UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education

Exploiting Unhappy Orcs & Gullible Hobbits

Colonialism and Oppression in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*

Silje Nilsen Strømsnes

Master's thesis in English literature ENG-3983-1, June 2021

Abstract

This master's thesis investigates J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* and specifically its three volumes: *The Fellowship of the Ring, The Two Towers,* and *The Return of the King*, from a post-colonial literary perspective. By examining these books based on Edward Said's theory of Orientalism and Frantz Fanon's ideas on national culture, reveals a new and original argument about Orcs and Hobbits which has been previously overlooked. In this thesis, I aim to argue the colonial situation of Orcs, and the oppressed situation of Hobbits. The first chapter explores the history of Orcs, from their creation, onto their portrayal in *LotR* and ultimately their chances of survival post-*LotR*. This chapter aims to explain that Orcs are deliberately portrayed as irredeemable, evil monsters and the reader is predisposed to see them objectively throughout *LotR*. Further, this portrayal is a result of the Orcs' history as a colonised race, in which they have been colonised by Morgoth, set free, and recolonized by Sauron and Saruman. The second chapter will explore the Hobbits' history as well and argue that they have been gradually oppressed by the Free Peoples to a point where they barely exist socially nor politically in Middle-earth. This oppression becomes problematic when discussing the Hobbits' portrayal in *LotR*, and what it means for them to partake in the War of the Ring. In the end, this thesis will compare the histories and oppressed situations of the Orcs and Hobbits and discuss the similarities and what benefits they gain from being part of the War of the Ring.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Notes and Abbreviations

1. The following is a list of Tolkien's texts used in this thesis. The listing will appear as the name of their first publication, the edition used, and the abbreviated names mentioned in this text. Abbreviations will be used throughout the text, except when citations do otherwise, and it will be appropriate to keep the original quotation. The three volumes make up a saga in which Tolkien bestowed the name: *The Lord of the Rings.* Only when referring to the saga, the abbreviation: *LotR* will be used. Otherwise, I will refer to the specific volumes with their respected abbreviations.

   a. *The Fellowship of the Ring: Being the first part of The Lord of the Rings.* First published in Great Britain by George Allen & Unwin 1954, edition used here: HarperCollins*Publishers,* 2008. Abbreviation will appear as: *FotR.*

   b. *The Two Towers: Being the second part of The Lord of the Rings.* First published in Great Britain by George Allen & Unwin 1954, edition used here: HarperCollins*Publishers,* 2008. Abbreviation will appear as: *TT.*

   c. *The Return of the King: Being the third part of The Lord of the Rings.* First published in Great Britain by George Allen & Unwin 1955, edition used here: HarperCollins*Publishers,* 2008. Abbreviation will appear as: *RotK.*

2. This thesis has chosen to use capital letters when addressing specific races and uncountable nouns for clarification. These include: Hobbits, Orcs, Goblins, Hobgoblins, Men, Dwarfs, Elves, Wizards, the Free Peoples. For emphasis, 'The War of the Ring' which refers to the conflict during *LotR*, will also be capitalised, and sometimes abbreviated to 'The War'. To stay consistent, I will keep original spelling in all quotations.

3. Please note that, for clarification, 'Orcs' will be used when discussing the race, although readers might be accustomed to *The Hobbit*'s use of 'Goblin'. Only when this discussion specifically speaks of Orc sub-breeds, will 'Goblin' and 'Hobgoblin' be used.

4. For further clarification, the Dark Lord Morgoth is also referred to as 'Melkor', which was his name before being labelled 'Evil'. This thesis will primarily use 'Morgoth', except when quotations use 'Melkor'.

5. For clarification on Tolkien's lore: Middle-earth is only a region in the world that Tolkien calls: Arda.

   a. Arda's timeline is separated into four Ages, all with different lengths (according to *RotK*: Appendix B):

   The First Age = Year 1 – unknown

   The Second Age = Year 1- 3441

   The Third Age = Year 1- 3021

   (*LotR* takes place in The Great Years of The Third Age: 3018-3021)

   The Fourth Age = Year 1- 119

1 General Introduction

J.R.R. Tolkien disapproved of allegorical readings of his works. As he put it, '[t]here is no "symbolism" or conscious allegory in my story. Allegory of the sort "five wizards=five senses" is wholly foreign to my way of thinking' (203). Many literary critics have disregarded this disapproval and seem to have agreed with a fact that Tolkien also seemed to come to terms with: '[a]n author cannot of course remain wholly unaffected by his experience' (*FotR* xxviii). In light of this, many scholarly publications have considered the effects of Tolkien's life and identity in *The Lord of the Rings* (Henceforth *LotR*). More specifically, there is sufficient research on *LotR's* connection to central twentieth-century elements, but little focus has been directed towards the critical study: post-colonialism. In this thesis, I aim to argue that, in *LotR*, Orcs are a colonised race and Hobbits have been oppressed since their earliest days. This interpretation will provide a new insight to the two races' history and portrayal in *LotR*, ultimately revealing that they are more complex than first anticipated.

In denial of Tolkien's disapproval of allegorical readings, scholars still analysed allegorical meanings in Tolkien's work. Anderson Rearick states that a light/dark dualism is present in *LotR*, and archetypal heroes are combined with brightness, and villains are typically reflected through darkness, similar to biblical imagery (864). Rearick explores Tolkien's life as a Judeo-Christian and concludes that this is Tolkien's direct inspiration (870). Respecting Tolkien's wishes appears difficult, when Tolkien himself admitted that: '*The Lord of the Rings* is of course a fundamentally religious and Catholic work; unconsciously so at first, but consciously in the revision' (Carpenter 164). After all, there are clear similarities with the biblical plotline and *LotR*. Morgoth, the first Dark Lord, rebelled against his creator (God) because he was jealous of his might and power - very similar to John Milton's mythology of Satan's emergence. Morgoth could not create, only change, and transform, so he moulded his own images of evil: The Orcs (*The Silmarillion* 38). Orcs have been described as corrupted versions of Elves (ibid.), suggesting that they are Tolkien's versions of daemons. And if the Orcs appear as daemons, then Morgoth certainly appears in the same narrative as the fiendish devil. Regardless, Tolkien's dislike of allegorical readings of his work seems to have been ignored, and many have already made connections with his life and religious allegories.

Additionally, several scholars relate to the argument that, 'the book is considered an obvious allegory for Adolf Hitler and World War II' (Winegar 1) and the Great War, which occurred during Tolkien's lifetime. Robert Tally argues that Tolkien's participation in the world wars

inspired his work: '[a]s a survivor of the Great War and the father of a Second World War veteran, Tolkien also exhibits a knowing ambivalence towards the horrors of battle' ('Demonizing the Enemy' 7). Michael Livingston discusses Frodo's reflection of a 'Shell-Shocked Hobbit' (2006), similarly to a veteran soldier who's survived World War I. Jerome Donnelly explores the possibility of Nazism occurring in the Shire and an 'applicability that invokes the practices of the recently defeated Nazis infus[ing] the Scouring chapter with satire' (83). However, few have mentioned the connections to post-colonialism. Jes Battis has drawn on post-colonial concerns like the 'imperial gaze' and races which embody colonial subjectivity that makes '[*LotR*] at first glance, easily accessible as a backdrop for postcolonial debate' (911). Battis' article: 'Hobbits, Elves, and the Queering of the Postcolonial Optic' investigates, as the title suggests, specifically Hobbits as 'displaced … ambivalent colonial subjects' (914). Further, it discusses several cases of queerness and otherness to explain that Hobbits act on anti-colonial resistance. Seeing that Battis is one of few who tackles post-colonialism in *LotR*, could imply that more research is necessary.

Even less focus has been given to post-colonialism's connection to *LotR* with a framework such as Orientalism. Astrid Winegar discusses 'Aspects of Orientalism in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*' and demonstrates several instances which point to an Orientalist reading of *LotR*: '[t]he potentially Orientalist themes are handled in a manner that encourages us to embrace Otherness, not distance ourselves from it' (9). Tally discusses humanity in Orcs to a great extent, although he does not consider a post-colonial perspective, which could move the discussion further. Only one other scholar has fundamentally discussed the Orcs' race in a post-colonial view; Louise Liebherr, in the form of a Ph-D dissertation which examines, 'whether or not *The Lord of the Rings* can be seen to function as a twentieth century post-colonial critique of colonial attitudes and ideas' (8), with a specific focus on Orientalism. These studies welcome the potential to analyse post-colonialism in *LotR* and demonstrate that Orientalism can be an essential method in analysing *LotR*. Given that Winegar and Liebherr are the only ones who engage with this specific view, this thesis will pursue the potentiality of expanding the post-colonial discussion focusing on Orientalism.

This thesis will build on this discussion and provide a similar post-colonial perspective, but with a different angle from Liebherr. This analysis will attempt a detachment from Tolkien's authorship and focus on the work as a stand-alone piece. This enables the resistant reader, such as myself, to discuss various aspects of Orcs and Hobbits without having to be concerned whether Tolkien meant for them to be interpreted in definitive ways. Resistant reading engages

in alternative readings of a well-known text, paving way to explore possible angles which have yet been discovered. Such a reading opens up possibilities to see behind the curtain of *LotR*, such as unethical processes like colonialism, exploitation, and inhuman consequences such as dissolution of nationality and identity. The existing debate on Tolkien's saga misses out on how post-colonial theory can explain that Orcs and Hobbits are oppressed races in Middle-earth. While there are a few studies on the matter, it seems that the discussion on Orcs have yet to fully expose the complexity of their race and colonised situation, and simultaneously highlight the underestimated villainy of their colonisers: Sauron and Saruman. Additionally, there seems to be more groundwork on Hobbits as colonial subjects, but I have yet to see a study that connects the colonial aspects (their oppressed history, the turbulent relation to other races, and the colonisation of the Shire) in one collected argument. This thesis will argue that the Orcs are a colonised race and has been colonised throughout their history, putting them in a unfavoured situation in *LotR* and in the future. I will also argue that the Hobbits have been oppressed by the Free Peoples from the start, and that this oppression shapes the Hobbits' view on life and Middle-earth through many centuries. The formation of their values and lifestyle made them easily persuaded by Gandalf to join the Ring-quest in *LotR*. Ultimately, the Hobbits Merry and Pippin stand strong to lead the Hobbit race out of oppression and into the geopolitical interplay in Middle-earth, but the long-standing oppressed, secluded life of the Hobbits hinders Merry and Pippin from succeeding.

1.1 Fantasy Unmasked

Fantasy, for Tolkien, was a way of getting closer to the important things of life than the realistic novel ever could. – Edward James

By filling an academic gap in the Tolkien debate, I will honour Tolkien's desire about fantasy being the best approach for meaningful discourse and this thesis will further show the importance of *LotR*. Tolkien aimed to change the idea that fantasy worlds were only for children, and one can see his 'greatest achievement … [was] normalizing the idea of a second world' (James 65), which has resulted in a wide field of literary critique to this day. Many might think that because of its imaginary factor, fantasy is meant only for entertainment and as a mode of escape. As Edward James lays out, '[f]antasy brings us Escape… a mental escape from the ugliness and evil around us' (66). On the contrary, it could be argued that, 'if fantasy

has a purpose other than to entertain, it is to show readers *how to perceive,* an extension of the argument is that fantasy may try to alter readers' perception of reality' (Chance, 'Tolkien and the Other' 171, italics in original). Fantasy opens up extraordinary possibilities for vast worlds and plotlines, which could seem natural to choose when one wants to relay important messages. Without worrying about making a story realistic, the author has unlimited ways to depict impactful messages, even in the most absurd portrayals of people and various situations. Tolkien might have had many reasons for writing fantasy, and James puts forth one possible and commendable point, that '[f]antasy, for Tolkien, was a way of getting closer to the important things of life than the realistic novel ever could' (69). Seeing as Tolkien might have written to depict the 'important things', for example, prejudice, the consequences of War, and cosmopolitanism, those important things would naturally be the easiest to spot. It seems crucial to investigate these aspects fully before remotely moving onto other potential theories and perspectives.

The principle of prejudice teaches us that preconceived notions about someone or something are a result of insufficient knowledge of said subject. Battis argues that, 'we are colonizing the hobbits as we read them – that we are, indeed, "reading" them into a corner' (916). I would add that we are simultaneously reading Orcs into a corner, because of the limited, fearful representation they receive in *LotR.* Because of this prejudiced 'colonization by reading' the scholar, as much as the common reader, label Orcs as evil monsters 'who lack any human right in Tolkien's world' (Tally, 'Let us now Praise' 21). This thesis will present evidence to argue that the Orcs' actions, which the narrator, the Free Peoples of Middle-earth and the reader condemn as evil, are enforced by the real antagonists of the plot: Sauron and Saruman. In light of this, it would be unfair to judge Orcs to be irredeemably evil, when the reason behind their actions is driven and forced by a colonised situation.

