



Ideological Discourse and Manufacture of Submissiveness in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*: Critical study

Ahmed Ali Mohammed

Open Educational College/Maysan Centre

ahalenglish@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3609-2254>

Abstract

This research paper is a study that highlights the correlation between ideological discourse, power, cultural hegemony, and the manufacture of submissiveness in Golding's novel "Lord of the Flies," published in 1954. Although the novel's themes of violence, leadership, symbolism, and human nature have been explored in the past, this study focuses on how discourse constructs and legitimizes hegemonic authority. This study is a qualitative textual and thematic analysis using Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis and Antonio Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony to analyse selected texts from the novel. The analysis shows that hegemonic power is exercised not only through coercion but also through ideological discourse, fear, symbolic language, collective rituals and the production of consent. While Ralph initially tries to establish a democratic social system based on rules, cooperation and shared responsibility, Jack gradually creates an authoritarian type of hegemony based on fear, violence, protection, hunting and emotional solidarity. In addition, the study shows how discourse on the Beast creates fear and makes it socially accepted reality in order to give Jack dominance and obedience from others. In conclusion, the study proves that Golding has depicted submissiveness as something ideologically constructed state, where domination is most efficient when the dominated part takes part in reproducing the values of the dominating power.

Keywords: Lord of the Flies; ideological discourse; cultural hegemony; Critical Discourse Analysis; power; submissiveness.

1- Introduction

William Golding's novel "Lord of The Flies" written in 1954 is highly regarded as an excellent description of the nature of humans and fragility of social structure when there is no government authority. The novel presents the story of English schoolboys, who get trapped on an unnamed and uninhabited island near the Pacific Ocean due to a plane crash. In the novel, the boys' early attempts to establish civilization and order on the island quickly descend into violence, chaos, and domination due to the absence of social order. As there are no grownups around and they have to rely on themselves, they try to keep up their civilized manner of living. The boys in this isolated setting attempt to form a social order by creating rules and appointing leaders. However, their efforts soon turn into a fierce power struggle, which eventually results in the collapse of their social system.



The core of the story is based on a clash between the two types of leadership that can be observed in the personalities of Ralph and Jack. While the former personifies a democratic style of leading through teamwork, coordination, and decision making together as one group, the latter shows an authoritarian style of power using coercion, intimidation, and violence as means of achieving their goal. The confrontation in the novel can thus symbolize not only a rivalry for dominance but an ideological conflict between civilization and savagery as well. Using the microcosm of this world of young boys, William Golding shows that people, irrespective of age, have the potential to become savage in behaviour once freed from societal limitations.

Despite the amount of critical work that has already been done on the novel, most of it seems to focus on certain topics – power, symbolism, or even human nature – in an isolated manner. On the contrary, there has not yet been any attempt at providing an analysis of the interrelationship of power, discourse, ideology, and cultural hegemony in the novel. More precisely, there has not been enough attention paid to discourse's role as a key tool for the creation, maintenance, and legitimization of power. In fact, there is a close relationship between power struggle and ideological discourse since those who have power do not depend solely on coercive actions but also depend on their thoughts, beliefs, and words to gain the consent of others and ensure that they continue exercising power over them. In this context, the role of ideological discourse is employed as a means by which dominant groups maintain their dominance and hegemony through the incorporation of their ideology into the systems, language, and daily practice.

At the same time, people's perception of themselves and the world around them is influenced by those who hold power and have considerable influence over what is considered knowledge or truth. The significance of this research paper is to explore the relationship between power, discourse, ideology, and cultural hegemony in the novel as factors that contribute to the development of the boys' social structure. The research will be based on the premise that power does not just come about through coercion and domination, but is also created and maintained by language, ideologies, belief structures, and the manufacture of consent. Special emphasis will be placed on the way in which discourse works as an instrument of both domination and subversion.

II- Research Problem and Research Questions

The research problem in this paper is the lack of critical exploration on the link between ideological discourse and the production of submissiveness in Lord of the Flies. Literature reviews show the importance of themes such as violence, power, leadership, symbolism, human nature, and others. However, previous researchers have overlooked discourse as an element for building, sustaining, and legitimizing the power and hegemony of the boys' leaders. The novel implies that domination requires not only the use of physical violence but also

ideological discourse, language, fear, and belief manipulation as a means of producing obedience and securing consent. Therefore, the main aim of the proposed study is to explore the impact that ideological discourse has on submissiveness, hegemony, and power in the text. The questions asked during this study are as follows: 1- what is the impact of ideological discourse in establishing and consolidating hegemonic power in the novel? 2- How does William Golding portray the making of submissiveness and consent through fear, language, and authoritarian leadership in the novel?

III- Research objectives

- 1- To examine the role of ideological discourse in the formation and sustaining of power in Lord of the Flies.
- 2- To analyse the discursive and linguistic strategies that the dominant characters use to establish hegemony and secure the consent of the other boys.
- 3- To examine the role of language, fear and authoritarian leadership in the production of submissiveness among the boys.
- 4- To apply Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model and Gramsci's Theory of Cultural Hegemony to identify the ideological meanings embedded in the discourse of the novel.
- 5- To analyse the influence of discourse and ideology, power and cultural hegemony on the group dynamics and social structure in the novel.

