



Kristianstad  
University  
Sweden

# **Rational Femininity and Emotional Masculinity in Golding's *Lord of the Flies***

**Stefanos Mavromatis**

Faculty of Education

Independent essay project in English Literature, 15 credits.

Spring term 2021

**Author**

Stefanos Mavromatis

**Swedish titel**

Rationellt feminint tänkande och emotionellt maskulint tänkande i Goldings *Lord of the Flies*

**English title**

Rational Femininity and Emotional Masculinity in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*

**Supervisor**

Maria Freij

**Examiner**

Lena Ahlin

**Abstract**

This paper argues that in Golding's *Lord of the Flies* feminine thinking is rational and masculine thinking is emotional. This essay provides historical background that presents the general patriarchal view of femininity during 20th century England of being seen as the inferior-emotional gender with intellectual limitations. By examining gender roles during the era that the setting of the novel takes place, what the terms feminine and masculine thinking indicate and by applying these terms, this paper categorises Piggy's, Ralph's and Jack's behaviour and way of thinking. Furthermore, this paper argues that feminine thinking and feminine group-oriented logical behaviour are more advantageous, while the masculine individualistic emotionally driven thinking and behaviour cause some key problems. This essay's goal is not to claim the superiority of one gender over the other but to question some of the masculine actions that Ralph and Jack engage in, by comparing them to the feminine actions that Ralph and Piggy engage in.

**Key words**

gender, traditional gender roles, feminine thinking, masculine thinking, patriarchy, William Golding, *Lord of the Flies*

The *Lord of the Flies* is William Golding's most popular novel written in 1954 and the one that he won a Nobel Prize for. The nature of the *Lord of the Flies* can be described as pessimistic, considering how the story of the young children unfolds. A peaceful, though involuntary, excursion to an uninhabited island, filled with curiosity, optimism and playfulness ends up with pagan sacrificial ceremonies, bullying and the deaths of Piggy and Simon. Arguably, Golding's idea to write a book with such a dark view on human nature is possibly a result of his traumatic experience during the Second World War. In the *Hot Gates*, in a chapter where Golding replies to questions about *Lord of the Flies*, he admits that after confronting Nazi Regime his world view radically changed and became more negative and cynical (Golding 85-86).

Some papers have tried to explore Golding's beliefs about human nature through *Lord of the Flies*. Other papers have taken on the postcolonial criticism and have pointed out how the children that form a tribe are portrayed as vulgar and barbaric. Some scholars have compared Jack, Ralph and Piggy to Freud's Id, Ego and Superego, thus taking on the psychoanalytic lense. *Lord of the Flies* is a very popular novel and has been researched extensively under different criticisms. This thesis applies the feminist critique and analyses the three main characters, Piggy, Ralph and Jack based on their gender and their actions. This paper argues that contrary to traditional gender roles, the character who displays masculinity is driven by emotions, Jack, whereas the characters that display femininity, Piggy and Ralph are the voices of reason. The analysis will be done by examining key terms such as traditional gender roles, patriarchy, gender and what is considered to be masculine and feminine thinking. The gendering of the characters will also play a prominent role in this thesis, to discover if the characters' actions fit their gender.

Traditional gender roles, according to Lois Tyson; “cast men as rational, strong, protective, and decisive; they cast women as emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive.” (Tyson 85). Traditional gender roles are an essential problem to patriarchal societies because they only reward women who fit their paradigm, women who stay home, while also discouraging the rest who try to escape this fate. Additionally, patriarchy defined by Tyson is; “as any culture that privileges men by promoting traditional gender roles” (85). Patriarchy is another crucial term in this paper, since the society that the *Lord of the Flies* reflects, the 1950s does seem to fit this definition. In addition, this essay argues that the characters themselves within the book generally do obey these traditional gender roles. Lastly, the definition of sex by Stephanie Shields is; “the biologically defined categories of male and female” while gender is; “the psychological features associated with biological states which involve social categories rather than biological categories” (Shields 11). This distinction between gender and sex is necessary since the terms are often conflated.

This essay will briefly address the 20th century England in order to give additional context to the gender roles in *Lord of the Flies*. This is the setting of the novel, therefore, it is essential to examine gender roles during this period, to compare them to those in the book. This paper will begin with women’s introduction into the labour force, that started during the First World War and continued after the Second World War. The reason is that the wars created a labour shortage, which made it necessary for more women to work (Brooke 777). While women started to prove that they could handle work way better than society expected them to, there was still the belief that a women’s primary occupation has to be their family which was the widely accepted opinion. As noted by the Birmingham Feminist History Group; “[w]omen’s entry into employment is understood in the context of a secondary job, preferably to be done part-time, so as to fit in with the

needs of husband and children” (Birmingham Feminist History Group 8). Another change towards gender equality during this period included the notion that women are “equal but different”, it was the idea that women are able to provide feminine qualities/point of view, something that men are not able to do (8). While the steps towards a more progressive culture were undeniable, there were still many views that did not conform to contemporary liberal ideas about equality between the two genders. Kathleen Ollerenshaw in her book *Education for Girls*, written in the early 1960s, noted that women would see their job as less important than men’s. She also stated that the reason for this was not the society and by extension patriarchy, but instead, it was because “she will usually want it this way” (Ollerenshaw 124). Finally, it is also crucial to the thesis to recognise the dichotomy created by this ideology, since the gender role of women, is to be a mother, the father has to be the breadwinner.