In the reader's eyes, the Hobbits are admired for being the main protagonists, and the moral of the story is that their smallness enables them to save the world. Problematically, this recognition barely scratches the surface of what certain Hobbits had to sacrifice to accomplish their mission. Frodo's mentality is so fractured after *LotR* that he no longer can live humanely in Middle-earth and lives the rest of his days in the West with the Elves. Merry, Pippin, and Sam are victims of interior othering once they return home, and even if they receive essential positions in the Shire, they have adapted their identity to being neither Hobbit nor any other race of Free Peoples. The romanticised portrayal of Hobbits and their endeavours in *LotR* makes it easy to perceive them as equally as much part of the Fellowship as the Free Peoples. With a resistant perspective, one

might discover that the Hobbits are, in reality, exploited and manipulated to participate in the War of the Ring. They successfully save all of Middle-earth, and the Free Peoples greatly admire Frodo, Sam, Merry, and Pippin. But the lack of recognition and change for the Hobbit race in general is a result of the continuous underestimation by the Free Peoples. Ultimately, the Hobbits of the Shire continue living their lives unchanged, reflecting the centuries of oppression from the Free Peoples. The Hobbits' endeavours in *LotR* are certainly the most important aspect of the plot, but the Hobbits receive anything but justice for their efforts. Therefore, by taking an extra interest in the Hobbits, one could see that their endeavours in The War seem modest compared to the harsh oppressed history they have been subject to and the injustice they might suffer after The War. Perhaps Tolkien aimed to highlight that the smallest protagonists could save the world when the strong couldn't, but there certainly are additional essential things to discover in Hobbits.

1.2 Orientalism

This thesis will focus on post-colonial theory to back up several claims. I will base my argument on ideas of Otherness, colonial subjectivity, and identity, and on Frantz Fanon's ideas on national culture. I will use Edward Said's theory of Orientalism when making my argument about the colonial situation of the Orcs. The four dogmas[1] of Orientalism determine what falls into the category of 'Oriental' and 'Occidental'. According to these dogmas, Orcs are Oriental, specifically because they are associated with Mongols, signalling why they are colonised. Three of Said's dogmas (the first, third and fourth) will be directly applicable in analysing Orcs in *LotR*. The first applies to the immediate difference one can notice between the Free Peoples of Middle-earth and the Orcs as two opposites: 'one is the absolute and systematic difference between the West, which is rational, developed, humane, superior, and the Orient, which is aberrant, undeveloped, inferior' (300). This dogma explains the view of Orientalism in its simplest form, though the third dogma delves into more detail which applies to more specific cases:

---

[1] The word 'dogma' will be retained in this thesis when discussing Orientalism, although it is Said's own term, in which he uses when discussing Orientalism.

the Orient is eternal, uniform, and incapable of defining itself; therefore it is assumed that a highly generalized and systematic vocabulary for describing the Orient from a Western standpoint is inevitable and even scientifically 'objective'. (301)

The West would, in this case, objectify the Orient and assume authority over the generalised East, whereas the primary consequence applies to the Orient's identity and human condition, posing a concern for the central unethical process that is colonisation. This dogma can also be responsible for demonising the enemy, as the demonisation of Orcs. Lastly, the fourth dogma results in interest to deal with the aberrant Orient: 'the Orient is at bottom something either to be feared (the Yellow Peril, the Mongol hordes, the brown dominions) or to be controlled (by pacification, research and development, outright occupation whenever possible)' (ibid.). These three dogmas appear in a sequence: The Orient is dealt with, from an inferior label to dehumanisation, resulting in constraint or elimination. This thesis will demonstrate how Orcs go through this sequence in Tolkien's *LotR*.

Using Said's theory of Orientalism can further elaborate that the narrative plays on Otherness, highlighting the distinction between the familiarity in the characters who reflect the Western bias and the unfamiliar enemy we initially know little about. Three of the four dogmas are fully suitable to explain Orcs as Oriental; however, Hobbits are a more complicated case. It is questionable whether Hobbits fit into the western category. They undergo heavy cultural and social oppression by the Free Peoples. But because of this, the Hobbits can qualify for the first dogma of Orientalism. The third and fourth dogmas are somewhat relevant to Hobbits, too, with some alteration to their meaning. Hobbits are forced to define themselves because of the complete disregard from other races. They are perceived objectively and ultimately underestimated and disregarded rather than feared and controlled, as explained in the fourth dogma. Nonetheless, Hobbits come from a region within 'the West', which raises the question if they are Occidental on that ground, even if they also share characteristics with the Orient. The dogmas of Orientalism will highlight the position in which the West objectifies the Oriental and simultaneously show how the Orcs' and Hobbits' colonial situation enforces the Otherness and marginalisation that occurs in *LotR*.

Scholars might oppose this thesis' use of Orientalism to discuss Orcs as Oriental, in the sense that the narrative of *LotR* repeatedly identifies the friendly and familiar regions as 'the West' while there is no clear significance that 'the East' is, in itself, an unfriendly, geographical space. 'The East' is merely used for directional purposes, instead of implying that 'the East' is in itself evil. I will explain later how this thesis' views will differ from Liebherr's incorporation of Orientalism in *LotR*, where she argues that *LotR* does not play on a generalised East and therefore is not explicable in terms of Orientalism. Winegar additionally argues that *LotR* does not correlate with Orientalism on the same ground: 'an Orientalist reading of Tolkien's text makes sense. However, Tolkien's East is not inherently evil; it has *become* evil because [of] Sauron' (4, italics in original). Even though there are conflicting arguments, this thesis' interpretation of Orientalism will bring a different light to the humanity of Orcs. On the other hand, some might oppose this thesis because of its deficient use of Orientalism on Hobbits, although incorporating any other, perhaps more fitting, theoretical frameworks would have required its own devoted thesis. It could have been more convenient to elaborate on indigenous literary theory because of the Hobbits' exclusion from Middle-earth based on their comparatively undeveloped society. This, I encourage others to explore further.

Comparing the colonial history of the Orcs and the Hobbits will reveal the similarities in their relation to other races and the differences that clarifies the degree of their oppressed and colonised situation. The fourth dogma shows that the main difference between the two races indicates that Orcs are treated as something that needs to be feared and represent a natural enemy. The Hobbits are the complete opposite in that they appear as non-threatening to the degree of complete disregard. This difference implies that Orcs have been physically colonised, but the Hobbits have lived peacefully under psychological oppression by being wholly ostracised. While both races share the same level of unimportance to society except for their single purpose in *LotR*, to fight or destroy the Ring, Orcs have experienced far more violent and traumatic colonisation than Hobbits, who have found peace in their oppressed society.

This thesis acknowledges an external, limited, Occidentally-aligned narration, whereas the Hobbits' experiences are still narrated Occidentally due to the narration acknowledging their affiliation with the West. Naturally, for the purpose of the plot, the narration is constructed Occidentally to enhance the Otherness of the enemy as well as strengthening the effects of the central conflict. On the other hand, it further hinders the reader to evaluate the complexity of Orcs. As part of this study, this narrative perspective will highlight why the reader is introduced to negatively-represented Orcs, and how it establishes the Orcs as Oriental in the reader's eyes

throughout *LotR*. Because of the Occidentally-aligned narration, the reality of the Hobbits' oppression might not be too visible, considering that their oppression has been deemed unimportant to the true Occidental West of *LotR*, the Free Peoples who disregarded them in the first place.

1.2.1 Racism

Much attention has been given to the argument that Tolkien's *LotR* is racist. The most common accusation seems to be that *LotR* shows racism in its portrayal of black Orcs who are irrevocably evil (*FotR* 422). Christine Chism conveniently summarises the charges of racism toward Tolkien that exist in scholarly works today:

> Critics who accuse Tolkien of racism fall into three camps: those who see him as intentionally racist; those who see him as having passively absorbed the racism or Eurocentrism of his time; and those who, tracing an evolution in his writing, see him becoming aware of a racism/Eurocentrism implicit in his early works and taking care to counter it in his later ones. (558)

In a 'The Guardian' publication, John Yatt outright states that '*Lord of the Rings* is racist' ('Wraiths and race' 2002). Yatt considers the work racist, and not necessarily Tolkien himself, placing Yatt in the second camp. This article has received criticism for being seemingly based on the movie adaptations contrary to the novels. The main counter-argument goes as follows: '[d]on't blame Tolkien for what Jackson does unless it is based on the original text' (Rearick 863). Rearick and Tally seem to fall under the second camp as well. Rearick's 'The Dark Face of Racism examined in Tolkien's World' (2004) discusses Tolkien's identity and whether he was racist or not when portraying the Orcs in *LotR*. The results show that 'Tolkien's connection as more historically linguistic and cultural than racial' (864) and that, 'Orcs in particular [are] based more on an archetypal and Judeo-Christian parameter than a racial one' (ibid.). Tally considers many humanlike factors which appear in *LotR* to counter the accusations of racism, in which he states, 'even if one were to accuse Tolkien of racism (which I am not doing), racism alone would not explain Tolkien's treatment of the Orcs' ('Let us now Praise' 20). Tally finds that Orcs are treated differently than other human races of colour and, 'are not viewed as a

subordinate or inferior race of humans, but as entirely inhuman' (21). It appears that Rearick and Tally thoroughly counter the racial references made about *LotR*. Chism's last point about the author becoming aware of supposedly racist portrayals is partly demonstrated by Tolkien's son, Christopher Tolkien. He discusses Tolkien's comments and numerous unpublished notes about descriptions that might have incidentally come across as inappropriate. Christopher Tolkien's 12-book series: *The History of Middle-earth* (1983-1996) and Humphrey Carpenter's (2000) collection of Tolkien's letters include explanations that contradict the racist accusations and Tolkien's motivations for his works. Since the everyday reader might overlook these publications, suspicions of racism could still remain.

In addition to the points presented above, the debate surrounding the supposed racism in *LotR* seems to provoke considerable attention to disclaim such comments, as in for example Rearick's 'Dark face of Racism' (2004), Tally's 'Let us now Praise Famous Orcs' (2010), and Sue Kim's 'Beyond Black and White' (2004). Winegar points out that the accusative tendency, such as calling the story 'racist', has consequences because 'this kind of blustery, ill-informed commentary … might lead a newcomer to *The Lord of the Rings* milieu to have second thoughts about entering Middle-earth' (2). This fact could intimidate interested individuals from contributing to Tolkien studies by misleading them to think that the debate focuses on racism. Ultimately when discussing Orcs and their portrayal, valuable discussions might have been lost due to a focus on whether Tolkien was racist in his narrative or not.

1.2.2 Post-Colonialism

The Tolkien debate is far-reaching and covers many topics, but little has been said about Tolkien's narrative from a post-colonial perspective. Battis discusses 'the Postcolonial Optic' where he explicitly argues that Hobbits are 'socially marginalized and culturally othered' (909) and finds that 'the hobbits are cultural strangers within the densely complex interplay of humans, Dwarves, and Elves that (allegedly) drives the political force of the world' (912). Battis' main arguments will be highly suitable to support this thesis' discussion on the Hobbits' colonial situation contrary to the Orcs'. Winegar's analysis on post-colonialism exposes that: 'Tolkien displays Orientalist tendencies in his description of the geography of Middle-earth [because the land] bears a striking resemblance to the continents of Europe and Asia' (3). Winegar justifies her use of Orientalism when analysing *LotR* because:

> [T]he East/West binary construction necessitates an examination of the text in obviously Orientalist terms, if we define Orientalism as a way of looking at other people with preconceived assumptions and assigned notions of essential characteristics. (1)

This explanation signifies that *LotR*'s characters are driven by prejudice and particular expectations of racial characteristics. Battis's and Winegar's articles limit themselves in discussion, perhaps because of the publication's length, and they leave many aspects of post-colonial concerns open for discussion. These post-colonial concerns can be furthered in discussions of the oppressed situation of Hobbits, but also possibilities of investigating other races, such as Orcs, with the same perspective.

This thesis differs in some ways from the only study on Orientalism and Orcs, that of Liebherr. Liebherr goes only so far in arguing that '[Orcs] are subjugated into the role of the colonial subject' (79) because they represent the ultimate 'other', which is similar to the procedure this thesis will undertake. Her discussion appears restricted because much is left unsaid – for example, Orcs have been colonial subjects since their creation. Additionally, one sentence alone closes off a range of interpretations which she misses out on, 'not one example exists in the text whereby the Free Peoples can be seen to either treat the Orcs, Uruk-hai or Ringwraiths with sympathy or try to view things from their perspective' (100). On the contrary, if Liebherr regards Hobbits as Free Peoples, the Hobbits give the reader access to the Orcs' life and behaviour several times, suggesting a sympathetic situation. As a result, this thesis will take form as somewhat of a continuation of Liebherr's analytical path.