IV - Methodology

My research paper is a qualitative literary study that explores the relationship between the ideological discourse and manufacture of submissiveness in the novel Lord of the Flies by William Golding. This study employs Fairclough's three-dimensional model and Gramsci's Theory of Cultural Hegemony as analytical tools. The novel's original text serves as the main source for the analysis. Selected information from the book will be examined using thematic analysis and textual analysis techniques. The following steps will be involved in the process: 1) Collect certain data straight from the novel's original text. 2) Identify and define the main thematic concepts that will comprise the study's conceptual framework. 3) Refine and sort the themes so that they represent the core meanings presented in the text. 4) Support my analysis of each theme with specific textual evidence from the novel. 5) Discuss and present the results of the textual analysis. 6) Make final conclusions based on the overall analysis and findings.

V- Theoretical Framework

Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

According to Fairclough (1989), language is a type of social practice. As stated by him, "Discourse refers to the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 23). Additionally, Fairclough (1989) argues that in addition to the texts themselves, critical analysts should also look

at the connections between texts, production processes, and their social context, as well as the process of producing and understanding the texts.

Fairclough (1989; 1992; 2003) created his three-dimensional framework based on such presumptions. According to him, every communicative event has three components: it is a text (speaking, writing, visual images, or a mix of these); it is a discursive practice that entails the creation and consumption of texts; and it is a social practice. Fairclough created three stages of CDA—description, interpretation, and explanation—that corresponded to the three dimensions of discourse. According to him, discourse embodies social structure and is a type of social practice. Discourse is composed of "context, interaction, and text." Text is located at the bottom of them and is the outcome of interaction. According to Fairclough (1992), context is essential to both the production and interpretation processes.

At the stage of description, linguistic elements including vocabulary (wording), grammar (transitivity, passivization), and text structure (thematic choice, turn-taking system) should all be methodically examined. Fairclough (1989) asserts that "description is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of text" (p. 26). He also adds ten major questions along with additional sub-questions, primarily related to the vocabulary, grammar, and textual structures sections, so that it can be understood more easily (Fairclough, 1989). The vocabulary section primarily deals with word choice; the grammar section focuses on grammatical aspects, which are closely related to Halliday's systemic-functional grammar; and the textual structures section addresses the discourse's overall structures.

Fairclough (1989) states, "interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction with seeing the text as the product of a process of production, and as recourse in the process of interpretation" (p.26). During the stage of interpretation, the connection between the discourse and its production and consumption needs to be interpreted. In addition, at this stage, discourse is not merely treated as text, but also as a discursive practice. This implies that in addition to considering the linguistic features and structure of the text, other considerations need to be considered, including speech acts and intertextuality (Fairclough, 1989).

Text as discursive practice includes two processes. They are the discourse process (the changes the text undergoes during production and consumption) and the institutional process (editing process). In this case, the crucial idea of "intertextuality" is quite helpful in explaining the discourse process. In other words, investigation of intertextual relationships between discourse, texts, and setting is the focus of this stage. In this regard, the discourse should be viewed as both a type of discursive practice and a linguistic version. In the interpretive stage of news reports, the news source and reporting modalities should be worth investigating because these elements connect to how individuals create and understand the news discourse (Fairclough, 1995b).



Fairclough (1989) states, "explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation, and their social effects" (p. 26). In the explanatory stage of analysis, the broader social, cultural and historical contexts in which discourse is produced and interpreted are taken into account. Given that news discourse can be viewed as a type of social practice, social institutions and wider social structures have an important impact on news texts. At this stage, discourse is examined within its institutional and sociocultural contexts to uncover the underlying relationships among language, power, and ideology. The notion of "discourse as social practice," or more exactly, "sociocultural practice," corresponds with the stage of explanation. At this level the elements of ideology and power are taken into account to give a full understanding of the relationship between social and cultural context and the production and consumption of texts (Fairclough, 1995b).

Gramsci's Theory of Cultural Hegemony

Overall analysis of the hegemony theory proposed by Antonio Gramsci can be viewed as an efficient approach towards analysing how power can be exercised in society by means of both coercion and consent. Gramsci emphasizes vital roles and the connection between coercion and consent. In this context, he demonstrates the fact that both these notions play significant role in the process of hegemony, however, Gramsci assumes that hegemony is based mostly on consent rather than on coercion (Houssay-Holzschuch, 2020). Laclau (2008) argues that hegemony is a concept that emerged in reaction to a crisis rather than a concept pertaining to the process of developing a whole identity. In this sense, Gramsci views hegemony as a form of moral and intellectual leadership that proactively incorporates the interests and aspirations of subordinate groups in the hegemonic block's political and cultural agenda (Gramsci, as cited in Jones, 2016).

Gramscian theory states that ideology is a domain of values, conventions and beliefs that defines people as social actors. Both the level of economic productivity and the general structure of society are impacted by the social agents created by that domain. Gramsci contends that ideology is both Marxist materialistic and constitutional as the products of ideology, represented by social agents, are impacted by institutional and economic circumstances. Moreover, Gramsci sees ideology as a battleground where long-lasting disputes between two hegemonic principles occur (Mouffe, 1979).