The idea of “feminine” and “masculine” thinking will play a prominent role in this essay, it will be used in order to analyse the behaviours of certain characters and determine which gender they can be associated with. Rosalind Simpson makes the argument that masculine thinking is generally more competitive and hierarchical. On the other hand, feminine thinking is generally more relational and cooperative while it focuses more on finding connections among people (Simpson 4). Some feminists such as Catharine MacKinnon, have been reluctant to accept feminine thinking because it has been shaped by patriarchy. She claims that; “[w]omen think in relational terms because our existence is defined in relation to men.” (MacKinnon 39). While Simpson observes that women thinking cooperatively and emotionally could potentially be from the belief that women’s primary role was to comfort others in relationships (21). This assertion seems to agree with the traditional gender beliefs of 1950s England that were briefly mentioned earlier in this paper. The function of these terms is to assist the paper by creating a di-

chotomy between the masculine and the feminine, which results in a more accurate assessment of the character's behaviour.

Piggy is the first character that will be examined. There is a plethora of evidence within the text regarding Piggy's behaviour and actions that seem to fit the feminine gender. He and Ralph are the first characters introduced to the reader, but his name is never revealed, none of the other boys cared to ask for it and he did not care to volunteer this information. Piggy is set up to be biologically weaker, he has a permanent overweight body composition that does not change at all throughout the novel, even though the children's diet consists mainly of fruits and extremely rarely pork. He also has asthma, which limits his physical capabilities even further and if these two conditions were not disabling him enough, he also has to take care of his glasses because he is unable to see without them. These biological limitations could point towards Piggy being the manifestation of Golding's perception of a feminine presence. The novel consists of only boys, so a feminine character could be a way of adding a female character who is not bullied about their sex, but about their traditional gender behaviours. Another stereotypical belief of that era in support of this argument is the idea of the weaker sex; during Golding's time women were still seen as the weaker sex so it would make sense for a character that has feminine characteristics and could be seen as the opposite sex, to also be physically limited.

Piggy's physical disadvantages make it difficult for him to keep up with more physically capable peers such as Ralph, Simon and Jack so his role is often more subtle and more group-oriented. For example, early into the novel he teaches Ralph how to blow the conch, he cannot blow it himself since he is asthmatic. He decides to learn the names of the children that are summoned by the sound of the conch (Golding 13-14) in order to familiarise the boys with each other, which aligns him with the group-oriented aspect of feminine thinking. Piggy is interested

in creating relationships, a group that he can be a part of and eventually a family, this is also evident on another occasion where Piggy assists a boy bullied by the crowd. When the boy with the mulberry-coloured birthmark is unable to speak in front of everyone, only Piggy stands by his side, helps him acquire the conch, since only the person with the conch is allowed to speak (31) and eventually helps the boy voice his concerns (34-35). A similar situation is repeated when another young boy called Percival is asked to give information about the “beast”, while the group is chanting, making him increasingly nervous, Piggy and Ralph this time, help him overcome his fears and talk to the crowd (93).

Another way that Piggy differs from the rest of the children, is by being raised by a feminine role model, on page eight, Piggy mentions that his father passed away and he lives with his aunt. Arguably, because Piggy lacked a masculine role model he developed feminine traits instead, and as such, his feminine side manifested. According to Paula Alida Roy, this feminine influence manifests in two ways; Piggy is always reminding the rest of the children about how they should follow the rules they set and he also plays a major role in assisting Ralph to keep the order. Roy continues by saying Piggy has some stereotypical negative feminine characteristics, such as “physical softness, fearfulness, nagging” that could be because of his feminine upbringing (Roy 83). Furthermore, within the novel, it seems that Piggy’s feminine values are acknowledged. When a group of the older boys decides to go explore the island and fight the “beast” if necessary, a question comes up who will take care of the younger children? The answer is Piggy, Jack also says “[t]hat’s right. Keep Piggy out of danger” (110) which sounds similar to the ideology of keeping the women and the children out of danger.

Piggy is often a victim of bullying since he is the easy target for Jack and Ralph to talk down to. To be precise, almost every time Piggy wants to express his opinion about an issue, Jack or Ralph will either tell him to “shut up” (11, 17, 42,

44) or they make fun of him for being overweight (17, 41). Berthold Schoene-Harwood believes that bullying is: “a reliable strategy of expressing one’s superior masculine composure” (Schoene-Harwood 68). This bullying could also point towards Piggy’s femininity because, as previously shown, there was still the belief that women could not compete with men in the academic sector and that they lacked leadership skills, this meant that often times their opinions were not taken seriously, which is also the case with Piggy.