This thesis adds to the work of Battis and Winegar. There are certain aspects these scholars have given little thought to or not considered at all. Battis examines how Tolkien's text treats language, but this thesis will approach language as evidence of colonisation and serve justice to the complexity of the culture and identity of Orcs. Ultimately, Battis and Winegar do not discuss Orcs with the Orientalist framework, and Liebherr stands as the only exception. However, Liebherr makes certain points which this thesis' angle disagrees with, such as considering Said's third dogma to be irrelevant, based on an outlook that the entire Eastern realms of Middle-earth represents the Orient and therefore Orcs (who do not live there) are not

Oriental. She additionally interprets the fourth dogma in a different angle than this thesis will encourage when arguing that:

> [in] Middle-earth … the East is clearly something to be feared … [because] the chief source of evil in the text is located in the East, [but] it is not something inherent in the people or the lands in the East which arouses this fear in the people from the West. (137)

Winegar seems to agree that Tolkien did not depict the East as an, 'inherently evil' unit either, although this thesis will argue that Orcs affiliate with the East regardless. This thesis' investigation on Orcs shows that the Free Peoples of Middle-earth, such as Gandalf, express fearful comments for specifically Orcs and deliberately spreads this fear to Hobbits and the reader. Furthermore, Liebherr confidently finds that 'there is no evidence in the text to support the claim that the peoples in the West view the people in the eastern regions of Middle-earth as entities which need to be controlled' (136). This thesis' interpretation proposes that Orcs are necessary to control to avoid further savage behaviour, although the West does not perceive this fact because the Oriental Orcs are not vital enough for the West to acknowledge. This thesis is ultimately more interested in Orientalist processes for representing the Orcs than in the legitimacy of an East/West geographical divide in Middle-earth.

1.3   The Tolkien Debate Continues

This thesis will advocate a way to analyse Tolkien's *LotR* without devoting too much time to his authorship and potential reasonings behind his work. Orientalism assists in this relatively new way of interpreting *LotR* and revealing particular characteristics with Orcs and Hobbits that have yet been discussed. The post-colonial field in Tolkien studies could benefit from more attention, given the lack of research and potential discussion, as shown by Battis, Winegar, and Liebherr. Therefore, this thesis will contribute to the analysis of Otherness, colonial subjectivity, and disregard of smaller races in a global community as seen with Orcs and Hobbits.

Primarily, this thesis aims to assist Liebherr in furthering the discussion on Orcs in a colonial perspective through Orientalism. The debate on Orcs will also build on Tally's research on Orcs' humanity, in which their humanity is further enforced by their colonial situation, that Tally did not recognise. Viewing Orcs as a colonised race shows that they are more complex than what has been previously recognised, and also reveals their colonisers as more terrible than first anticipated. Not only are Sauron and Saruman vicious warlords, but they are willing to go so far as violating the Orcs' race through colonisation to achieve power.

The first chapter about Orcs will provide a thorough reading of the Orc-encounters throughout Arda's history, from their first appearance in *The Silmarillion* until their predicted future after *RotK,* to show that the Orcs are in reality colonised and deserve a sympathetic re-evaluation. In this process, the discussion will establish that readers deliberately dehumanise Orcs because of an Occidentally-aligned narration that fixes the harsh interpretation of them as irredeemable monsters throughout the narrative. On the other hand, I will demonstrate that Hobbits provide readers with an insight into Orcs' reality, which proves that they possess human characteristics. These characteristics reveal that Orcs have a neglected situation, in which they dwell in a colonised state, and have throughout history been colonised, set free, and re-colonised. A section on colonialism will therefore occupy most of the chapter. By the time of *LotR*, their post-colonial situation resulted in the re-colonisation by Sauron and Saruman due to being unable to regain their pre-colonial identity. A devoted sub-chapter on Saruman reflects a colonial politician who will sufficiently reveal the Orcs' colonial situation during *LotR*. Lastly, this discussion will predict that Orcs are not remotely close to realising a post-colonial reality that promotes peace and effective social development, because their continuous othering hinders them from being treated as anything but threatening Orientals.

The section on Hobbits will connect the points of previous influential scholarly articles, which separately discuss various sections of the Hobbits' history. While others have hesitated to claim the longevity of their oppression, this thesis will see the relation between the early signs of oppression in history, the tense relationship with other races and the unsurprising colonisation of the Shire during the penultimate chapter: 'The Scouring of The Shire'. Other scholars have adequately focused on the actual events of 'The Scouring of the Shire', although this thesis will explore that the colonisation resulted from the inferior, non-threatening image the Hobbits give off to the rest of Middle-earth. In the end, as no other scholar has declared, Hobbits gain little from the Ring-quest due to the devastating consequences of being Othered by their people and barely earning an acknowledged position to the rest of Middle-earth from their endeavours.

The second chapter will lay out an analysis of the less obvious oppression of the Hobbits to show that they have indeed been indirectly colonised throughout time, forced to change and adapt their identity and culture to survive, and further so during the plot of *LotR*. This Hobbit chapter will discuss their position in-between the Oriental and the Occidental, making them victims of colonisation. A general explanation of their history in Middle-earth brings forth a sense of disregard and exclusion from the Middle-earth social sphere. Due to their Otherness, Hobbits are exploited and manipulated into fearful and undesired quests in *The Hobbit* and most importantly in *LotR* because of their unique attribute of not caring about power. As a result of this, the Hobbits betray the essential component of 'Hobbitness' as they become queer to their fellow Shire-dwellers for leaving the Shire in the first place. By being detached from their pacifistic identity, the Hobbits gain the tools to fight the colonisation that Saruman administers in 'The Scouring of the Shire'. Ultimately, Hobbits will be compared to Orcs in their colonial situation and I will discuss why they could resist colonisation, but Orcs could not. Therefore, I will discuss that Hobbits are not oppressed to such a degree as Orcs, which proves that the Hobbits are not 'Oriental'; however, they do not have any authority to label themselves as Occidental. Therefore, Hobbits are a middleman between Orientals and Occidentals.

2   Chapter 1: Unravelling the Colonised Orcs

At first glance, the reader undoubtedly interprets the Orcs as the enemy of the main characters. Orcs are immediately associated with evil when it is announced that they are servants of the terrifying Dark Lord. Scholars Helen Young and Tom Shippey explain the audience's general interpretation of the Orcs:

> Orcs cannot be considered in the same way as the other species of Middle-earth since they were specifically created for malicious purposes and are … under the domination of Sauron's malevolent will' (Young 358),

> Orcs entered Middle-earth originally just because the story needed a continual supply of enemies over whom one need feel no compunction'. (Tom Shippey, quoted in Tally 'Demonizing the Enemy' 6)

The Orcs appear as merciless murderers, distorted figures who use violence and vicious, black humour to hurt and scare the main characters. This interpretation is navigated mostly by Gandalf, which shows that the reader is predisposed to perceive the Orcs as feral monsters, unworthy of sympathy. This chapter will delve into how this representation manifests, what makes the reader inclined to view Orcs as terrible and evil, and how the reader might ignore potential sympathetic attributes of the Orcs later on. Once the reader has gotten a considerable portion of negative Orc representation, the chances are low for them to acknowledge the several human traits that Hobbits unravel throughout *LotR*. The Hobbits Frodo, Sam, Pippin, and Merry frequently find themselves hiding and running from Orcs. When captured by the Orcs, the Hobbits become victims of vicious taunting for sport and entertainment. But as this chapter will show, the Hobbits Sam, Merry, and Pippin also reveal the Orcs' identities as something other than monsters through their encounters with them, as presented in this chapter. The Hobbits help the Orcs show that they possess fear, hate, mercy, humour, empathy, loyalty, critical thinking, and rationality. Additionally, the Hobbits unravel that Orcs possess complex ethnic structures with several sub-races who speak different languages and come from varying geographical regions. Through the open-mindedness of the Hobbits, certain Orc-features are

revealed, showing their actual colonial background, and making them worthy of the reader's sympathy and re-evaluation.

The Orcs' history reflects that of a colonised race because, before colonisation, they were once an independent Elven race called the Avari. Orcs were corrupted and disfigured by the first Dark Lord, Morgoth. Morgoth comprehensively colonised them through social manipulation, exploited their unhappiness, and made them serve in his army. I will discuss whether the Orcs still possessed some of their original Elven qualities, since it is clear that Morgoth failed to subjugate them completely. Problematically, being colonised by Morgoth resulted in a savage lifestyle for the Orcs. With Morgoth defeated, the Orcs received their sovereignty abruptly and without a decolonisation initiative. In between the Orcs' colonised periods, the Orcs resorted to plundering, murder, and savagery because of their lack of societal- and organisational-knowledge. Because the Orcs did not create a self-reliant, functional society, the Free Peoples instead feared them and pushed them to live underground and in the mountains. Because they were colonised and failed to build themselves up while independent, the Orcs were once again colonised by Sauron and Saruman in *LotR*. Saruman reveals clear similarities with a European colonist and a well-spoken politician through his strong rhetoric and manipulation. When colonised, the Orcs are unhappy and show a reluctance to fight, which the Hobbits witness and convey to the reader. When Saruman and Sauron are defeated, the Orcs are once again independent. Because of the bad conditions Aragorn gives them after The War by Aragorn, their future seems bleak, involving continuous conflict, starvation, murder, plunder, and chaos. The end of the saga does not suggest a happy ending for the Orcs, but a destiny driven by oppression by the Free Peoples or re-colonisation.

This chapter will primarily discuss Said's theory of Orientalism in relation to *LotR*. *LotR* appears to reflect, 'Orientalism as a Western Style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient' (Said 3). The structure represents a clear distinction between the characters in *LotR* who seem part of 'the Occident', Western characters, and Orcs who seem part of 'the Orient'. Said distinguishes between the Occidental and the Oriental as, 'the familiar (Europe, the West, "us") and the strange (the Orient, the East, "them")' (43). *LotR* demonstrates that the West affiliates with good, and the East symbolises evil and uncertainty:

The weather was still grey and overcast, with wind from the East, but as evening drew into night the sky away westward cleared, and pools of faint light, yellow and pale green, opened under the grey shores of cloud. (*FotR* 501)

This imagery clarifies that gloomy weather is 'caused' by the East, and brightness and clear weather directly associates hope with the West. On multiple occasions, it seems that the narration distinguishes between a good 'North/West'. Hope and clarity are once again associated with the North and West: 'into the distance, north and west … the sky was again clear' (371). The Free Peoples seem to affiliate with the West in multiple situations, making them Occidentals: 'Aragorn gave [the sword] a new name and called it Andúril, Flame of the West' (360), and calls their lingua franca 'Westron' (441). Although the narration rarely states that the Free Peoples solely belong in the collective West, the mightier beings such as Elves and High Elves 'are far north and west' (453). The South/East seem to represent the opposite, the Orient: 'and away far east and south there were wars and growing fear' (57) and 'the darkening East' (101). *LotR* seems to operate with an Orientalist structure, whereas the Occidental West includes the North, and the Oriental East includes the South. These presentations indicate a pattern that Westwards (the Occident) equals holy and hopeful, Middle-earth equals a middle-ground, and Eastwards (the Orient) equals uncertainty and fear.

The geographical Orientalist associations might not be as explicit in the *LotR* narration with specific characters and races, but the East/West imagery could link characters as either Occidental or Oriental. Even though the Orcs do not receive a direct label as 'Eastern', their negative representation, similar to the fearful representation of the East, could easily regard them as Oriental in the readers' eyes. Tolkien specifically described Orcs as 'Mongol-types' with stereotypically Asian features (Carpenter 274), reflecting Oriental characteristics. I will discuss that the narration deliberately presents the Orcs negatively, and their Oriental identity comes forth clearly in *LotR*.

The narration characterises an Occidentally-aligned narrative perspective. The third-person narrator is mainly affiliated with the Hobbits and sometimes with Gandalf, who are Occidental in this regard, given their connection to the Western Middle-earth and being part of the Free Peoples. Winegar considers the idea that '[*LotR*] is told from a singular Hobbit perspective, not the perspective of a citizen of the East, and in that sense, we might concur with the Orientalist,

or racial reading' (4) but she hesitates to elaborate further on this idea. Battis discusses that the Hobbits are the primary narrators and presents that, '[a]lthough the human character, Aragorn, occasionally takes up the narrative, the hobbits are the primary lens through which the reader experiences Middle-earth' (911-912). One of the most prominent arguments that Said presents is that narrativity represents the role of 'the Occident' in a written work, whereas 'Orientalism is premised upon exteriority, that is, on the fact that the Orientalist … makes the Orient speak' (20). The narrator inhabits a 'strategic position' where they must locate themselves compared to the Orient and assume the authority of the West's relation to it. Said further explains this strategic location:

> includes the kind of narrative voice [the narrator] adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kind of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text - all of which add up to deliberate ways of addressing the reader. (ibid.)