Ideological hegemony as explained by Gramsci (1971) is the process in which the ideas, values, and norms of society are used in such a manner that the current relations of power appear natural and inevitable. Gramsci (1971) asserts that hegemonic power does not only involve use of force but the construction of an ideological narrative that ensures consent. Gramsci suggests that the dominating class uses ideological strategies to obtain the consent from subordinate classes in addition to using force to maintain its domination. Cultural and social



institutions are created in order to create ideas and norms, which will support the existing social order and make the domination of the dominant class inevitable and natural. (Gramsci, 1971).

It is generally understood that the state is separated into a base and a superstructure from a Marxist perspective. Gramsci, however, advanced this theory by contending that both political and civil society make up the superstructure. Coercive institutions like the government, military, and police are referred to as political society. Conversely, civil society refers to organizations that do not use force, especially those that work to influence public opinion. As cited in Boggs (1976), Gramsci argues that "anything which influences or is able to influence public opinion, directly or indirectly, belongs to it: libraries, schools, societies and clubs of various kinds, even architecture and the layout and names of streets" (p. 389).

Analysis and discussion

VI- Ideological discourse and the development of power

"Seems to me we ought to have a chief to decide things." (Golding, 1954, p. 22).

From the textual point of view, the statement involves such modal element as **"ought to,"** indicating not only obligation but also the social need as opposed to personal choice. The pronoun **"we"** creates a common identity and portrays leadership as a social need. The word **"chief"** is an indication of politics and organization, while the infinitive phrase **"to decide things"** describes leadership from the operational and management perspectives. The use of **"seems to me"** weakens the statement making it appear like a social discussion and not authoritative command. According to Fairclough (2001), modality and lexical choice are some of the most important linguistic devices used to establish social relations and power.

This utterance occurs as the boys attempt to create social order for the first time on the island. This discourse relies on an ideology where there is a need for leadership and hierarchy in political communities. The boys view the suggestion through the lens of past experience of organizational frameworks such as institutions like schools, families, and the government. The discourse thus legitimizes the concept of leadership as a necessity in social life. As Fairclough (1992) points out, discourse creates conventions of society by influencing interpretation of social reality. From the social point of view, this statement is the first attempt to build a hegemonic structure through ideological hegemony. From the Gramscian point of view, the legitimacy of leadership is acquired when subordinate classes accept the domination of dominant classes willingly (Gramsci, 1971). Boys' willingness to have a chief proves the application of the concept of ideological hegemony, according to which social stratification is seen as something natural and positive.



"We've got to have special people for looking after the fire. Any day there may be a ship out there." (Golding, 1954, p. 42).

The modal phrase **"have got to"** implies obligation, need and urgency, highlighting the importance of working collectively. The use of inclusive pronoun **"we"** develops a sense of collective identity, shared responsibility among the boys, and reduces the distance between the leader and the followers. The phrase **"special people,"** implies a social organization and a hierarchy. In addition, the word **"ship"** is an image of rescue, civilization and hope and appeals to the common interest of the boys. Finally, the declarative form of the statement adds to the authority of Ralph because his suggestion is logical and necessary. Fairclough (2001) notes that the choice of pronouns and the use of modality are linguistic devices for construction of authority.

Ralph uses this discourse in an effort to convince the boys to agree to the establishment of organized leadership, social responsibility, and discipline. Ralph's speech relies on the social values that are prominent within civilization, namely rationality, cooperation, and organization, which the boys have already learned through their experience within the civilized world through their experience within the civilized world. This discourse is persuasive in nature since it depicts the leadership of Ralph as an effort to ensure collective survival and rescue rather than a mere desire for leadership. In this way, Ralph tries to establish the relationship of mutual obligations between the leader and followers. Fairclough (1995a) asserts that discourse is a means of reproducing and legitimizing social behaviors and ideological presumptions.

The discourse is an indication of the practice of hegemonic leadership through ideological persuasion and agreement. Ralph attempts to exercise hegemonic leadership through the development of mutual understanding of the nature of social order and responsibilities. As defined by Gramsci, hegemony refers to the continued ability of the dominant groups to persuade others that certain ideologies and values are beneficial and good for them (Gramsci, 1971). Hegemonic leadership applied by Ralph is based on the assumption that the boys will embrace civilization, discipline, and cooperation as significant aspects of social order. Therefore, this discourse illustrates the way hegemonic leadership operates through ideology and creating consent without coercive measures. According to Simon (1991), the practice of hegemonic leadership involves the continuous process of consent making.

"I'm not going to play any longer. Not with you." (Golding, 1954, p. 127).

The repeated negative construction **"not"** highlights rejection, separation and opposition. The first-person pronoun, **"I,"** emphasizes Jack's agency, independence, and authority. Shortness of the sentence brings about an aggressive sense to the statement. In addition, the use of the verb **"play"** belittles the political structure of Ralph by signifying that political structures and democracy are merely games for children and not serious tools used for organization. Suddenness of the statement shows that Jack has made up his mind



about rejecting the existing political structure. According to Fairclough (1992), language can be used to indicate ideology and power relations.