In Tyson’s chapter about feminism, there is a question regarding characters’ gendering. This question is relevant when analysing Piggy because there is a significant amount of evidence that point towards his femininity. The question is: “[d]oes the characters’ behavior [sic] always conform to their assigned genders?” (Tyson 119). Piggy’s gender assigned at birth is the male one, however, in the majority of the situations, he acts in a traditionally feminine way. Thus, the answer to that question would have to be a “no”. In addition to Piggy’s actions being feminine, the perception of him from the rest of the group and the way they interact with him points towards him being feminine. Finally, his upbringing seems to be feminine as well since he was brought up solely by a matriarchal figure, his aunt, without having a traditional masculine influence.

The second character analysed is Ralph. He is an intriguing character because he transitions from a fairly masculine character to someone that considers more and more his feminine side. Ralph’s transition can be partially attributed to his close association with Piggy, a majorly feminine character. Ralph is the first boy introduced to the readers and the democratically elected leader (19). Unlike Piggy, Ralph is introduced in a pretty flattering manner. He is described as a handsome boy with fair hair (1) with heavy and wide shoulders that could indicate proficiency in boxing (5). Golding sets him up to be essentially antithetical to Piggy, a handsome genetically blessed individual with leadership qualities.

Ralph starts off as an ill mannered boy, he ignores Piggy, he does not ask him about his name, and he orders him to bring him his clothes as if Piggy is subservient to him (9). When he is informed that Piggy does not care what he is called as long as they do not call him “Piggy”, he decides to repeatedly mock him (6). Ralph does not seem to care about hurting Piggy’s feelings and as soon as all the boys arrive and start exchanging names the bullying begins. Jack starts bullying Piggy by calling him “Fatty” and Ralph decides to join in and humiliate him further in front of everyone by calling him “Piggy” (17). Later on, when Piggy confronts him about it, he replies in a bit of a cynical manner; “[b]etter Piggy than Fatty and anyway, I’m sorry if you feel like that.” (21-22). Ralph is the person who decides that when they call a meeting, whoever has the conch, only he is allowed to speak and only Ralph can interrupt him since he is the leader (31). When he has to reinforce that law, in a situation where Piggy has the conch and Jack interrupts him all the time, Ralph is reluctant to act (45). Ralph does not seem to respect Piggy’s role in the group, which is mostly about taking care of the younger boys, supporting when they are afraid to speak and generally keeping the group together. This situation could be interpreted as a metaphor about the era’s view on women’s work; taking care of the family was not valued very highly, on the contrary it was taken for granted.

Moving on from Piggy, it is important to mention that fire in combination with smoke play a prominent role within *Lord of the Flies*. Ralph has the idea to light a fire in the mountain so if any ship passes along the island, they will notice the smoke and rescue the boys (37). The fire plays a very crucial role because it is the only way in which the children can control their fate, the only way they can increase their chances of being rescued from the island as soon as possible. Therefore, all the boys agree that there has to be smoke all the time and Jack actually volunteers to split his hunters and have half of them be responsible for taking care

of the fire (42). Unfortunately, when Ralph notices the first ship, Jack is chasing a pig and his hunters are playing or bathing, forgetting the huge responsibility they have of keeping the fire alive (73). This situation creates the first rift in their relationship and after this point, it seems that Ralph's behaviour changes and becomes more group-oriented - thus feminine. Ralph's behaviour up until this point has been mainly harsh and traditionally masculine, but he shows some feminine traits as well when he insists on making shelters, in order to protect the group from the rain and create a safe sleeping environment.

An aspect of femininity that this paper wants to emphasise, which builds on the previous point about fire, is the family and home/hearth. The fire that Piggy and Ralph are so insistent about has multiple uses; to be noticed and get rescued is its main use, but to make the children feel comfortable and to provide a hearth is a very subtle yet crucial utility only the fire is able to provide. The only place where the children feel safe from the "beast", is whenever they are next to the fire. This sense of security is usually provided by the feminine gender, therefore, it does make sense that Piggy and Ralph are the characters who keep repeating how important fire is and that their main objective should be to take care of the fire. This utility is acknowledged only once within *Lord of the Flies* by Ralph: "[t]his was the first time [Ralph] had admitted the double function of the fire. Certainly, one was to send up a beckoning column of smoke; but the other was to be a hearth now and a comfort until they slept." (179). Because the traditional gender roles for men and boys during this era are focused on bravery and not being emotional, the boys are unwilling to admit that they are afraid of the dark and that the fire provides a comfort that they need. After all, they are only prepubescent boys that have to deal with some very challenging circumstances.