The Occidentally-oriented narration deliberately addresses the reader because Gandalf explicitly represents the Orcs as irredeemably evil and fixes the Orcs' image. Said additionally argues that Occident-aligned narration is never concerned with the Orient unless vital for and to the West. Evidence of this we find in *The Silmarillion*: 'the uncounted legions of the Orcs perished like straw in a great fire … Few remained to trouble the world for long years after' (231). Not only are Orcs seen as pure trouble, but they are of no concern to the Occident unless they pose a severe threat, and so they are not mentioned by narration until *The Hobbit*. The strategic positioning of the Occidental narrator represents the Oriental Orcs through the Occident's perspective, by the evidence that they do not initiate their presence and only appear when it is vital to the Occident. Orcs only appear in the narration when Occident/western Characters are present or bring up Orcs, meaning no Oriental Orcs initiate a single passage in *LotR*. This chapter will discuss various examples that reflect an Occidentally-aligned narrator because Orcs constantly represent the Orient in the narrator's eyes. Even if Hobbits seem Western in their cultural associations, they lack Occidental colonisers' authority because they are themselves colonised, which I will discuss in Chapter two. But because of this complication, the Hobbits can perceive Orcs neutrally and give the reader a chance to understand the Orcs better. The Hobbits reveal sympathetic and overlooked characteristics with Orcs, such as fear,

concern, humour, hatred for their colonisers, and a degree of independent and critical thinking, distinguishing them from feral monsters.

2.1 First Description

Without any prior knowledge of the world of Middle-earth, the reader might initially perceive the Orcs as villains in fairy tales or monsters in the distance. The narrator describes them as far away, in incidents that happened some time ago, giving the impression that they are frightening legends (*FotR* 14-15). The first mention of their existence to Frodo's knowledge is through distant rumours that 'Orcs were multiplying again in the mountains' (57). These fearful rumours might intentionally introduce these beings as enemies, giving the reader an impression that the protagonists should especially beware of them. The missing introduction could indicate that the Orcs did not need an explanation and that their mention should be sufficient for the reader to understand the terror they bring. From the start, it is suggested that Orcs are a foul enemy and that it's dreadful news for the main characters to receive.

Orcs are described in more detail in the Mines of Moria, once 'the fellowship' ventures there. This scene reveals the Occident Gandalf and deliberately shapes the first impression of Orcs for the reader towards a negative angle. Gandalf warns the group: '[t]here are Orcs, very many of them … [a]nd some are large and evil: black Uruks of Mordor' (*FotR* 422). An emergency calls for brief, immediate information that will benefit the best preparations. Therefore, the Orcs appear large, evil, and black, shaping the reader's opinion when continuing to read. In this situation, the narrator, who I have presented as Orientalist, exercises the 'Oriental precedent'. Said argues that '[e]very writer on the Orient … assumes some Oriental precedent, some previous knowledge of the Orient, to which he refers and on which he relies' (Said 20). Given that Gandalf is an Occidental character, the Orientalist narration reflects Gandalf's relationship with the Orient. Gandalf has experienced Orcs negatively during The Hobbit and convinces the blissfully ignorant Fellowship that Orcs are irredeemably evil Gandalf specifically does his work as an Orientalist because:

> to a very large extent the Orientalist provides his own society with representations of the Orient … that illustrate his conception of what the Orient can or ought to be … that

provide Orientalist discourse with what, at that moment, it seems most in need of. (Said 273)

 The reader receives the Orcs' negative representation because of Gandalf's Oriental precedent and accepts that it is justified to kill the savage Orcs. Gandalf additionally represent the Orient as it seems 'most in need of' because they are in an emergency, and the other members of the Fellowship need to be scared of the Oriental Orcs. Therefore, the first impression is already tainted, reducing the chances of the reader's sympathy for the Orcs. Tally argues that presenting the Orcs in a bad light encourages the reader to support the main characters: 'it is easier to fight and to cheer on the fighters if one can be convinced that the other side is irredeemably evil.' ('Let us now Praise' 22). Not only does this representation increase the reader's support for the main characters, but the reader will be less open-minded toward Orcs later on. When Orcs' real background comes to light, this first impression will hinder readers from considering the Orc's potential innocence and strengthen their encouragement for the Occident characters.

2.2   First Direct Encounter

The second important meeting with the Orcs occurs in the woods surrounding the Anduin river, where Orcs chase the fellowship. The Orcs pursue, attack, and kill without a second thought; and do not give the reader any indication that they can speak, think, or decide anything for themselves. Through this representation, the reader discovers that the Orcs are animalistic monsters which further manifest a negative impression. The presence of Orcs in the woods, feral monsters surrounding the Fellowship, can bring readers a haunting nightmare. Cries and harsh voices fill the scenery, a terrifying presence associated with what Aragorn knows as cruel enemies, '[Aragorn] stiffened. There were cries, and among them, to his horror, he could distinguish the harsh voices of Orcs.' (*TT* 537). Aragorn is in a state of nervousness, not knowing where the cries are coming from and where the potential position of his allies are. The uncertainty is enough to emphasize the chilling atmosphere in the woods. The cries continue horrifically, '[f]ierce and shrill rose the yells of the Orcs' (538), adding to the suspense and nightmarish experience in the woods. Because of this imagery, the Orcs most definitely fit into the fourth dogma of Orientalism, 'that the Orient is at bottom something to either be feared or controlled' (Said 301). I will go further into their colonised state, but in this scene, the Oriental

Orcs can appear as being both controlled by Saruman and simultaneously feared by the Occidentals. These first encounters with Orcs show nothing more than their animalistic tendencies, enhancing the Orcs' Otherness. Verlyn Flieger argues that Orcs have 'clawlike' hands, 'rending nails,' and legs 'made of wire and horn' which further shows the animalistic portrayal of Orcs, and as Flieger summarises, it creates 'the image of a creature out of a bestiary' (208). This imagery of wild animals parallels the same metaphor Lucy Jarosz shows being used about Africa and its people during the darkening of the African continent (112). This further signifies the feral Orcs as something to be feared. They are, like the Africans, 'described in stereotypic terms as creatures of darkness' (ibid.). The reader's first impression of the previous encounter with the Orcs further hardens the negative interpretation. The sure feeling of being chased by these feral creatures determines that the reader sees the Orcs as only animalistic. From here on out, the multiple layers of the Orcs promote their sympathetic value, although the reader's negative foundation will be hard to bend.

The Orcs' physical characteristics further implies an Occidentally-aligned narration, encouraging the Oriental Orcs' Otherness and making them more repelling. The narrator describes the Orcs (as it seems, through Occidental Aragorn's eyes) as, 'goblin-soldiers of greater stature, swart, slant-eyed, with thick legs and large hands.' (*TT* 540). This description correlates somewhat with Tolkien's description that these characters possess Oriental traits, similarly to non-western races:

> The Orcs are definitely stated to be corruptions of the 'human' form seen in Elves and Men. They are (or were) squat, broad, flat-nosed, sallow-skinned, with wide mouths and slant eyes: in fact, degraded and repulsive versions of the (to Europeans) least lovely Mongol-types. (Carpenter 274)

In short, he gives us an image that the Orcs are Oriental. They are openly connected to Mongols and conceived with stereotypically Oriental features: disproportionately short and broad, with 'yellow-like' skin, slanted eyes, as well as flat-noses and wide mouths. To recall, Said also mentioned Mongols in his fourth dogma: 'the Mongol hordes' (301). This description suggests that Orcs were considered inferior to European standards and as Other. Said points out that, 'Orientalism is never far from what Denys Hay has called the idea of Europe, a collective noun identifying "us" Europeans as against all "those" non-Europeans' (7), which correlates with the

depiction of Orcs as being foreign and strange, making them Other. Flieger points out that Orcs are prone to 'familiar Western-inspired racial stereotypes', making them 'objects of distinct racial bias' because it is 'difficult not to see in this reference to the conventional nineteenth-century European projections of the racially suspect East' (206). Even if the Orcs' description seems innocent, the reader could subconsciously apply these racial stereotypes, enforcing the Otherness of the Oriental Orcs. The emphasis on the Orcs' unfamiliar and perhaps foreign characteristics further encourages the reader's hostility toward Orcs. The following subsection discusses that Hobbits reveal the pure and unconditional representation of the Oriental Orcs, but the reader is by that point predisposed to neglect this representation.

2.3   The Orcs and Hobbits

The Hobbits mainly carry out more in-depth descriptions and sympathies with the Orcs. It does not seem like the Hobbits have a prejudicial relation to the Orcs, and they can therefore see them neutrally. McFadden demonstrates that Tolkien might have given Hobbits an open-mindedness for this purpose: 'he makes Sam's first impulse to try to see the [Swerting]'s humanity and to imagine what he would be like if there had been no war.' (159-160). The Hobbits reveal the Orcs' identities as something other than monsters. Even though the Hobbits come from a Western region of Middle-earth, which could label them as 'Occidental' characters, they do not show an apparent authority over the Orcs but rather a neutral standing. Merry and Pippin engage with the Uruk-Hai Orcs, and Sam and Frodo encounter Orcs on their journey to Mordor, where they seem to listen to and acknowledge the Orcs. Even when it seemed like the Occident Gandalf managed to incorporate negative first impressions of Orcs during 'First Description' and the Oriental narrator's animalistic portrayal during 'First Proper Encounter', the Hobbits did not seem affected. By looking closer at passages through the Hobbits' perspective, we see evidence that the Orcs are worthy of sympathy and that they are a colonised race rather than irredeemable monsters.

Merry and Pippin overhear a quarrel between the Orcs which clearly shows some prominent human emotions: loyalty and critical thinking. The Orcs disagree on which master they would please, 'Is Saruman the master or the Great Eye [Sauron]? … We should go back at once to [Sauron's tower]' (*TT* 581). This disagreement could be about whom the Orcs were loyal to or whom they feared the most. In general, it might prove that they are conscious enough to make their own decision about whom to obey. The Orc Uglúk clearly expresses critical thinking in

this situation: 'I don't trust you little swine' (ibid.), indicating that he makes up his own opinions and is sceptical toward a foreign Orc. The other Orc shows some independent reflection as he plots revenge against Uglúk for the mean comment, '[w]ho does *he* think he is, setting up his own with his filthy white badges? [The bosses in Lugbúrz] might agree with me, with Grishnákh their trusted messenger' (ibid.). It seems like a headless quarrel in-between the enemies, but these comments demonstrate a more complex background. Tolkien argued that Orcs were indeed rational creatures, capable of independent thinking, although in a mean nature, 'the Orcs – who are fundamentally a race of 'rational incarnate' creatures, though horribly corrupted, if no more so than many Men to be met today.' (Carpenter 185). The dialogue between the Orcs reveals that these Orcs can reflect independently and rationally, motivated by their loyalty to their masters.

The quarrel additionally confirms that there are multiple sub-races of Orcs, further enforcing their humanity. One Orc curses Isengarders and mentions taking the Hobbits to 'Lugbúrz' (*TT* 581), Sauron's dark tower, indicating that it could be Sauron's soldier. Initially, the reader might assume that all Orcs are associated with Isengard, but evidently, at least two different platoons are present. An attentive reader might notice that *The Hobbit* and *LotR* use 'Goblin', 'Hobgoblin', 'Orc' and *snaga* interchangeably (*The Hobbit* 1). In *The Hobbit*, the narrator explains that 'Orc' is translated to 'Goblin' and suggests that larger goblins would be called 'Hobgoblins' (ibid.). Christopher Tolkien finds that Orcs, 'are to be regarded as a more formidable kind of "Goblin"' (*Return of the Shadow* 437). Lastly, the narration presents an addition to these labels in *LotR*, 'the lesser kinds were called, especially by the Uruk-hai, *snaga* "slave"' (*RotK:* Appendix F 1486, italics in original). These four labels alone demonstrate four very distinctive versions of what the reader knows as the generalised Orc. The narrative explains that there are at least two different Orc-tribes in general. However, it does not specify which label they hold, 'of the older tribes, such as those that still lingered in the North and in the Misty Mountains, had long used the Westron as their native language' (1486-87), indicating that they also come from different native areas. While there is insufficient information to label the Orcs present in the quarrel specifically, it suggests that even Orcs (distinct from Goblins and Hobgoblins) illustrate several sub-races. Though scholars like Liebherr, Flieger and Tally do not expand on the racial diversity, it is vital to acknowledge the underestimated complexity of the Orcs' race. Because of the omission of more specific labels on Orcs, the reader might see them collectively and generalise about them. With a second look, the reader might perceive the Orcs as surprisingly complex and diverse.