Jack's utterance is a major discursive break from Ralph's leadership and the ideology that he embodies. In rejecting Ralph's rule and asserting himself in this manner, Jack tries to create his own discourse which revolves around concepts of brute force, hunting, emotional appeal, and loyalty. The utterance, therefore, is not merely an expression of personal displeasure but is an effort towards re-defining politics in terms of discourse on the island. In this new discourse, Jack invites others to rethink their allegiance and join him under a new ideology based on power and tribal membership rather than consensus. According to Fairclough (1995a), discourse is the location of ideological contestation where different groups vie for dominant power.

Socially, the speech denotes the shift from consensus-based leadership to dominance and ideological battles. Jack rebels against the hegemonic order that has been set up by Ralph and tries to form another hegemonic order based on fear, violence, and emotional solidarity. In terms of Gramsci's conceptual framework, hegemonic struggles include competition between two ideological systems that try to legitimize themselves and gain consensus (Gramsci, 1971). Jack's opposition to the authority of Ralph reveals the inherent instability of hegemonic power and shows that hegemonic discourse and power may be replaced by other discourses and power relations. According to Storey (2018), any hegemony is contested and requires continuous reproduction to be effective.

VII- Hegemonic and Leadership Discursive Techniques

"We've got to have rules and obey them. After all, we're not savages. We're English; and the English are best at everything." (Golding, 1954, p. 42)

The use of the inclusive pronoun "we" in the statement provides solidarity among the boys and the proposed rules are presented as a shared responsibility. According to Fairclough (1989), the use of pronouns is important from the ideological perspective in establishing social relationships and positioning people in certain groups. The modal verb "have to" is used here to indicate obligation and necessity; obeying the rules is portrayed as something unavoidable. According to Fairclough (2003), the use of modal verbs shows a person's belief in a statement and is used in regulating social relations and establishing authority. In addition, the opposition between "savages" and "English" creates a binary opposition where civilization is associated with discipline and morality.

The statement is based on the prior social interactions of the boys within the British culture, whereby discipline, laws, and order are seen as inherent attributes of a civilized society. "Englishness" is perceived by the boys as being equated to being responsible, rational, and well-behaved. Thus, the power of Ralph's persuasion lies in the fact that he uses beliefs that are already part of the culture rather than using coercive power. Fairclough (1992) argues that the

interpretation of the discourse relies on the background knowledge of the participants.

According to Gramsci's point of view, Ralph maintains the dominant ideology that he received from the British society by emphasizing the importance of order, discipline, and democracy in his leadership style. Instead of using force to gain compliance, Ralph tries to persuade the boys to agree to the already existing rules because these rules would be useful to all of them for their survival. The discourse of Ralph uses the cultural values that have already been adopted by the boys and their perception of social organization as a civilized institution. Thus, Ralph appears as a leader not imposing his personal power on the boys but restoring the familiar social order that the boys readily accept. This is consistent with Gramsci's (1971) claim that hegemony is maintained by agreement, in which dominant ideals are no longer perceived as forms of dominance but rather are accepted as common sense.

"The mask was a thing on its own, behind which Jack hid, liberated from shame and self-consciousness." (Golding, 1954, p. 64)

In this metaphorical expression, the "mask" is not described as merely an object, but as an independent social force. The use of symbolic expressions leads to the transformation of the personal identity into tribal identity, implying the ideological meaning of the mask as opposed to its practical use. The use of words such as "liberated" and "hid" points out the shift from individual moral values to collective values where the mask not only conceals individual identity, but also helps individuals adopt the emerging social values of the tribe. The personification of the mask illustrates the capacity of the mask in changing social identity and allowing actions that would not be possible under civilized rules. According to Fairclough (1989), lexical choice and metaphor are vital ideological resources in representing social identity, social relations, and social beliefs.

To the boys, the painted face represents the visual indicator of belonging to the hunting tribe and a sign of allegiance to Jack's authority. The wearing of the mask allows them to create new identities based on norms that are totally different from the ones of the civilized society. By taking part in the activities of the group, the boys manage to construct a new identity based on the values of Jack. According to Fairclough (1992), the role of the discourse is to shape identities by offering individuals a new way to construe their own social identities.

The mask acts as an ideological symbol that creates new identities and strengthens Jack's hegemonic domination over the other boys. According to Gramsci (1971), hegemonic systems depend on cultural symbols through which people understand themselves as members of some social group and adopt the values of this group willingly. Through wearing the painted face, the boys absorb Jack's ideology and voluntarily adopt the behavior norms of the hunting

tribe, proving that their compliance is based on their recognition, but not on force. The mask thus becomes a way in which Jack exercises cultural hegemony and ensures the agreement of the other boys. Hall (1997) also asserts that identities are discursively produced through representational systems, thus implying that the tribal identity of the boys is socially constructed.

***"The conch exploded into a thousand white fragments."* (Golding, 1954, p. 181)**

The explosion of the conch is expressed by means of highly symbolic language. Through the entire story, the conch is symbolic of democracy, legality, and legitimacy as it is the major symbol of civilized society on the island. The use of the verb **"exploded"** shows that the destruction of the conch is sudden and violent, which highlights the total and irreparable destruction of the ideological values embodied by the conch, as well as the notion of **"a thousand white fragments"** implying the disintegration of the social order represented by the conch. Fairclough (1989) states that symbols in the discourse always carry ideology and social relations inside them, thus the shattering of the conch illustrates the destruction of the ideological system behind it.

