagleton, Terry. *On Evil*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. PDF.
- Farhoudi, Sasan Basirat & Fatima. "Lord of the Flies and Implications of Tutelage." *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* (2015): 189-199. PDF.
- Foucault, Michel. *Abnormal: Lectures at the College de France (1974-1975)*. UK: Verso, 2003. Print.
- Fraser, Carolyn Kenny and Tina Ngaroimata, ed. *Living Indigenous Leadership: Native Narratives on Building Strong Communities*. Vancouver, Toronto: UBC Press, 2012. PDF.
- Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies: A Novel*. New York: The Penguin Publishing Group, 1954. Print.
- Hanash, R. B. Chougule & Manee M. "Scarce Life between Leadership and Nature of Savagery in William Golding's Lord of the Flies." *Literary Endeavour* (2020): 47-52. PDF.
- Harle, Vilho. *The Enemy with a Thousand Faces: The Tradition of the Other in Western Political Thought and History*. Westport: Praeger, 2000. PDF.
- Harter, Nathan W. *Foucault on Leadership: The Leader as Subject*. New York: Routledge, 2016. PDF.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill*. London: Green Dragon, 1651. PDF.
- Jelmer W. Eerkens, Kevin J. Vaughn, and John Kantner. *The Evolution of Leadership: Introduction*. Introduction. n. p.: www.sarpress.sarweb.org, N. d. PDF.
- Kazi, Tahseen. "Foucault and Weber on Leadership and the Modern Subject." *Foucault Studies* (2017): 153-176. PDF.
- Kirtipur, L. Bhattarai and K. *Intrinsic Deterioration: A Study of Symbols in Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Master Thesis. N. p.: Tribhuvan University, 2006. PDF.
- Lubbock, John. "On the Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man." *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* (1868): 328-341. PDF.
- Mazhar, S., Malghani, M., & Khan, F. R. "The Hallmark of Civilization: A Psychoanalytic Study of Ralph in Lord of the Flies." *Global Regional Review* (2020): 31-39. PDF.
- Meuronen, Johanna. *Construction of Otherness in William Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Master Thesis. Laitos: University of Jyväskylä, 2013. PDF.
- Mumford, Eben. "The Origins of Leadership." *American Journal of Sociology* (1906): 216-240. PDF.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Ed. Keith Ansell Pearson. Trans. Carol Diethe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1887-2007. Print.

Patterson, A. Gregory Stone and Kathleen. "The History of Leadership Focus." *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable* (2005): 1-23. PDF.

Ponížilová, Karolína. *The Failure of the Canon of Britishness: The Shift of the Moral and Ethical Codes of the Society Reflected in Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Diploma Thesis. Brno: Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, 2020. PDF.

Schmitt, C. *Concept of the Political*. Rutgers University Press: New Brunswick, 1976. PDF.

Tuglu, Utku. *A Bakhtinian Analysis of William Golding's Rites of Passage: Heteroglossia, Polyphony and the Carnavalesque in the Novel*. MA Thesis. N. p.: Graduate School of Social Sciences, Middle East Technical University, 2011. PDF.

Tylor, Edward. *Primitive Cultures: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1871. PDF.

Wren, J. Thomas. *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages*. New York: The Free Press, 1995. PDF.