Returning back to Ralph, it can be argued that the motivation was not clear for becoming a leader and he did not do a very good job organising the rest of the

boys, but after the fight with Jack, he starts taking his role more seriously. He calls an assembly and starts holding the rest of the boys accountable, he reminds them about how everyone helped to build the first shelter, but fewer people helped with the second and eventually, only he and Simon created the last one (85). Taking responsibility and holding everyone accountable is a traditionally masculine feature, women were rarely in positions of power so it logically follows that the traditional gender roles forced men be responsible. In addition to becoming a more capable leader, he starts to show more respect and listens more to Piggy. When Jack starts to bully him again, Ralph actually decides to defend Piggy this time (98). At this point, Ralph is a combination of the two genders, he takes care of the other children and tries to protect them, but he also holds every child responsible for their action. Furthermore, he takes responsibility by becoming a more involved leader, he does not let the children to play around because he knows that if they are not organised and if no one cares about their fire they will never be rescued.

The next event that has a big impact on Ralph's behaviour is Simon's murder. Simon is a calm character that likes to take strolls in the forest and explore the island alone in general. He is the character that the "Lord of the Flies" reveals himself to in a state of delirium and explains how they cannot kill the "beast" because the "beast" is a part of them (157-159). When Simon reappears and tries to illuminate the rest of the boys about his insight on the "beast", the boys do not recognise him and during their ceremonial dance, they stab Simon to death (168). After Simon's murder Ralph is considering giving up, witnessing his peers murdering another boy from the group makes him realise that they are no longer playing. The result of Simon's murder is the split of the older children into two groups, the ones that are trying to survive until they get rescued and the ones

that have painted themselves and created a tribe that hunts and kills. The first group includes Ralph and Piggy and the other one has Jack.

The problem with Jack's group is that they no longer have Piggy's glasses and they do not have the knowledge to create fire without them. The simple and masculine way does prevail and Jack decides to assault Ralph's group at night and take the glasses by force (186). This act consequently leaves Ralph's group without a choice, they no longer have fire, they are no longer able to be saved, or stay protected from the "beast" and they no longer feel comfortable. Therefore, they decide to confront Jack's tribe and try to appeal to his sense of morality, since they know they do not possess neither the strength nor the number's advantage to fight them (190). Piggy is unable to see, he is myopic and without his glasses he has to "be led like a dog" (189). When they arrive at the tribe's side, Piggy is sitting nearby a cliff and Ralph tells him to sit still and wait for him to come and save him (193). Jack returns from another hunt and Ralph is not willing to apologise, plea, or forsake his ego to save everyone on the island. His masculine side takes control and he decides to be aggressive about getting back Piggy's glasses by simultaneously calling Jack a thief and preparing for a fight (195-196). Ralph forgets about the people depending on him, he no longer thinks about compromising, he is thinking in an individualistic thus masculine way. This situation quickly escalates to a battle between the leaders of the two groups with no clear winner (196-197). Piggy's voice manages to stop their fight again and it is now his turn to try to convince the tribe to return his glasses, however, he is not successful either. He asks the tribe if it is better to be "painted niggers ... or to be sensible like Ralph is?" which reveals Piggy's impatience and masculine side (199-200). This leads to the last murder, when Roger releases a big rock that hits Piggy and causes him to lose his balance and fall from the cliff (200-201).

Lastly, the same question from Tyson about the characters conforming to their assigned genders (119), is a bit more complicated for Ralph. The answer is again negative because a lot of Ralph's actions do not conform with the masculine gender. Ralph shows fear, vulnerability, gives up, cares about the group and tries to take care and protect everyone. These actions stereotypically in the patriarchal society of 20th century England would represent feminine traits. On the other hand, Ralph also behaves in a very masculine way, he bullies Piggy, he orders him to bring his clothes, he humiliates him in front of everyone and he chooses to fight Jack. There is a change when Jack disappoints him and he realises that their priorities differ. For Jack, it is more important to prove his masculinity by successfully hunting a pig, thus fulfilling his role as a provider to the family. Ralph changes his way of thinking and decides to value the opinions of other people more and take responsibility for the whole group, but eventually, he gives in to his pride and ego, he cares more about fighting Jack and proving he is the leader, than surviving in cowardice in an attempt to save all the boys. Therefore, this paper observes that Ralph has both feminine and masculine attributes but eventually the masculine side overtakes the feminine one.

Jack is the last character that will be analysed. He is absolutely crucial to the progression of the plot, since he is Ralph's rival. Jack is by far the most masculine boy, he is the leader of the choir that later become the hunters, and has an affinity for hunting and killing. He regularly bullies other children but it seems like the driving factor behind his change, from an aggressive boy to a murderer who only cares about hunting and retaining his status as the leader, this paper speculates that the answer are his failures. The first failure occurs when Jack, as the head of the choir, feels entitled to the leadership position. When Ralph brings up that they should have a chief, Jack immediately says: "I ought to be the chief" (18). When the children vote for Ralph he seems disappointed but Ralph

quickly comforts him by allowing him to control his choir, as he did before and choosing the role that they will have on the island (19). Jack takes pride in his physical capabilities and is happy to be chosen by the leader to be in the group that explores the island, when Piggy wants to join he tells him “[y]ou’re no good on a job like this.” (21). Even though Jack lost the leadership position to Ralph, he has a hierarchical masculine way of thinking, he feels like because he has been appointed as the leader of the choir he is superior to Piggy.