The symbolical change from civilization to authoritarianism is recognized by readers. It is clear that the conch is no longer recognized by the boys as a symbol of power since the discourse has changed to the ideology of Jack. As Jack's discourse becomes more accepted, the principles of democracy that come with the conch are no longer convincing and therefore fail to regulate social behaviour. This is consistent with Fairclough's (1992) contention that discourse shifts frequently coincide with more significant shifts in social practice, as changing systems of meaning affect ideas of legitimacy, authority, and appropriate behaviour.

The smashing of the conch represents the substitution of one hegemonic order for another. The democratic ideology of Ralph is no longer legitimate while the authoritarian ideology of Jack gains dominance since the symbolic base of the previous social order gets destroyed. The smashing of the conch indicates not only the destruction of a physical object but also the undermining of the beliefs and values upon which the previous social order was built and the previous social order had obtained the consensus of the boys. According to Gramsci (1971), change in hegemony happens when a new ideology replaces the beliefs and values of the previous social order and forms a new conception of the legitimate order of things. It means that the leadership of Jack becomes hegemonic since the boys begin to recognize it as a social reality.

VIII- The Role of Fear and Violence in Production of Submission

***"Maybe there is a beast... maybe it's only us."* (Golding, 1954, p. 89)**

The use of the modal adverb **"maybe"** in the statement is used to convey uncertainty and speculation, while at the same time raising the existence of unknown danger. The use of **"maybe"** twice increases the ambiguity of the



text, leaving room for many meanings of what the beast is. The word "**beast**" is chosen as a symbolic description of fear rather than as an actual physical entity. The comparison of "**a beast**" and "**us**" implies that the meaning changes to include the idea that evil comes from people themselves. In the words of Fairclough (1989), lexical choices and modality create certain interpretations of events and impact participants' worldviews, hence shaping social reality.

In the social environment of the boys, the uncertainty about the beast creates anxiety amongst them. The boys use shared discourse to characterize the threat, since none of them can verify that it exists, and this leads to a sense of fear in the group. As the society is preoccupied with the talk about the beast, fear begins to take the place of logical reasoning in decision making process. As Fairclough (1992) states, discourse produces social reality by changing people's perception and reaction towards events as a group. According to Gramsci, the role of the beast is ideological concept that enables the boys to become ready to obey an authoritarian system. The fear makes security more important than democratic practice, and therefore the promises of safety made by Jack become very attractive to the boys. Over time, the boys accept Jack's authority since they view him as someone who can face up to the perceived danger. For Gramsci (1971) hegemony is achieved when the perspective of a dominant group is perceived as common sense. Here belief in the beast legitimizes Jack's growing authority and assists in the manufacture of submissiveness.

"The beast is a hunter." (Golding, 1954, p. 153)

The statement is a simple declarative clause that shows speculation as an undeniable truth. The use of the definite article "**the**" assumes that the beast exists, whereas the relational process "**is**" gives it an identity of "**a hunter**." Grammar used here takes away the element of uncertainty and makes the presence of the threat an established fact. Moreover, the use of the word "**hunter**" makes the monster appear as an active threat rather than an anonymous threat, thus increasing fear among the boys. The declarative form does not allow any doubts or any other interpretations, thus making the boys accept the statement as an established fact. According to Fairclough (1989), declaratives are often used in order to perform ideological work, making certain representations to be seen as objective facts.

The boys begin to perceive the beast as an actual danger. With acceptance of the danger as true, the boys' actions become centered not on logic but on fear. Thus, the discourse about the beast creates the boys' perception and determines their social actions in such a way that the boys rely on those who can protect them from the beast. Fear becomes the socially constructed reality, which affects the decisions and actions of the boys. Despite the fact that the beast remains only an idea, not supported by any evidence, the discourse about it strengthens its



symbolic existence. Fairclough (1992) asserts that discourses determine social practices since they shape the interpretation of reality by participants. Hall (1997) argues that representation plays an active role in the construction of meaning, rather than representing an existing reality.

The theory of cultural hegemony by Gramsci highlights the way in which fear is employed as an instrument of achieving consent. Jack's role as a leader becomes legitimate because he identifies himself as someone who will protect the boys from the beast. Instead of questioning whether the danger is real or not, the boys accept the discourse related to the threat without any doubts and become willing to have a more authoritarian leader. Hence, fear is an ideological tool that ensures the development of authoritarian hegemony. Simon (1991) argues that hegemony is sustained when the dominant ideas are accepted as common sense and not subjected to critical review. Similarly, Jones (2006) observes that successful hegemonic leadership must create a sense of reality in which obedience is taken for granted as natural and necessary.

"Bollocks to the rules! We're strong—we hunt! If there's a beast, we'll hunt it down! We'll close in and beat and beat and beat—!" (Golding, 1954, p. 91)

"Bollocks to the rules!" is the first exclamatory rejection of any form of democratic authority in the statement. As the repeated verb **"hunt"** emphasizes violence as the major characteristic of the group, the repeated pronoun **"we"** establishes a collective identity centered around Jack's leadership. The phrase **"beat and beat and beat"** is repeated to intensify the aggressive act of the group that makes violence as a legitimate exercise. According to Fairclough (1989), speakers use pronoun selection, repetition, and evaluation as ideological strategies to construct identities and power dynamics.