The narration does not specify the Orcs' several possible labels, but their language customs clearly diversify them. Pippin contemplates that, 'many of the Orcs were using ordinary language. Apparently, the members of two or three quite different tribes were present, and they could not understand one another's orc-speech' (*TT* 580). This comment indicates that the Orcs use different languages. One Orc uses a language that other Orcs cannot understand, indicating that at least two present subraces inhabit unique cultural customs. The narration explains that, 'they had no language of their own, but took what they could of other tongues and perverted it to their own liking' (*RotK:* Appendix F 1486*).* Liebherr discusses that Orcs used Westron as a result from remodelling their colonial tongue, Orkish/Black speech: '[Orcs] too have to rely on the Common Speech so that they can communicate with Orcs from outside of their linguistic tradition' (183). Fanon presents a scenario where a native would learn the colonisers language, to getting closer 'to becoming a true human being' (*Black Skin*, 2). One could then see more humanity with Orcs because they speak the common tongue, making them more 'visible' because 'to speak [and being understood] is to exist absolutely for the other' (1). The complete remodelling of Orkish made it useless and led to the development of as many dialects as there were Orc groups, further indicating that their language customs had much variety and were wide-spread. And their use of Westron further proves their humanity.

Shortly after the quarrel, the Uruk-Hai show empathy and kindness towards Merry and Pippin through medical treatment. This small empathic action indicates, once again, that Orcs possess human emotions. Uglúk had to, 'humour unwilling followers' (*TT* 584) by giving them painful medicine. Pippin is fatigued and cannot use his legs, and by force, drinks a burning liquid, quickly bringing him to his feet. The Orcs laugh and seem to be having a merry time seeing the Hobbits reacting wildly to the helpful medicine, and one could interpret this as a light-hearted episode. Uglúk aims to make the Hobbits move on their own, but he gives Merry treatment for a gash on his forehead. This gash does not hinder Merry in moving his feet, so one can see this as a merciful act by an Orc treating a Hobbit solely for his own sake. Tally argues against the fact that this passage promotes kindness, given that the actions were founded on practical reasons. However, Tally also highlights a central point that, 'in the three ages of Middle-earth, nowhere does Tolkien depict any kindly treatment towards Orc prisoners-of-war on the part of Men or Elves' ('Let us now Praise' 25). This argument challenges the Orcs' specific behaviour against Hobbits, considering that perhaps the Orcs would not treat their hostages the same if they were Man or Elven. Relations between Orcs and the different races seem to differ in the

minds of the Orcs. At least they can establish how they treat other races based on conscious decisions rather than pure violent impulses.

The overheard quarrel reveals that Orcs have concerns and fear about their master, which shows that they are colonised through fear. Later on, Sam eavesdrops on a conversation between two Orcs: Shagrat and Gorbag. These two seem to blindly follow an order by saying, 'Lugbùrz wants it, eh? What is it, d'you think? … They don't tell us all they know' (*TT* 964). The same conversation seems to show that the Orcs are worried about being punished for merely discussing among each other, 'they've got eyes and ears everywhere' and then mentioning a safer position 'where we can talk a bit' (ibid.). The anxiety of being monitored and their distress concerning the Nazgûl, 'those Nazgûl give me the creeps' (965), indicates that Orcs are scared and vulnerable. This conversation suggests a looming sense of concern about being monitored, and a knowledge that if their superiors witnessed them, they could be in grave trouble. Tally recognises this passage and argues that, '[t]hese are reasonable, and altogether human, concerns.' ('Let us now Praise' 23). It shows that the Orcs are controlled through fear and not by their own will to serve the dark lord. Ultimately, the Orcs are scared for themselves, which simultaneously gives them more sympathetic value.

The previous evidence shows that Orcs feel fear, concern, humour, and to some degree, empathy. But the following emotion is what connects them to colonisation the most: anger. The quarrel clarified that, 'orc-speech sounded at all times full of hate and anger' (*TT* 580), suggesting that the Orcs followed their orders involuntarily, by force. Pippin paid close attention to the quarrel about what the Orcs were to do with them:

> 'Don't draw attention to yourself, or I may forget my orders. Curse the Isengarders! Uglúk u bagronk sha pushdug Saruman-glob búbhosh skai': he passed into a long angry speech in his own tongue that slowly died away into muttering and snarling. (579)

There seems to be tension between the Orcs and hatred towards their commander, Saruman, because the angry speech includes him. The hatred itself as an emotion shows enough that Orcs share some of the same characteristics as humans, distinguishing them more and more from

animalistic traits. The anger also parallels the Orcs' anger toward their coloniser: Morgoth in earlier settings, indicating that they are colonised in the same manner once again.

The unhappiness of the Orcs also promotes their sympathetic value. At a later point, Gorbag expresses a vital human desire:

> 'What d'you say? – if we get a chance, you and me'll slip off and set up somewhere on our own with a few trusty lads, somewhere where there's good loot nice and handy, and no big bosses.'

> 'Ah!' said Shagrat. 'Like old times.' (*TT* 965)

Shagrat's daydreaming about their seemingly better past indicates that their situation could undoubtedly get better. Tally presents that, '[t]hese Orcs are not having any more fun than the Men … the Elves … or the Dwarves … War is Hell, for all parties involved' ('Let us now Praise' 23). He argues that it would be natural for the Orcs to fantasise about a better future, like any other victims of war. Tally overlooks that, combined with the hatred shown by the Orcs alongside their ability to hope, their human desires also reveal their colonial situation. Not only does this passage show that these Orcs are in the war against their will, but the indication that 'old times' were merrier proves that they might not have been under Sauron's control for a long time. The desire that the Orcs would go somewhere with 'no big bosses' further suggests that they want to escape Sauron's dominion. The hatred and fear the Orcs feel towards their colonisers, might even mean that they are more scared of Men than of other Orcs. Men have a reason to fight them: to save their world from evil, but Orcs do not have any subsequent objective to kill Men other than unwillingly following orders. The Hobbits' eyes have revealed the Orcs to have many emotions that connect them to human beings. Most importantly, they show many of these emotions in protest of the colonised situation they find themselves in. The following section will therefore delve into exactly how Orcs became a colonised race.

2.4   Colonisation

I have discussed how Orcs might be initially perceived as unredeemable, evil monsters. However, they show real emotions, gradually revealing them as humanlike. I have also argued that the Hobbits provide a second chance to prove that Orcs are more than what they seem at first and that their revealed emotions might suggest that they are in a forced, miserable, colonial state. Their history shows us how their race has survived in a world ravaged by conflict and war. Firstly, their independent wills were twisted, and they turned to puppets to serve only Morgoth. Secondly, they were forced into Saruman's service to perform the same role. In-between these controlled states, they have proven unable to construct a functional society, where they could divert from savage actions such as cannibalism, plundering, and killing. The Orcs' central colonists, Morgoth and Saruman, are the main reason why they continued to be ensnared into colonial settings. The hatred towards Saruman exposed through the Hobbit-encounters in *LotR* mirrors the hatred that we see in Morgoth's era, which could prove that the Orcs are controlled by colonial rule twice. Not only does hatred indicate this colonial history, but also the nineteenth-century imperialist ideologies Saruman reflects through his manipulation which is based on the same principle as Morgoth's social manipulation. The Orcs' colonial lifestyle persists due to missing decolonisation initiatives and ultimately drives them into Saruman's colonisation during the Third Age. By researching Orcs' history in *The Silmarillion* and *The Hobbit*, I will provide insight into how their culture and race has developed. Specific setbacks will be discussed to explain why Orcs have not become anything else than servants of a higher power. This section will discuss all the points above, and lastly present the insignificant chances the Orcs' have of social and national development due to a repeated lack of decolonisation policies. Firstly, I will specifically look at the nature of their creation, where Orcs were already at a disadvantage, being 'born' into captivity and enslavement – being born into their colonised state.

2.4.1   Colonial history

2.4.1.1   The Beginning

The Orcs' origin is debated due to an inconsistency between the description in *The Silmarillion* and Tolkien's more recent notes and thoughts. Christopher Tolkien concluded from his father's notes that: '[t]his then, as it may appear, was my father's final view of the question: Orcs were bred from Men' (*Morgoth's Ring* 421). Dimitri Fimi suggested that the thought of

Orcs being Elves once, 'the 'highest' beings of Middle-earth – became increasingly unbearable to Tolkien' (155), which could explain why Tolkien seemed to change his mind on the origin of Orcs after *The Silmarillion*'s publication. As it happened, Tolkien did not seem to have sufficient time to edit his descriptions to make them perfectly matched with his outlook. This discussion will therefore focus on the original reading of the Orcs' origin: Orcs were previously Elves.

The dark lord, Morgoth, transformed the Orcs from the purest and most powerful beings, Elves. The Orcs were mainly created as a resource for Morgoth to produce a massive army in his mission to conquer the world. Morgoth aimed to mock the 'elitist' race of Arda, Elves, by turning them into hideous, evil monsters. *The Silmarillion* presents how this happened:

> of those unhappy [Quendi, a synonym for Elves] who were ensnared by Melkor, little is known of a certainty … all those of the Quendi who came into the hands of Melkor … were put there in prison, and by slow arts of cruelty were corrupted and enslaved; and thus did Melkor breed the hideous race of the Orcs in envy and mockery of the Elves. (38)

To clarify, Morgoth could not create like his own creator, and making Orcs meant transforming an old race into a new race in the Elves' reflection. Tally demonstrates how this process of corruption in Tolkien's mythology parallels Satan's creation of demons ('Let us now Praise' 18). The term 'corrupt' might be misinterpreted in this setting. I look into the nature of the Orcs' creation and find that the Orcs were significantly disfigured in appearance. They were mostly brainwashed by Morgoth's evil intentions, but the narrative gives a brief insight to the brainwashing, making it hard to know the extent of it. I therefore investigate the text and present evidence of the Orcs' independent thinking, suggesting that they were not completely brainwashed.

The leading theory is that Orcs were transformed specifically from Dark Avari Elves. *The Silmarillion* strongly implies that this is the case:

Whence [the Orcs] came, or what they were, the Elves knew not then, thinking them perhaps to be Avari who had become evil and savage in the wild; in which they guessed all too near, it is said. (80)

The foreshadowing in guessing 'all too near' suggests that most likely Avari Elves were turned to Orcs, although they did not become evil in the wild but by the Morgoth's hand. Morgoth corrupted the 'unhappy ones', indicating that the Avari Elves were unhappy, presumably from not joining the 'Westward March' to the Holy nation of Numenòr, as all other Elves did. Because, 'their hearts were turned towards the West' (41), the Avari most likely wanted to March, but were rejected. Afterwards, the Avari were labelled, 'Elves of the Darkness, for they never beheld the Light that was before the Sun and Moon' (ibid.). If they were indeed rejected, the exclusion could be devastating for the Avari, resulting in seclusion from their kinsmen in Middle-earth. Morgoth could take advantage of this unhappiness and turn the Avari against their people. Morgoth convinced them that, instead of feeling sad about being badly treated, they should see the other Elves as evil instead: 'one thing Morgoth had achieved was to convince the Orcs beyond refutation that the Elves were crueller than themselves' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419). And according to Fanon, such manipulation is evident in colonisation:

Colonisation is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it. (*Wretched of the Earth* 210)

Morgoth certainly took advantage of the Orcs' affiliation and identification with Elves and twisted the Elves into Orcs. Orcs received some mercy for their situation, 'the Wise in the Elder Days taught always that the Orcs were not "made" by Melkor, and therefore were not in their origin evil' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419), and Free Peoples should therefore show mercy towards Orcs if they were taken captive or surrendered (ibid.). It seems like the Orcs were sympathised with in the earliest days of their disfigurement and a clear colonisation was afoot. Perhaps there was a chance for them to seek redemption and get help to revert to their original selves. However,

Orcs already qualified as Oriental at this point. Because the Avari were already labelled 'Dark' by other Elves and as 'Orcs' by Morgoth, they seemed 'incapable of defining themselves' (Said 301). Additionally, not once in Tolkien's works do Orcs comment in the lines of: 'I am Orc'. Morgoth supposedly continued to darken their image and eliminated their chances of reuniting with their original society by convincing them to hate and battle Elves.

Reading the text closely reveals the Orcs as more human than at first anticipated and reflect their original, still present Elven identity. Flieger points out an estranging fact about their appearance:'[the] deliberate mismatch of appearance and language divides the Orcs not just from the reader but from their own identity as monsters' (207). Tally argues that, 'In fact, perhaps even more than the Elves, whose near-perfection marks them with a profound otherness, Orcs are shown to be human' ('Let us now Praise' 20). In short, he illustrates that Orcs reflect more human traits than their previous form, Elves. This mismatch with a feral identity could indicate a connection to their original form as Elves. Even though Tolkien's notes explains that, 'in [the Orcs'] corruption they had lost almost all possibility of resisting the domination of [Morgoth's] will' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419), the fact that they were not pure monsters, proves that resistance is present, and they still inhabited connections to their original selves. A reasonable amount of independent thinking could perhaps be their strongest connection to their original identity as Avari Elves. The Avari Elves' rejection of the March can reflect the one trait they kept intact through Morgoth's disfigurement. This rejection is present also during Morgoth's colonial rule:

> [The Orcs] were capable of acting on their own, doing evil deeds unbidden for their own sport; or if Morgoth and his agents were far away, they might neglect his commands. (417-418)

The quote shows without a doubt that Orcs were still capable of controlling their own will and actions, without turning into complete puppets under Morgoth's control. Though it can be considered an essential human action, the ability to resist the March followed the Avari into their being as Orcs as they continued to resist and reject Morgoth's commands as well. Keeping this ability intact, shows that even though the Dark Avari Elves were disfigured and labelled something else, they were still partly Elven.