Jack’s second failure occurs during the exploration mission with Ralph and Simon when they locate a piglet and Jack hesitates, he is unable to kill the piglet (28). This event lights a fire within Jack that is not dealt with properly, which causes the repression of these painful emotions of failure and this potentially slowly changes his character. His discussion with Ralph reveals all the pent up emotions that are created during this experience:

“I was choosing a place,” said Jack. “I was just waiting for a moment to decide where to stab him.”

[...]

“Why didn’t you?”

They knew very well why he hadn’t: because of the enormity of the knife descending and cutting into a living flesh; because of the unbearable blood.

“I was going to,” said Jack. He was ahead of them and they could not see his face. “I was choosing a place. “Next time!”

He snatched his knife out of the sheath and slammed it into a tree trunk. Next time there would be no mercy.” (29)

This event sparks the beginning of the obsession that Jack has for killing and hunting, because when he has the chance he cannot perform the frightening action and now he has to prove to everyone, that he is capable of hunting - killing and providing some meat to the group. This could result in the group losing all respect for Jack who at that point had a leadership position. Patriarchal societies are not lenient when dealing with a failed breadwinner.

His next hunt is also unsuccessful, this time he does manage to swing at the pig but it is too nimble for him and manages to escape (49). This situation only frustrates Jack further and makes him even more obsessed with hunting. On a discussion with Ralph, Golding draws attention to it: “[t]he madness came into his eyes again. ‘I thought I might kill.’” (51). In the meantime, this creates another issue, while Jack is wasting time and energy that could be spent more productively, for example for helping with the shelters (51). An argument between the two leaders arises; Ralph asks Jack to assist them with the shelters, but Jack just deflects with “[w]e want meat” which illustrates perfectly each boy’s mentality. Ralph cares about creating shelters and protecting everyone, while Jack cares about successfully killing a pig to prove his physical capabilities and fulfil his role as a competent breadwinner. Jack’s goal is what the traditional gender roles instructed for the boys and men during that time.

Although it is evident that Jack has the wrong priorities, he is not witless, for example, he is the one that comes up with the idea of using Piggy’s glasses as “burning glasses” in order to light up the wood (40). This might be Jack’s most important contribution to the group. But the priorities are important in a novel about survival, Ralph reminds Jack: “[t]he best thing we can do is get ourselves rescued.” and he just replies “[r]escue? Yes of course! All the same I’d like to catch a pig first” (54). This passage demonstrates again, how the two boys had different objectives all along and this is Golding’s way of telling the reader that

unless the boys find a way to solve this problem, it will lead to bigger ones. Since this novel's genre is a dystopian one, the problems escalate to tragedies before the boys are able to find a solution. The rift between the two boys starts when a ship that could potentially rescue them passes near the island, but because Jack and his hunters were busy hunting they forgot about the fire and there was no smoke. Jack is delighted with his first success and is eager to tell Ralph, but when he does Ralph just ignores him and repeats the phrase "You let the fire out." which makes Jack uneasy and when Ralph informs him that a ship passed by, Jack is "faced at once with too many awful implications" (73-74).

After this crucial mistake Jack is unable to deal with his emotions and he takes his frustrations out by punching Piggy in the stomach and breaking one of his glasses' lenses (75). This instance can be better understood by R. W. Connell's assertion that "many members of the privileged group use violence to sustain their dominance." (Connell 83). The context of this quote is about men being the privileged group and trying to sustain their dominant position by using force against women. This occasion seems fairly similar if compared to Jack hitting Piggy, because there is a masculine character, feeling like he is losing his dominant position, using force against a feminine character. Golding indicates that it is not only Jack's fault, when he bullies Piggy the crowd starts laughing, which encourages Jack's negative behaviour (Golding 76). Instead of taking the situation seriously and maybe protecting Piggy, the boys cheered Jack, an act that reinforces his terrible behaviour, which is to be expected in a patriarchal society who applauds violence. Jack eventually does apologise to Ralph about the fire but the chasm is already created. Ralph takes Jack's apology as a verbal trick aimed to win the crowd and not a genuine admission of his mistake. Jack's behaviour also changes and becomes exceedingly masculine, however, he is unable to fulfil his traditional gender role, to take responsibility for his actions, and accept the fact that his mis-

take caused them to miss the ship so he starts blaming the younger children. He blames them for bringing up the “beast” and for being unable to hunt, build or help and he also calls them “babies” and “sissies” (88). The word “sissy” is significant because it reinforces the patriarchal status quo, Tyson writes that “one of the most devastating verbal attacks to which a man can be subjected is to be compared to a woman.” (Tyson 88). Jack starts to bully Piggy even on points they agree, when Piggy says that he does not believe in supernatural phenomena and that there is no “beast” it is only in the younger children’s imagination, Jack replies “Who cares what you believe Fatty!” for no apparent reason (97). Jack believes that the best way to deal with the “beast” is the most masculine one, he thinks they are strong and they can just overpower it and kill it (99).