The boys read Jack's confident and aggressive discourse as proof of effective leadership. This discourse changes the perception of fear into joint action and encourages the boys to come together as a group and fight their common enemy without adhering to Ralph's democratic procedures. Consequently, obedience depends on emotional allegiance to Jack's leadership rather than any kind of institutional legitimacy. Discourse about collective power and action makes boys feel that they are a part of Jack's group, and loyalty becomes more valuable than democracy. As a result, the boys start to identify good leadership with aggression and power rather than dialogue and agreement. Fairclough (1992) claims that discourse creates social identities and social practices through authority and collective action.

Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony shows how fear is used as a mechanism for securing consent. Jack becomes the leader since he represents the one who will protect the boys from the beast. Instead of thinking about whether there actually is any danger, the boys believe in the discourse about the danger and agree to accept more authoritative leadership. Fear, thus, becomes an ideological tool that ensures the rise of hegemony in the form of authoritarianism. According to Simon (1991), hegemony is achieved through the dominance of



such ideas which are treated as common sense, rather than questioning them. Similarly, Jones (2006) states that effective hegemonic leadership is achieved through making people accept the way they view reality and see obedience as something natural and necessary. Therefore, the discourse of the beast helps Jack to make people obedient through their own fear.

IX- Cultural Hegemony, Consent, and Social Order

"The conch doesn't count on this side of the island." (Golding, 1954, p. 150)

This statement shows the struggle of two different forms of leadership and their ideologies. Conch has played the role of a major symbol of order, discussion and legitimate authority. However, by making such a declaration, Jack not only rejects the object but the entire set of values and political ideologies it symbolizes. The term "**count**" implies recognition of authority and importance, and through this statement, Jack changes the notion of legitimacy in the boys' society. Rather than accepting discussion, which is democratic, Jack promotes a leadership style, which is characterized by physical strength and control. This change slowly affects the boys' trust in democratic institutions and helps create an authoritarian social order. In a Gramscian analysis, Jack's statement becomes an example of the struggle of two different forms of hegemony since he tries to impose the hegemony of power in place of that of democratic order (Gramsci, 1971). As Ives (2004) states, the language becomes very significant in these cases of hegemony struggle because social meanings can be contested.

This statement shows the struggle of two different forms of leadership and their ideologies. Conch has played the role of a major symbol of order, discussion and legitimate authority. However, by making such a declaration, Jack not only rejects the object but also the entire set of values and political ideologies it symbolizes. The term "**count**" implies recognition of authority and importance, and through this statement, Jack changes the notion of legitimacy in the boys' society. Rather than accepting discussion, which is democratic, Jack promotes a leadership style, which is characterized by physical strength and control. This change slowly affects the boys' trust in democratic institutions and helps create an authoritarian social order. In a Gramscian analysis, Jack's statement becomes an example of the struggle of two different forms of hegemony since he tries to impose the hegemony of power in place of that of democratic order (Gramsci, 1971). As Ives (2004) states, the language becomes very significant in these cases of hegemony struggle because social meanings can be contested.

"The tribe is going to be a lot of fun." (Golding, 1954, p. 140)

This seemingly simple statement reveals an important way through which Jack attracts followers. The noun "**tribe**" creates a new collective identity, and the phrase "**a lot of fun**" makes the membership of Jack's group seem appealing



and emotionally rewarding. Jack does not openly present his group as a system of authoritarian domination, but instead as a source of pleasure, excitement, protection and belonging. The positive depiction makes the group look desirable and helps Jack get the boys' voluntary backing. Thus, his authority starts to develop by attraction rather than by direct physical force.

This process illustrates the Gramscian connection of consent and coercion. According to Gramsci (1971), the exercise of power tends to be stable whenever it succeeds in winning the consent of the people it governs. It is for this reason that Jack does not at first resort to coercion in making all the boys follow him. Instead, he wins them over with the promise of food, hunting, excitement and safety. Therefore, his authority is built up by a combination of ideological appeal and material rewards. Jack presents his leadership as good for the boys, so that obedience appears to be a voluntary, rational choice, not an act of submission. The boys' participation in Jack's group then becomes a form of consent that reinforces his emerging authority. His ability to attract followers helps to normalize his leadership and makes his increasing dominance acceptable within the group.

Jack's leadership provides a good example of how hegemony can be built through the interplay of consent and coercion. He describes his tribe as meeting the needs and fears of the boys, particularly their need for food, excitement and protection. Thus the boys willingly join Jack's regime, for Jack offers them something they need, and this allows Jack to make the boys' collective acceptance of his leadership the basis for his personal interests. However, once Jack's authority is established it becomes increasingly coercive as fear and violence play a greater and greater role in maintaining the boys' obedience. Gramsci (1971) argues that in cases where consent is not enough to secure domination, there is a growing need for force. Jack's leadership thus exemplifies how voluntary support can gradually develop into submission when fear and violence limit resistance, and the boys' ongoing compliance is ensured by their dependence on Jack's protection as well as their fear of confronting him.