The Orcs' hatred towards Elves and Morgoth, alongside the clearly stated awareness of the thraldom exercised on them, reveals that Orcs were not corrupted to a completely subjugated state. Tolkien's notes confirms that Morgoth forcibly controlled the Orcs, 'It is true of course, that Morgoth held the Orcs in dire thraldom' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419) and that '[Morgoth's] dominion was by fear, and [the Orcs] were aware of this fear and hated him.' (417). Similarly, it is said in *The Silmarillion,* 'in their dark hearts the Orcs loathed the Master whom they served in fear' (38). If fear alone would make Orcs fight for Morgoth under any circumstances, he would not have had to convince them that 'Elves were crueller than themselves' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419). Morgoth, parallel to British colonisers, had to give the Orcs a purpose to serve him through political manipulation. By manipulating the Orcs' to hate Elves because they rejected the Orcs, Morgoth gave them an incentive to act on that hatred. Just like the European colonists in Africa who implemented taxation to manipulate the natives into thinking that colonisation was an effective situation (Daviron 487-488), Morgoth manipulated the Orcs into thinking that his colonisation was the best way to satisfy their sadness and anger – it would benefit them to fight for him. Morgoth, therefore, acts on similar political propaganda to give Orcs a resolve to serve him, rather than having Orcs actively resisting their colonisation.

The hints of the Orcs' terrible living-conditions prove their colonial situation. Not only did the Orcs feel an immense hate towards their colonial master, Morgoth, but with a merciless administration, the Orcs had to resort to cannibalism, presumably based on the lack of food. Orcs were convinced by Morgoth that Elves were 'taking captives . . . to eat them … as the Orcs would do at need' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419), to point out that cannibalism did occur, and only because there was a need originating from somewhere. Since Morgoth is portrayed as 'pitiless', 'treacherous', and given to 'arrogance' (*The Silmarillion* 19), it is very unlikely that he would prioritise providing sufficient food for the Orcs, which resulted in such harsh conditions that they resorted to cannibalism. Such neglect for the workers is also parallel to colonial situations in Africa, as evidenced by the construction of the Kariba Dam which completely disregarded the natives' food resources (Jarosz 109). Like European colonists in Africa, Morgoth seems only to prioritise his war objective and care little about the well-being of his soldiers.

2.4.1.2   Wandering State

In the days after Morgoth's colonisation, the Orcs had to govern themselves, which proved problematic because they seem to wander confusedly. After Morgoth's rule, they were not 'spirits', but 'living creatures, capable of speech and some crafts and organization; or at least

capable of learning' (*Morgoth's Ring* 417). The Orcs are implied to have minds of their own and performed actions based on their choosing, although mostly evil deeds. The Orcs seemed to develop their own culture as time went on, expanding varieties of their tongue, determined by what might suggest different 'breeds' of Orc (418). The encounters with the Hobbits in the novels prove that they did indeed develop several sub-races who reflect different cultures and opinions.

Given that Orcs were given little to no attention after the defeat of Morgoth in *The Silmarillion*, evidence from *The Hobbit* suggests that the Orcs struggled to work independently and that they would have needed guidance to become a self-sustaining society. It is described that 'in those days and those wild parts [the Orcs] had not advanced (as it is called) so far' (*The Hobbit* 74). The implication that Orcs had not advanced too much, presumably in contrast to other races of Middle-earth, parallels Said's first dogma, 'the Orient … is aberrant, undeveloped, inferior.' (300). Considering that the narrator reflects a Western outlook, this signifies that Orcs are seen as an undeveloped Oriental by an Occidental. Orcs lived in caves which were 'horribly stuffy' (*The Hobbit* 72), clearly reflecting an inferior lifestyle. They have been pushed to live underground because they were not welcome above ground. The Orcs' way of living mostly involved scavenging: 'there were all the baggages and packages lying broken open, and being rummaged by goblins', and hunting: 'goblins eat horse and ponies and donkeys (and other much more dreadful things), and they are always hungry' (73). Seeing as Orcs would resort to cannibalism during Morgoth's dominion and seeing as they do not hesitate to eat other dreadful creatures, cannibalism during this period could be feasible. By this evidence, Orcs reflect the Oriental even as independent beings, indicating that Morgoth fossilised their colonial state. Additionally, this savage state implies that the Orcs do not possess the skills to develop a working society, which seems problematic when discussing their future in 'Future Projections'. Even though they were no longer under the colonial rule of Morgoth, the Free Peoples of Middle-earth forced them to live in the shadows. The only life Orcs have lived before *LotR* has either been under a colonial government or a state of wandering where their civilisation has only consisted of plundering and stealing – proving that they were not capable of creating a functioning, self-reliant society.

The colonised Orcs were left in chaos without guidance, which resulted in the unstable society they continued to live in. This scenario could hypothetically have been avoided if there were any established decolonisation policies in place for them. Andrew Smith and Chris Jeppesen describe that, 'In its shallowest and narrowest form, decolonization refers to the transfer of

sovereignty from colonizer to colonized.' (2), although what exactly determines decolonisation is widely discussed. The Orcs regained their sovereignty naturally by the sudden disappearance of their colonial master – their decolonisation was immediate and uncontrolled, leaving them powerless to all the Free Peoples. If the Orcs got effective decolonisation and Morgoth's defeat meant forcing him to provide it, a different development of the Orcs' society could disassociate them from savage portrayals and behaviours. Therefore, they were helpless and indoctrinated to live a savage life, hindering them from establishing a self-sufficient society, as seen in *The Hobbit*.

2.4.1.3   The Voice of Imperialism

I have discussed how Morgoth used fear and social manipulation to control the Orcs successfully. During the Orcs' period as non-colonised, they 'had become accustomed to independence' (*Morgoth's Ring* 420), although the independence meant chaotic savagery. Sauron might showcase a clear colonial motive, like Battis presents:

> The results of Sauron's quest for domination – war, enslavement, extermination, suppression of individuality, and the insistence of unswerving loyalty to an absentee monarch – are all the trappings of colonization. (919)

Sauron's dominion could seem to represent an authoritarian rule rather than a colonial, 'Sauron indeed achieved even greater control over his Orcs than Morgoth had done' (*Morgoth's Ring* 419). Most importantly, there are few to no instances where the reader witnesses Sauron's manipulation or colonial process, therefore, I will specifically look at Saruman and how his strategy reflects colonialism. Previously, I have shown that Orcs were frightened of being monitored by their masters, as overheard by Samwise. Fear and hatred towards a master have been common with Orcs in the past with Morgoth, which evidently repeated itself when Saruman colonised them. It has not been directly stated that Orcs were aware of their colonisation with Saruman, such as with Morgoth, but they still hated Saruman. Saruman especially shows similarities with colonial ideologies, and he rules Orcs based on a Darwinian imperial fantasy that Orcs are the proletariat who only live to fight for him.

Saruman's motive behind colonising the Orcs is strikingly similar to the social ideologies flourishing from nineteenth-century Europe, especially imperialist ideas of Social Darwinism. Great Britain invested about half their wealth into their colonies because they gave their empire immense income and valuable resources (Palmer, Colton, & Kramer, 2014, pp. 650-653). To justify the exploitation of African and Asian colonies, many theoretical/social ideas were advanced, and Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory was often used to support them. Jan Morris explains the new interpretation of Darwinism during the nineteenth- to twentieth-century:

> there were many imperialists who carried Darwin's ideas yet a stage farther, and saw the whole grand progress of the Empire in evolutionary terms. Britain was, of course, the fulfilment, populus sapiens. The self-governing colonies were great apes among the species.... And down at the bottom, inchoate and utterly dependent, lay the primitive territories of Africa and Asia, dressed in scales. (126)

This Social Darwinism caused imperialists to believe that they were naturally superior, and the colonised natives were inferior. In an attempt to persuade Gandalf, Saruman reflects this mindset of natural superiority, 'we must have power, power to order all things as we will, for that good which only the Wise can see.' (*FotR* 337). Saruman says, 'which only the Wise can see', meaning the great Wizards and Elves of the White Council. To demonstrate, Saruman acts condescendingly toward the Man Éomer and the Dwarf Gimli, whom he does not consider Wise, telling them to, '[m]eddle not in policies which you do not understand.' (*TT* 756). Saruman's superior mindset considers all others inferior and unwise, and believes that Wizards (meaning only himself and Gandalf) are by nature required to rule, '[t]he time of the Elves is over, but our time is at hand: the world of Men … we must rule' (*FotR* 337). Saruman seems to possess this type of imperial mindset, inspired by Social Darwinism.

This superior mindset based on Social Darwinism, could have been the main motivator for Saruman's colonisation. Said presents Leroy-Beaulieu Orientalist philosophy which correlates with Social Darwinism: 'weaker or underdeveloped regions like the Orient was viewed as something inviting [European] interest, penetration, insemination – in short, colonization.' (219). From what we know, Saruman seems to be Occidentally inviting himself to colonise the Oriental Orcs and justifying it with the nature of his own being. Brantlinger adds that 'one of

the central fantasies of imperialism' involves a racist view that Africans were the natural working class and suited only as a 'completely subordinate proletariat' (181). Saruman expresses that he inhabits a natural position as leader over 'all things' and parallel to the ideologies justifying colonial conquest, he sees himself as entitled to rule over Orcs because they reflect the 'proletariat', the Orient – the working class who are only valued by their strength in fighting. Believing that he is naturally superior, Saruman utilises the same key concepts of Social Darwinism as nineteenth-century imperialists to justify his turn to colonialism.

Saruman displays similarities with a modern colonist by abusing ideas such as Social Darwinism and white supremacy. Sauron is the ultimate Dark Lord in *LotR*, but Saruman represents a much more complex villain because the reader witnesses his powerful, manipulating rhetoric. Firstly, Saruman represents a modern colonial politician. Jay Ruud's inspection of Saruman's rhetoric reveals that he possesses a, 'sophistry in the way only a skilled modern politician can perform it, disguising a wrong cause in fair words' (142). Ruud's clear description of Saruman's intention of a 'wrong cause' conveniently highlights the similarity between Saruman and a modern Western-European who disguises the wrongdoings in colonial politics with ideologies such as Social Darwinism. Secondly, Saruman reflects white supremacy because he appears as the 'the White', contrary to the Dark and evil Sauron (*FotR* 63, *TT* 581). The contrast between the two masters emphasises that Saruman displays whiteness and further aligns his motives with Western colonists, seeing as Africa represented an, 'entity to be tamed, enlightened, guided … by white, European males through Western science, Christianity, civilization, commerce, and colonization' (Jarosz 108). By publicly stating his superiority and branding his 'white hand' visibly on the Orcs (*TT* 540), Saruman signals that he is in charge. It demonstrates how Saruman's social advantage and white supremacy would colonise his inferior army and that the Orcs would have to be 'enlightened' by the white Saruman – a colonist. Just like the British could take advantage of their colonised South-Africans ('Military Effort of the British Empire'), Saruman certainly saw great potential for his quest by building an army, with or without their consent. Given that colonies were a great advantage to Western colonists, one could interpret Saruman as exercising the same ideas of exploitation. He views himself as the highest authority, and since he justifies his colonisation with Western colonial ideas, nobody questions the well-being or state of the colonised Orcs.

Morgoth chose to colonise Orcs by distorting their physical appearance, manipulate them into thinking they served him for their vengeful aims and suddenly leave them to their sovereignty, which resulted in continuous savagery. Saruman supposedly used force to colonise Orcs;

however, he took advantage of his powerful rhetoric to control them. One can discuss whether it was easy to colonise the Orcs, seeing how colonialism shaped their past. One could argue that they needed to be colonised because, when independent, they acted like feral animals ravaging their surroundings. Seeing how Orcs are ruled through colonial strategies once again, it is possible to judge that as a result of recolonisation. The Orcs' predisposition suggests that history will repeat itself, which we will look into next.