Ironically, dealing with the “beast” in a masculine way, is a bit paradoxical because it can be argued that the “beast” itself is a manifestation of their masculinity. There are a lot of interpretations of the “beast” and they are often theological since the “Lord of the Flies” refers to Beelzebub (Fitzgerald and Kayser 79) which is another name for Satan. Another interpretation by David Spitz about the “beast” is: “the beast is not something outside of man but is an actual part of man, always close to man, and hence not something to be killed or run away from.” (Spitz 25). Spitz states the argument that the “beast” is in human nature and that is why it is inescapable. If this claim is taken a bit further, there is an argument to be made about the “beast” being the traditional masculine negative traits, such as: aggression, violence and obsession with physical strength. Because in the end, it is masculinity that causes them to fight with each other, instead of talking things out, the rule of the strong must be applied and the strongest boy must force everyone to obey his commands, that is the traditionally masculine way.

After the chasm between the two leaders is created, Ralph and Jack go back and forth arguing and eventually Jack wants to repeat the voting process believing this time the result will be different (139). The outcome, however, does not change, Jack suffers another humiliating defeat and decides to leave the group and make his own tribe without having to constantly obey Ralph's orders (140). Jack as a leader of his group knows that no one will try to challenge his views and objectives, so he immediately goes on a hunt with his new tribe. The victim is a mother sow who is feeding her piglets unaware of the tribe who stalks her (147). There is a consensus among critics cited in this paper; Bernard Dick F, Paula Alida Roy and Berthold Schoene-Harwood that an underlying sense of rape takes place when Golding describes this successful hunt. Using sentences with phallic symbols such as a knife penetrating the sow's flesh creates an atmosphere of not only murder but also sexual intercourse. This assertion is suspected because of sentences such as: "Jack was on top of the sow, stabbing downwards with his knife." (149). Bernard Dick believes that even the rising hot temperature acts as an erotic stimulant and continues: "the animal's being female is an incentive for a rapelike assault; its being a mother is an invitation to perversity." (Dick 21). Paula Alida Roy calls this scene a "parody of a rape" (Roy 83) and quotes other sentences from the book that have strong sexual assault implication's such as: "wedded to her in lust" (148) or: "[t]he sow collapsed under them and they were heavy and fulfilled upon her" (149). Berthold Schoene-Harwood believes that this graphic imagery by Golding assists the boys' transition into "the violent masculinity of big game hunters" (Schoene-Harwood 69).

The tribe celebrates their successful hunt with the flesh of their prey and a pagan sacrificial ceremony while chanting and dancing (168). Simon is their next unfortunate victim, who enters the area during this ecstatic trance the tribe is in and they confuse him for the "beast" and stab him to death (168). It is difficult to

recognise at this point if it is masculinity and the traditional gender norms at fault or the boys are too far gone into this bizarre situation. The next sign of Jack's uncompromising masculinity is when Piggy, Ralph with Sam and Eric visit his tribe, after Jack with some other boys stole Piggy's glasses, in order to demand the glasses back because Piggy is unable to see and they cannot create fire without them. Ralph's aggressive manner of demanding the glasses back plays completely into Jack's masculine way of solving things, which means a fight until someone admits defeat or dies (196). This argument connects back to masculine thinking, it is competitive because Jack does not cooperate with Ralph and resolve their issues, he wants to compete with him to prove that he is the stronger, therefore, real leader. In addition, it is also hierarchical for a similar reason, Jack wants to be the sole leader in the island and he does not want cooperate with Ralph. This battle leads to the death of Piggy and the apprehension of Sam and Eric, meanwhile, Ralph is wounded but he manages to escape (198-202). Finally, the tribe chasing Ralph leads to a naval officer who is able to rescue everyone (222). It is worth noting, that when a more complete grown-up masculine figure such as the naval officer asks: "[w]ho's the boss here?" Ralph immediately answers he is, whereas Jack starts to make a step forward, but he regrets it and just stands still in the end (224). This event shows Jack's respect of hierarchies, he feels like Ralph is the real leader, so he just remains silent.