"The rules!" shouted Ralph. "You're breaking the rules!" (Golding, 1954, p. 150)

Through repeated mentioning of "the rules," Ralph shows how democratic authority begins to deteriorate within the group of boys. His exclamation reflects his attempts to defend the system of common laws that once regulated their collective life. Nonetheless, the need of Ralph to urgently remind the boys about the rules is indicative of the fact that the process of deterioration of democratic authority has already started. The rules still exist, but they are no longer able to provide enough power to make people follow them. Thus, one can say that the issue of authority presupposes not only the presence of institutions of regulations but also the recognition of their legitimacy by individuals. According to Fairclough (1989), power is maintained through social practices and relations that establish legitimacy and acceptability of certain authorities.



Thus, the appeal of Ralph is indicative of the widening distance between the presence of the democratic system and its practical capacity to control behaviour. As the boys become more disobedient, the democracy loses its practicality and acquires symbolic significance only.

According to Gramsci, this particular situation represents the case of a crisis of consent. While it is true that democracy is founded upon having rules, it is also true that democracy requires the willingness of the community to recognize these rules and to follow them. According to Gramsci (1971), the domination is best exercised when the consent of the people being dominated is secured, because without the consent, the domination becomes less stable. As the boys start accepting Jack's ideology of strength, hunting, and protecting, the boys' allegiance to Ralph's rule of order starts fading away. This change of ideology makes it hard for Ralph to impose social order in the community of the island. It can be noted from this example that the rivalry between Jack and Ralph goes beyond the personal conflict to represent the conflict of ideologies of social order and domination. In effect, once the boys accepted Jack's ideology, they could no longer feel allegiance to Ralph's ideals.

The fall of democratic authority is therefore described in the story as a gradual process in which rules become illegitimate and fail to be effective in practice. Ralph's efforts at defending the rules are not enough to recreate the collective faith in them that once existed. Van Dijk (1993) explains that ideologies have the potential to affect the attitudes and actions of a group of people through shaping their perception of power, authority and group interests. In the case of the novel, Jack's ideology slowly changes the perception of the boys about legitimate leadership and makes strength and protection more attractive than democracy. As a result, authority is judged by the boys according to its capacity to ensure security and satisfaction of immediate desires instead of by principles of equality and collectivity. Golding thus reveals how democratic authority is made fragile due to the loss of consent and the shift towards authoritarianism.

X- Discourse, Ideology, and the Transformation of Social Structure

"I ought to be chief," said Jack with simple arrogance, "because I'm chapter chorister and head boy. I can sing C sharp." (Golding, 1954, p. 19)

Jack's discourse shows how discourse plays an important role in the construction of social hierarchy. The use of the first person pronoun "I" makes Jack the center of the process of taking up leadership role and shows his aspiration to have a higher place in this newly formed community. When he says that he **"ought to be chief"** he understands this role as something that should be provided to him, not negotiated by all members of the community. Moreover, **"I am chapter chorister and head boy"** constructs authority on the basis of the past experience of the speaker and the fact that **"I can sing C sharp"** serves as the manifestation of personal qualities that should provide a good leader.



From the textual level of Fairclough's (1989) model, it is possible to see that these linguistic options build up Jack's image as being one who deserves the position of authority. The use of "I" signifies the superiority of the individual while "ought to" shows leadership as being one of the entitlements. In his discourse theory, Fairclough (1989) states that there is a strong connection between discourse and power, as language may symbolize social identity as well as relations between participants. Therefore, Jack's discourse helps build a social structure where leadership is related to superiority and confidence.

In terms of the discursive practices, Jack's discourse is in opposition to Ralph's discourse of collective decision-making. According to Ralph, the group needs to have a leader; however, the issue of choosing the leader is resolved in a democratic way with the use of voting procedure. In this case, the process of creation of social hierarchy is obviously created through competing discourses of legitimacy. The fact is that Jack's discourse is not successful at first because the boys agree with Ralph's democratic approach to leadership; however, his claim becomes the base for his later challenge to Ralph's power. As the boys' conditions change, Jack starts to develop his own more powerful discourse, which is based on the concepts of fear, protection and strength. In such a way, he manages to turn his personal ambitions into ideology and challenge the democratic power of Ralph.

According to the Gramscian viewpoint, this moment represents the beginning of the struggle to set up ideological leadership. According to Gramsci (1971), the domination will be more stable if the social group will be successful in making its leadership and values seem acceptable to the larger community. At this early stage, Jack has not been able to create a hegemony because the other boys have not accepted the idea of his authority. However, Jack's discourse provides a different understanding of the concept of authority, which includes the aspects of status, superiority, and power. In the course of the novel, Jack becomes increasingly successful in turning the ideology of his personal authority into the ideology of strength, hunting, and protection. With the help of this ideology and the necessity of its realization in terms of the safety of the boys, he manages to make his leadership more and more legitimate and attractive.

The construction of group identity is highly linked with the power struggle. Jack turns the choirboys into hunters and creates a tribal identity that centers on hunting and rituals, as well as obedience to Jack's leadership. In this case, it can be noted that the discourse and social practices organize individuals into a collective group. Social identity of the boys shifts from being members of a democratic assembly to being a part of Jack's tribe. According to Fairclough (1992), discourse does not represent social identity; rather, it plays an active role in its construction through creating social practices and relationships. The idea of hegemony, presented by Gramsci (1971), further describes how the group slowly adopts Jack's values. Thus, his increasing power is not based on mere physical power alone but on creating a collective social identity as well. This



social identity supports group unity and undermines Ralph's democratic authority. Thus, the conflict between Ralph and Jack is also a struggle over social identity, leadership and legitimate power.