2.4.2 Future projections

Sauron and Saruman are defeated, and in parallel to Morgoth's defeat, the Orcs are once again granted their sovereignty naturally and abruptly. The Orcs receive personal territory, but once again miss out on the most important part of post-colonialism: decolonisation. Aragorn, as King, pardoned many of his enemies after the War, and 'the slaves of Mordor he released and gave to them all the lands about Lake Núrnen to be their own.' (*RotK* 1269), without giving them any further council or guidance. According to Tolkien's maps of Middle-earth (1571-1575), the 'Sea' of Núrnen is located south-east within Mordor, even further away from the Free Peoples than Sauron's fortress and 'Mount doom'. Given that Mordor is surrounded with mountains, the Orcs would possess a territory far from anyone else, presumably indicating that Aragorn wished to have them at a distance. Tally and Cristina Scull seem convinced that Orcs are excluded from this blessing, without specifically explaining who 'the thralls of Mordor' (Tally, 'Let Us Now Praise' 21, 'Demonizing the Enemy' 8, Scull, 'Open Minds' 155) are if not Orcs. Throughout *LotR*, Orcs have been labelled 'slaves' of either Isengard or Mordor (*FotR* 64, *TT* 722, 948, *RotK* 1166, 1177), so it is peculiar to interpret 'thralls' as anyone else than Orcs. Said confirms that the Orient is strikingly similar to 'the colonised' because, '[t]he Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of Europe's greatest and richest and oldest colonies.' (1), therefore implying the accompanying fact: Occidental is colonist. As Said's third dogma specifies, 'a highly generalized and systematic vocabulary … describe[es] the Orient' (301), explains that the Oriental Orcs were generalised throughout *LotR*. Due to Aragorn being part of the Occidentally-aligned narrative, logically he would use a collective term for the Orient, without acknowledging their different cultures. Post-colonial discourse commonly presents colonised natives collectively, such as Branlinger's many examples with only 'the African' (181) and Fanon's point that 'for the colonist, the Negro was neither an Angloan nor a Nigerian, for he simply spoke of 'the Negro.' (*Wretched of the Earth* 211). As previously presented, the Orcs were distinguished into at least four different titles depending on varying appearance: Orc, Goblin, Hobgoblin or *snaga*. Orcs also appeared as different tribes with

varying geographical background and dialects. Because the Oriental Orcs would be highly generalised, I conclude that all the Orcs were given a territory, but Aragorn did not provide any more guidance to help them organise a proper society for themselves. Because their colonists were Sauron and Saruman, naturally Sauron and Saruman would have been forced to decolonise Orcs, but they were completely defeated and unable to perform any task after The War. As a result, Orcs were left to themselves once again.

This independence is problematic for a race that has not successfully governed themselves since they were Avari Elves thousands of years ago. In *The Hobbit*, they had not shown any indication of creating a functioning society in the mountains they lived in, at least not a community that did not require plundering and scavenging for survival. During The War, the Orcs were, regardless of their varying geographical backgrounds, cultures, and languages, forced together. Even though Aragorn granted them lands in which to reside and possibly build a society, they lacked the skills of organisation and leadership to split this land between their different tribes. A. Adu Boahen presents one of the more problematic consequences of African colonialism, which parallels the Orcs' limitations:

> Because of the artificiality of [African borders, established by Europeans], each independent African state is made up of a whole host of different ethnocultural groups and nations having different historical traditions and cultures and speaking different languages. One can imagine, then, how stupendous the problem of developing the independent states of Africa into true nation states is. (96)

Expecting the Orcs to overcome all conflict between each other and develop an organised society based on either proper separation or unification of their tribes would be wishful thinking. One of the obvious predictions about the Orcs' future, based on real colonial history, is a continuation of conflict amongst themselves, a common occurrence in *LotR*. The end of *RotK* does not bode well for the post-colonial era for the Orcs. It implies that the Orcs will create further conflict amongst themselves to split this land fairly, while still living in an ungoverned society, greatly affected by murder, plunder and starvation.

The Orcs find themselves fossilised in their colonial state, unable to regain their native identity and continue to be demonised by the Free Peoples of Middle-earth. After Morgoth's defeat and the emergence of Sauron as the new dark lord, approximately at the start of the Third Age, the remaining Avari Elves were 'wandering free in [Middle-earth] far from the sea' (*The Silmarillion* 264). Even after several thousand years, the Orcs' native race was still alive, providing even the slightest chance of redemption. I have shown how Orcs still retain skills and independent abilities, reflecting their connection to their pre-colonial identity. Without evidence suggesting otherwise, the Avari most likely still existed at the end of The War and could encourage the Orcs to revert to their original form. Without evidence as to whether the Orcs have memories from their lives as Elves, it is difficult to know what actions they could take to return to their Elven form. The Orcs have failed to reflect on their identity due to a typical condition of the Oriental to be, as Said's third dogma explains, 'incapable of defining itself' (301). Because of the fourth dogma of Orientalism, the Orcs also struggle to rid themselves of the image they have received in *LotR*, 'the Orient is at bottom something either to be feared … or to be controlled' (ibid.). In *The Hobbit*, the Orcs were feared and pushed by the Free Peoples to dwell underneath the surface to survive, and in *LotR*, Saruman perceived them as Oriental, needing control by a colonist. Because the Orcs were no longer controlled after The War, their role as Oriental indicates that the Free Peoples would still fear them. Therefore, their chances of discovering their original identity seem small. The Free Peoples were the only ones possessing records to prove that the Avari were most likely the Orcs' actual identity. In the Early Days, the Orcs received some sympathy from the Elders, as presented in 'The Beginning', indicating a chance to seek redemption. If this mercy could exist among the Free Peoples, The Fourth Age could have completely changed the fate of Orcs. However, without establishing a relation with the Free Peoples, the Orcs would never discover or be inclined to understand their true identity. Therefore, it is most likely that the Orcs would forever live as Orcs, feared, and oppressed by all of Middle-earth.

2.5 Conclusion

The in-depth analysis of the encounters between Orcs and Hobbits in the novels reveals how the narration shapes the first important impressions of Orcs for the reader. This presentation makes it harder for the reader to neutrally understand their miserable position as the Hobbits reveal bits and pieces of their colonised background and partial justification for their behaviour. The Occidentally-aligned narration, which deliberately puts the Orcs in a bad light, could explain why there has been little research specifically on Orcs and their being, except for

Rearick and Tally. The Orcs are Oriental based on all three dogmas presented in this chapter. Since they are not evil because they are from the East, the reader is still inclined to affiliate them with the East because the portrayal of the East also equals evil. Even though these declared villains in this universe are supposed to appear as evil, scary, and worthy of immediate death, they show multiple layers worthy of the reader's sympathy. Orcs were manipulated and forced into colonialism – taken advantage of because of Saruman reflecting Darwinian ideologies, which seemed to justify his colonisation. The Orcs have not lived a decent life ever since they lost their way to the West, alongside their fellow Elves, and were pushed to living conditions where plundering, murder, and cannibalism became normalised.

To get back to who they once were, the Orcs would have to restructure their whole life purpose and accept that they were once the race that Morgoth manipulated them to hate the most. Middle-earth's constant battles and conflicts only made it harder for them to accept their fate and further ignite the hate they would ideally have to resolve. Morgoth and Saruman were both the principal colonial powers who would continue this oppression and make them stray from reclaiming their old identity and gain a voice to stand up for themselves. Even when they are set free, their likely future entails more chaos and little chance of establishing a functioning society and regaining their original identity. A slight chance for redemption remains if the Orcs would establish some relations with the Free Peoples. Their main objective and reason for existing are what hinders them from getting back to their independent selves and breaking free from their new, set colonised identity.

3 Chapter 2: Concerning Hobbits

At first glance, the Hobbits seem like peaceful folk who enjoy solidarity, filling their every day with eating, drinking, and smoking. They are perceived as childlike because of their short stature and by being seemingly patronised by other characters. But the Hobbits have a long history in Middle-earth, full of hardships and fascinating experiences that many might unconsciously overlook. At first, the Hobbits migrated westwards to survive a growing threat around them and settled in the Shire region. The king of the Northern region gave them the Shire, and they maintained their relation to the king and learned many crafts from his people and Elves in those days. When the Free Peoples saw little profit from associating with Hobbits, they gradually lost interest. The Hobbits' only hold to the international sphere, the Northern King, disappeared, and their social survival became increasingly difficult. To seem more appealing and relevant to the Free Peoples, the Hobbits willingly adapted their cultural customs, such as changing their native language. The Free Peoples did not recognise this eagerness and unconsciously ignored the Hobbits. Ultimately, Hobbits gradually disappeared from the international stage and history itself. Hobbits became victimised by subconscious oppression by the Free Peoples and saw no other way to live than in a secluded, autonomous society. I will discuss in this chapter why this was the only option the Hobbits had and how they learned to appreciate their life in the far corner of Middle-earth.

This oppression is evident when the narrator presents the Hobbits to the reader in a somewhat condescending way and establishes an inferior-directed perspective on the Hobbits as the story continues. Evidence indicates that Hobbits are finally part of an affair relevant to all the Free Peoples primarily because they are being taken advantage of for a specific purpose. Underneath the surface, Frodo is manipulated to partake in a perilous journey to Rivendell and Mordor. Because of Frodo's insufficient knowledge of the world outside of the Shire, he becomes an easy victim for both Elrond and Gandalf's exploitation and sacrifices himself for an unknown campaign. Since Frodo gives the first Hobbit appearance internationally for a thousand years, the other Free Peoples either patronise or do not acknowledge their existence, proving the Hobbits' exclusion from Middle-earth until this time. Therefore, I will discuss the Hobbits' encounters with other Peoples, such as the Men of Gondor, the Men of Rohan, and the Elves, as well as other significant situations in *LotR*.

The Fellowship breaks before *TT*, and until the Free Peoples' victory in The War of the Ring, the plot concentrates mainly on the action-based events. Therefore, I will discuss how the

consequences of The War affect the Hobbits individually and collectively. Merry, Pippin, Frodo and Sam are subject to interior othering when they return to the Shire, which complicates their national identity. Sam is less affected, and Frodo leaves the Shire to travel westwards shortly after returning to the Shire. The Hobbits are exposed to the rest of Middle-earth and Saruman takes advantage of their apparent weakness and colonises them during The War of the Ring. This colonisation highlights how oppressed the Hobbits have been and how being excluded led to this terrible situation. Merry and Pippin triumph regardless of their othering because they lead the charge against Saruman and frees the Shire. Therefore, they become the main characters who can release the Hobbits collectively from the millennia-long oppression. To explain why Merry and Pippin have a disadvantage in doing this, Fanon's ideas on national culture is central. Because of The War of the Ring, Merry and Pippin have become Western-educated and reflect the 'native intellectual' who could lead the anti-colonial resistance. This fails in the end because Merry and Pippin no longer represent the real national Hobbit and have conflicting interests with the rest of the Hobbits.

I will therefore discuss what foundation Merry and Pippin have created in encouraging a future where Hobbits are not oppressed. When their straightforward leadership in an anti-colonial resistance seems to fail, there are still high chances of gradually including Hobbits in the geopolitical interplay of Middle-earth in the future. Hobbits are interested in recording history, which plays a central role in spreading Hobbit literature within the Reunited Kingdoms[2]. This Hobbits' version of history is vital to discuss whether the Free Peoples will encourage such studies or overlook them as they have done in the past. The same goes for the verbal exchange, whether the Free Peoples will speak of Hobbits between themselves or their children. Pippin and Sam take good care of teaching their next generation about the ventures of Hobbits and could ensure the open-mindedness to the Free Peoples. Therefore, the knowledge spread through the Great Hobbit families' generations could further the interconnectedness between the Shire and the rest of Middle-earth.

---

[2] Reunited Kingdoms refers to the Free Peoples territory of Middle-earth when The War is won.

3.1 Identity

Hobbits are depicted as a peaceful race on the surface. They follow a pacifist principle, and they enjoy only the simple elements in life: eating, sleeping, and smoking tobacco. David Day provides a description of Hobbits which many might find familiar:

> Although Hobbits do not possess great physical strength, they are generally sturdily built and remarkably resilient to extreme rigors of the body … Hobbits are an elusive, curly-headed folk most easily distinguished by their diminutive size – between two and four feet in height - and their large, hairy feet. (118)

The description provides a picture to their appearance, but it is also quite characteristic for a Hobbit to 'live in "holes" called "smials" (pronounced "smiles") … warm, well-lit, wood-panelled, well-padded, well-stocked, and rather over-furnished dwellings of the most cheerful and homely sort' (119). Jane Chance further elaborates on typical characteristics which define Hobbits: '[s]ameness is familiar and secure, and sameness means hobbitlike. The hobbits relish what is natural for them, which involves physical activities, living close to nature – living in holes, eating, smoking tobacco. To do otherwise is unhobbitlike' ('Power and knowledge in Tolkien' 117). Hobbits are different from the Free Peoples because of their size, the fact that they live in holes and enjoy solitary activities. Chance's description reveals perhaps the most established difference between Hobbits and other races: conflict and mobilisation are not hobbitlike.