Before concluding Jack's analysis this paper will also mention a brief argument in favour of homoeroticism within the *Lord of the Flies* between Jack and Ralph since homosexuality is often deemed as a feminine behaviour. This statement is supported by Connell when they are talking about homosexuality in patriarchal culture. More specifically, Connell writes that: "[p]atriarchal culture has a simple interpretation of gay men: they lack masculinity." (Connell 143). When explaining the common assumption that the opposites attract, Connell adds that:

“[i]f someone is attracted to the masculine, then that person must be feminine.” (143). Returning to homoeroticism, Tyson defines the term as: “erotic (though not necessarily overtly sexual) depictions that imply same-sex attraction or that might appeal sexually to a same-sex reader” (Tyson 321). If this definition is considered, there are a few clues that might indicate homoeroticism, for example when Ralph tells Jack that he can remain the leader of the choir and they can become the hunters: “smile(d) at each other with shy liking” (20). Ryuichiro Miyanaga argues that there is implicit homoeroticism in the scene where Jack and Ralph have to come up with a way to create a fire (Miyanaga 6). The issue is that none of the boys knows how to exactly do “it”: “[t]he shameful knowledge grew in them and they did not know how to begin confession.”. The conversation continues as Ralph poses the awkward question: “[w]ill you light the fire?” Jack blushes and replies “You rub two sticks. You rub—” (39). Miyanaga opines that the “shameful knowledge” in “rubbing two sticks” is identical to a “sentimental account of your first handjob” (6). Homoeroticism is addressed in order to have a more nuanced perspective for both the masculine and the feminine side of Jack.

Lastly, this paper will try to answer Tyson’s question about gender behavioural conformity (Tyson 119) on Jack. It is essential to note that Tyson’s question is posed in a hyperbolic manner in order to make her readers question every characters’ assigned gender in relation to their behaviour within the text and the society they live in. The reason this question is perceived as exaggerated is the adverb “always”. It is hard for a character to “always” act in a way that conforms with their assigned gender but it seems like Jack is consistently according to the masculine gender norms prescribed in the 1950s British Society. Thus, it is possible to argue that in Jack’s case, unlike Ralph and Piggy, the answer could lean closer to a “yes”. However, there are the scenes of homoeroticism that were mentioned before and a few times when he shows hints of fear, or fails to take responsibility but

it would be unfair to describe these as solely feminine emotions. The reason is the binary view that most societies have about dealing with masculinity and femininity as opposites. If masculinity is painted with only positive adjectives; strong, aggressive, courageous, logical femininity has to automatically be weak, passive, cowardly and emotional. Pam Morris writes that “[t]he construction of gender identity on oppositional terms [...] is too limiting” and she presents the following more radical feminist logic, which this paper agrees with: “we should be aiming not so much for equality between men and women as for a transcendence or transformation of the present over-rigid definition of gender as difference” (Morris 5).

This paper attempts to analyse the masculine and feminine behaviours of the main characters and the masculine and feminine way of thinking. Bernard Dick separates the two groups that are created after Jack’s unsuccessful attempt to become the leader in two separate groups. The “rational (fire-watchers)” and the “irrational (hunters)” (Dick 7). Ralph and Piggy belong in the first group, their main objective is to get rescued as soon as possible by creating smoke. Their secondary objective is to build some shelters in order to protect everyone from the rain and to make the younger children feel safer, they want to create a sense of hearth/home (52-53). These objectives are group-oriented, which would put them under the feminine thinking category, they aim at making sure everyone is safe and they do not really gain any rewards or respect for this type of labour. On the contrary, it is hard, unexciting, exhausting labour that no one wants to do, but even when everyone else leaves, Simon and Ralph work hard to finish the job themselves (51). Piggy is unable to help because of his asthma and weak physical strength but Simon does, he is another majorly feminine character but is unaccounted for in this paper, since his analysis would make the paper too broad.

The other group that Dick creates, consists of mainly Jack’s choir and some other younger boys. Only Jack is examined from this group because the rest

just follow his orders, however, there are other boys that could also be considered mainly masculine, such as Roger, since he participates in the metaphorical rape of the sow and Roger is the one who actually murders Piggy (200). An aspect that this paper takes interest in, is masculine emotionality. Jack is driven throughout the whole novel by the masculine emotions that he represses, however, psychoanalysis is beyond the scope of this paper, this thesis mainly wants to raise some questions about masculine emotionality. Returning to Jack's emotionality, the emphasis has to be on his previously accounted failures. Jack fails to be the leader so he has to find another way to bring value in the group. His way of contributing is by hunting for meat, which in all fairness, is a luxury food. The children's diet consists of only fruits, nuts and maybe some fish if they were able to catch any (78). Although his goal is the one society prescribes for the masculine gender it would be unfair to just discredit it. This paper's aim is not to demonise masculinity after all but to problematise the gender norms that exist and the often positive outlook that societies have towards traditional masculinity. The problem is that he does not follow the most important objective which he took responsibility for, keeping the fire alive. Instead of swallowing his pride and doing a better job next time, Jack just decides to give up, create his own tribe and completely forsake any chance of being rescued. But even in the most charitable interpretation of this goal, it is almost impossible to consider it a group-oriented goal. It is more plausible to consider this as a sacrifice in the name of pride and masculinity. If Jack simply admitted that he needed more time to practice hunting and he apologised for missing an opportunity to get rescued, his inner masculinity would crumble.