***"Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood."* (Golding, 1954, p. 75)**

The chant **"Kill the pig. Cut her throat. Spill her blood"** is an example of how language turns into an instrument of violence for a group. The imperative verbs **"Kill," "Cut" and "Spill"** establish a rhythm of rising violence and turn violence into a shared group activity. Their repetition reduces individual liability and prompts the boys to function as a collective group, as their social identity is based on ritual, violence and obedience but not on rationality and democracy. In the textual dimension of Fairclough's model (1989), an imperative structure makes the violence an act that should be done and not questioned. The repeated commands normalize killing and the rhythmic form of the chant allows the ideology of violence to circulate among the boys. Therefore, language is a tool, which the group uses to form and reinforce a common identity.

On the discursive level, chanting is a ritual that reinforces the sense of cohesion and solidarity among the members of Jack's group. The participants are not only recipients of the discourse but also performers who collectively reproduce it and engage in the practice of violence that is represented through chanting. In fact, such relationship between discourse and practices can be seen in Fairclough's (1992) argument that discourse is not only influenced by current practices but also changes them at the same time. Therefore, chanting contributes to the creation of the social setting where violence is becoming acceptable, collective participation is encouraged, and personal responsibility fades away.

From a Gramscian perspective, the use of the chant helps in the formation of a new type of hegemonic power. According to Gramsci (1971), the process of domination will become much more stable if the values of the dominating group will be reproduced and internalized by the whole community. Jack's ideology starts becoming influential as a result of the active participation of the boys in its language and rituals. Through the act of collective chanting, it is clear that Jack's power is maintained not only through coercion but also through the boys' active participation in the culture practices, which sustain and normalize his ideology. Through participating in the chant, the boys support the power system that begins to control them. Through their participation, Jack's ideology is changed from an individual's discourse to a collective practice, thus giving more legitimacy to his leadership among them.

This chant also reflects how the resistance to the hegemony is being undermined. Ralph and Piggy provide another way of organizing society that relies on rules, rational discussion, and individual responsibility. However, the power of the discourse of these characters discourse is becoming less significant because of the emotional power of the collective rituals of Jack's group. The involvement of the boys in the chanting reflects their transition from one

ideology to another. In addition, the collectivity of the chant prevents resistance since the voice of the individuals is absorbed into the power of the whole group. The breakdown of civilization is then a process of language, ritual and collective identity gradually reshaping social behavior. The chant, by repeatedly giving violent commands, normalizes brutality, while the collective reciting of the chant encourages the boys to accept violence as an integral part of group membership. The model of Fairclough (1989, 1992) demonstrates the interdependence of language and social practice, and Gramsci's (1971) theory of cultural hegemony describes how Jack's ideology gradually becomes dominant through the active engagement and consent of the boys. Golding thus demonstrates that civilization begins to collapse when violent ideology is not only imposed by a leader, but also reproduced by the community itself.

XII- Conclusion

The present research has analyzed the correlation between ideological discourse, power, cultural hegemony and the creation of submissiveness in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. Using the Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis and the concept of Gramscian cultural hegemony, it has been found out that power in the novel is created and preserved due to the combination of the following factors: language, ideology, fear, symbolic actions, consent, and coercion. Whereas Ralph symbolizes a democratic system, which is based on the ideas of rules, cooperation, and collective responsibility, Jack is able to create the authoritarian hegemony, which is based on fear, violence, protection, hunting and the feeling of solidarity. Moreover, it can be said that discourse about the Beast creates an image of fear as socially constructed one that leads to the idea that there is a need for the authoritarian leadership to ensure the security and survival of the boys. It is clear, therefore, that submissiveness is neither an innate state nor a natural one; rather, it is a process of ideological construction created by means of fear, discourse, agreement, and force. In essence, what Golding tries to communicate is that domination is most powerful when those who are oppressed become active in maintaining their own oppression, showing clearly that the breakdown of civilization consists of both violence and a new use of language, ideology, and identity.

References

- Boggs, C. (1976). *Gramsci's Marxism*. Pluto Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 357–378). SAGE.
- Golding, W. (1954). *Lord of the flies*. Faber and Faber.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds. & Trans.). International Publishers.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. SAGE.
- Houssay-Holzschuch, M. (2020). Hegemony. In *International encyclopedia of human geography* (2nd ed.). Elsevier.
- Ives, P. (2004). *Language and hegemony in Gramsci*. Pluto Press.
- Jones, S. (2006). *Antonio Gramsci*. Routledge.
- Jones, S. (2016). *Antonio Gramsci*. Routledge.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2008). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (2nd ed.). Verso.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. SAGE.
- Mouffe, C. (Ed.). (1979). *Gramsci and Marxist theory*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Simon, R. (1991). *Gramsci's political thought: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Lawrence & Wishart.
- Storey, J. (2018). *Cultural theory and popular culture: An introduction* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>