Jack's individualistic masculine approach and his inability to express and deal with his emotions properly, since emotionality is also a feminine characteristic, lead to the deaths of Simon and Piggy. Arguably, Ralph's incompetence in dealing with Jack and in helping him understand the importance of fire and shel-

ters also contributed to the augmentation of the problem. Hunting was never the main issue to begin with, it did become later in conjunction with the obsession for killing and after being the only way Jack's existence can be meaningful in the group, but it could have been another advantage if handled properly. As mentioned before, the children were not exactly happy with their piscatorial diet (78), they could have definitely used some meat as long as the group had lit a fire and had built some shelters.

Concluding, this paper has to acknowledge that, even though there were mentions about Jack's psychological state and emotionality, these were not explored properly. However, this topic could be inspected in a future study. There have been some papers that compare; Jack, Ralph and Piggy to Freud's Id, Ego and Superego, but Jack's psychoanalysis can be investigated further. As previously pointed out, Jack represses his feelings continuously and some of his actions can be explained as defence mechanisms.

Feminism and gender studies are essential for progressive modern societies in order to minimise injustices in the future. The goal of this thesis is not to convince its readers about the superiority of the feminine way of thinking over the masculine one, but to recognise, that historically, both masculinity and femininity were viewed in a flawed manner that caused problems for both genders. For example, the belief that women are emotional, illogical, weak and are unable to be successful academically, or have a work-related career, or just the fact that they should stay home and take care/please their family. Britain during the 1950s was not an exception. This paper presents an argument as to why feminine thinking, even though different, plays a prominent role in modern societies and has a claim in logic. This paper observes that the characters that align with feminine thinking, Ralph and Piggy, focus on: lighting a fire to be rescued, creating a hearth to sleep comfortably and building shelters to protect the group, which is how they

create the most optimal and probable environment for survival. On the other hand, the masculine Jack is preoccupied with having fun, fulfilling his traditional gender role of becoming the breadwinner and is ultimately unable to deal with his repressed emotions of failure, since emotionality is feminine, which leads to the “beast” devouring the boys.

## List of references:

- Bernheimer, Charles and Kahane, Claire. *In Dora's Case Freud-Hysteria-Feminism*. Columbia University Press New York, 1985.
- Birmingham Feminist History Group. *Feminism as Femininity in the Nineteen-Fifties?*. *Feminist Review*, no. 80, 2005, pp. 6–23. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/3874362](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3874362). Accessed 25 May 2021.
- Brooke, Stephen. *Gender and Working Class Identity in Britain during the 1950s*. *Journal of Social History*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2001, pp. 773–795. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/3789418](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3789418). Accessed 25 May 2021.
- Connell, R. W. “Masculinities: Second Edition”. Polity Press, 2005.
- Dick, Bernard F. “Chapter Two The Anarchy Within” *William Golding Revised Edition Twayne's English Authors Series*. Twayne Publishers, 1987, pp 6-30.
- Fitzgerald, John F. and Kayser, John R. *Golding's 'Lord of the Flies': Pride as Original Sin*. *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1992, pp. 78–88. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/29532839](http://www.jstor.org/stable/29532839). Accessed 25 May 2021.
- Golding, William. “Fable” *The Hot Gates*. Faber and Faber Limited, 1965, pp 85-101.
- Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies*. Faber and Faber Limited, 1954.
- MacKinnon, Katherine A. “Difference and Dominance: On Sex Discrimination” *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Harvard University Press, 1987, pp. 32-45.

Miyanaga, Ryuichiro. *Absence of Bikini, or the Cold War Boyology in William Golding's Lord of the Flies*. Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2017, pp. 1-11. doi:10.1080/00111619.2017.1321523. Accessed 25 May 2021.

Ollerenshaw, Kathleen. *Education for Girls*. Faber and Faber, 1961.

Pam, Morris. *Literature and Feminism an Introduction*. Blackwell Publishers, 1993.

Roy, Paula Alida. "Paula Alida Roy on the Absence of the Female in *Lord of the Flies*" *Bloom's Guides Comprehensive Research & Study Guides William Golding's Lord of the Flies New Edition*. Infobase Publishing, 2010, pp. 82-84.

Schoene-Harwood, Berthold. "Berthold Schoene-Hardwood on Destructive Masculinity in *Lord of the Flies*" *Bloom's Guides Comprehensive Research & Study Guides William Golding's Lord of the Flies New Edition*. Infobase Publishing, 2010, pp. 68-74.

Simson, Rosalind S. *Feminine Thinking*. *Social Theory and Practice*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1–26. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/23558685](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23558685). Accessed 25 May 2021.

Spitz, David. *Power and Authority: An Interpretation of Golding's 'Lord of the Flies'*. *The Antioch Review*, vol. 30, no. 1, 1970, pp. 21–33. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/4637248](http://www.jstor.org/stable/4637248). Accessed 25 May 2021.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: a User-Friendly Guide*. Routledge, 2006.