Hobbits are also interested in their history. The Hobbits started recording what interested them in written form, 'about the year 1300 of the Third Age, the Hobbits began to collect the considerable store of tales and legends and oral annals and genealogies that they already possessed.' (*Peoples* 40). In short, as Hobbits learned the written language, they immediately started putting it to ink (*FotR* 5) and 'liked to have books filled with things that they already knew' (10). Liebherr argues that Hobbits are central in the written literature that appears in *LotR:*

> although the Men of Minas Tirith and the Elves are recorded as having kept historical records, the majority of the allusions to writing and written literature are mostly concerned with the Hobbit community. (208)

Bilbo and Frodo are prime examples of this literature, as they both contributed to the making of 'the Red book of Westmarch' (*FotR* 18), which led to further interest in literature in the Shire. As I will discuss toward the end of this chapter, this interest in writing history books is crucial to determine the Hobbits' future after The War of the Ring.

Because of the Hobbits' short stature and the fact that they are called '*Halflings,* since they were half the height of normal men' (Livingston, 'Myths of the author' 132, italics in original) they could be perceived as children, regardless of appearance. Scholar Jonathon Langford discusses Hobbits' 'coming of age' (1991) in the adventures they undertake during *LotR* and *The Hobbit,* where he finds that 'they are immature, both as individuals and as a race; sheltered from the challenges in Middle-earth, they have not achieved their true potential' (8). Because Langford points out that only Frodo, Sam, Merry, and Pippin go through a maturation process through their experiences in *LotR,* one might speculate that the remainders of Hobbits have not come of age yet and are therefore immature in general. Tisa Ho discussed 'The Childlike Hobbit' (1983) to justify whether *The Hobbit* was more suitable to children because of the Hobbits' childlike attributes. She points out that a Hobbit and a child have a likeness because 'they both share the attributes of smallness, and membership of the human race.' (3). She concludes that 'the hobbit can be regarded as a child' (9) thanks to various examples of how the other characters such as Aragorn and Gimli seem to treat the Hobbits with concern and 'observant care that a parent might' (6). Both Langston's- and Ho's arguments indicate that there is a general notion that other races discern Hobbits as childlike and helpless, which is evident in the encounters that I will present in 'Hobbits in *LotR*'. This interpretation of Hobbits suggests that they have been excluded from global politics, presumably because they seem like a liability. They are therefore underestimated, which will be elaborated on next.

3.2 Early History

The Hobbits initially settled in the Shire because of survival alone. The first mention of Hobbits among Elves and Men appears around the year 1000 of the Third Age: 'they began to move westward over the Misty Mountains into Eriador … because Men increased much at that time; and because a shadow fell on Greenwood, and it became darkened, and was called Mirkwood, for an evil spirit stirred there.' (*Peoples* 229). Either the Hobbits felt a threat by the increase of

Men who drove them away or by the 'evil spirit' implied to be Sauron. Considering that Hobbits are not familiar with conflict and battle, it was wise to emigrate elsewhere to avoid trouble. A conflict could emerge from the rising amount of Men who desired more territory and saw Hobbits as weak victims. Additionally, the Hobbits knew that they had no chance in defending themselves against the 'evil spirit' that seemed to become gradually more threatening. It seems like the Hobbits wanted to hide because they knew they were vulnerable to any threat in Middle-earth 'after the crossing (year 1601) the L[ittle] P[eople] settled down and almost disappeared from history' (9, brackets in original). In the end, the Hobbits stayed low and away from possible conflicts to best secure themselves and survive.

3.2.1 Gradual Disappearance

Hobbits are content with living secluded as long as their physical activities, such as eating and smoking, remain unchanged, but it was not always like this. When they first migrated to the West, they had more enthusiastic relations to other races. The King of Fornost, the protector of the realm, gave The Shire region to the Hobbits, '[i]t was Argeleb II who granted the land west of the Baranduin to the Periannath (Hobbits)' (*Peoples* 194). King Argeleb II was part of the Dúnedain race, the same royal ancestry as Aragorn, which is described as 'Fathers of Men … and the span of their lives was thrice that of men in Middle-earth' and 'Kings of Men' (31). The relationship between the Dúnedain and Hobbits will be more important later. The Hobbits were expected to follow orders to prove loyalty and appreciation for this gesture '(1) to keep the laws of Arthedain (the realm); (2) to keep the Bridge (and all other bridges) in repair; (3) to allow the king to hunt still in the woods and moors thrice a year.' (9). In the year 1601 of the Third Age, the Hobbits followed the rule of the High King of the North. As nothing indicates otherwise, they still obeyed this King's authority until the end of his line, 300 years later (*FotR* 5). Even though it said that in the year 1601, '[Hobbits] were virtually independent and ruled by their own chieftains' (*Peoples* 231), the 'first independent Shire-thain' (232) was in office as late as the year 1979 (233). This means that Hobbits followed a higher authority than themselves for about 300 years and spent some time electing their first chieftain. It will become more apparent later that the chieftain has not actively governed the Shire in any noticeable degree.

Hobbits did not disappear from the global scene on their terms but were instead pushed away because other races did not see much reason to affiliate themselves with Hobbits, and their

relations gradually declined. The three most common breeds of Hobbits had dealings with Elves, Dwarves, and Men:

> The Harfoots had much to do with Dwarves in ancient times, and long lived in the foothills of the mountains… The Stoors … were less shy of Men … The Fallohides, the least numerous, were a northerly branch. They were more friendly with Elves than the other Hobbits were. (*FotR* 4)

It seems that Hobbits had decent relations with the leading races of Middle-earth, but they gradually waned, 'as the days of the Shire lengthened they spoke less and less with the Elves, and grew afraid of them, and distrustful of those that had dealings with them' (9). Dwarves and Men seem to have forgotten the Hobbits race during *LotR*, which I will discuss below in 'Hobbits in *LotR*'. One of the possible reasons is because the collaboration was not profitable enough for the Free Peoples. It is explained in *FotR* that '[i]t is probable that the craft of building, as many other crafts beside, was derived from the Dúnedain. But the Hobbits may have learned it direct from the Elves' (8), and considering that the Dúnedain taught them Westron, the Hobbits received much from their relations. It is unknown whether the Free Peoples learned any new crafts or knowledge from the Hobbits. Therefore, Liebherr's argument on the Hobbits' position in Middle-earth becomes rather convincing:

> the Hobbits arguably come to reflect the archetypal colonised people as they appear to be invisible to the other peoples of Middle-earth. It is not that the Hobbits cannot be seen by the other peoples of Middle-earth, rather it is that the other people of Middle-earth have in general overlooked/ignored their existence. (186)

Hobbits lost their relations to the Free Peoples because they reflect this colonised archetype. By denying Hobbits a relevant international position and limiting their space to develop, the Free Peoples covertly oppressed them into the far corner of Middle-earth. This choice was not necessarily the conscious intention of the Free Peoples, but it does not change the fact that they entirely disregarded Hobbits based on their own needs. While these relations disappeared over

time, the Hobbits became gradually less relevant, contributing to their disappearance from Middle-earth.

The Hobbits were conveniently protected by the King of Fornost, who actively defended his realm for about 300 years. The Hobbits' survival became more challenging when the King disappeared - 'there had been no king for nearly a thousand years' (*FotR* 12) - and the Hobbits continued taking necessary measures to survive. When the Free Peoples seemed to lose interest in them, the Hobbits attempted to stay relevant by adapting their language customs. At first, '[o]f old [Hobbits] spoke the languages of Men, after their own fashion' (2), but the Dúnedain taught them the written language and 'the Common Speech, the Westron as it was named' (5) which they, in turn, had learned from the Elves. The Dúnedain gave the Hobbits an advantage in communicating through Middle-earth's lingua franca. Fanon's idea is as relevant here as with Orcs: 'to speak [and being understood] is to exist absolutely for the other' (*Black Skin* 1). Attempting to continue existing for the Free Peoples led the Hobbits to adapt their native tongue. Learning Westron brought some consequences as well, 'they forgot whatever languages they had used before' (ibid.), which meant losing a part of their nationality to have a chance of surviving socially in the international community. Liebherr points out that 'their decision to adapt their tongue to "the languages of Men near whom, or among whom, they lived" was seen as a necessity in their cultural survival' (185). In short, they gave up their native language to stay affiliated to the international scene and the majority language. All was not lost, because 'they kept a few words of their own, as well as their own names of months and days, and a great store of personal names out of the past' (*FotR* 5). These words were unproblematic to keep because they were not crucial in understanding the Hobbits. Therefore, the Hobbits' names could be the only identifier that others would acknowledge. Evidently, they kept minimal cultural customs, but losing almost an entire language for the sake of the majority language reflects that Hobbits struggled to stay visible to others.

Oppression might not be what the everyday reader associates with Hobbits, although the disregard from the Free Peoples signifies the Hobbits' gradual, unintentional disappearance from the global scene and history itself. The narrator presents the Hobbits as similar to Men; however, they are not considered as important in history-recordings, '[o]nly the Elves still preserve any records of [the Elder days], and their traditions are concerned almost entirely with their own history, in which Men appear seldom and Hobbits are not mentioned at all' (*FotR* 3). Even though Elves prioritise their own affairs, they still saw the possibility of including Men into their records, but clearly saw Hobbits as even less important and left them out completely.

They did not even incorporate the Fallohide tribe, who was most friendly with them and even shared their values and interests, '[Fallohides] were lovers of trees and woodlands' (*Peoples* 56). The narrator seems to justify this exclusion because Middle-earth, in general, had many different races and beings, where Hobbits got lost in the great crowd, 'the world being after all full of strange creatures beyond count, these little people seemed of very little importance.' (*FotR* 3). However, another passage states that '[t]o the last battle at Fornost … [Hobbits] sent some bowmen to the aid of the kind, or so they maintained, though no tales of Men record it.' (6). Liebherr addresses this exclusion and concludes that:

> the absence of the Hobbit-folk's voices from the chronicles of history … connects the Hobbit folk with the formerly colonised peoples of the real-world whose voices were also, historically, absent from written record. (208)

Hobbits were easily overlooked as strange creatures even though they contributed to war efforts. According to Orientalism, the Hobbits could fit into the Oriental role based on these scenarios. The fourth dogma of Orientalism highlights the feared Oriental, but Hobbits are, at this point, the opposite: they are ignored because they pose no threat whatsoever. Ultimately, the Hobbits were more or less relevant in certain events, as evidenced by the narrator, but according to the other races of Middle-earth, they were not significant enough to recognise, which led to their social disappearance. As Liebherr concludes, the Hobbits' omitted voices indicate that they inhabit a colonial position in Middle-earth, which I will delve into next.

3.2.2 Autonomy and Oppression

Hobbits had to look after themselves and lived without interactions with other races of Middle-earth; therefore, they adapted to an autonomous society. This autonomy comes forth in *LotR*, 'The Shire at this time had hardly any "government". Families for the most part managed their own affairs' (*FotR* 12). The only exceptions involved showing particular respect for the most wealthy family in the Shire, having an appointed mayor who only had to show up at banquets and an appointed 'police' who were 'more concerned with the strayings of beasts than of people' (12-13). Given that Hobbits adapted to a peaceful, quiet, and comfortable lifestyle, a police force would have little to tend to in such a community. Because of the seemingly difficult

task to maintain relations with the Free Peoples, remaining wholly independent might seem like the only option. Therefore, Hobbits normalised the Self-sufficient morale, which sparked Liebherr's argument: 'it would appear that all of the members of the community must espouse the belief that the Shire offers everything that a Hobbit could desire in order to adhere to the image of the Self as created by the Shire members.' (58). The Hobbits became Self-sufficient, created their own national identity, and adopted a Self-governing community, all because they could satisfy their own needs and no one else's. Therefore, they had to identify themselves and establish their solitary position in Middle-earth: '[t]he hobbits are not named by the Elves, not viewed by "the race of man," not fixed by the "roaming eye" – but rather are self-named, self-(em)-bodied, self-authorized to look, act, and desire differently' (Battis 922). Pippin demonstrates this Self-identification when enlightening Treebeard that 'Nobody else calls us hobbits; we call ourselves that' (*TT* 605). Without much evidence, one could wonder if they chose this label, or if was given to them by the Free Peoples. Considering that Hobbits were, in the past, divided into at least three different sub-species, the generalised 'Hobbit' could apply to Orientalism's third dogma, depending on the name's background. Battis concludes, 'the hobbits are cultural strangers within the densely complex interplay of humans, Dwarves, and Elves that (allegedly) drives that political force of the world.' (912). Not only are the Hobbits cultural strangers in Middle-earth, but they find themselves outside of its geopolitical borders as disregarded aliens. Langford also adheres to the point that 'the inhabitants of the Shire are content in their own enclosed world' (8), which is presumably what the everyday reader would also perceive. While this interpretation could seem innocent and harmless, my investigation insists that autonomy is not something the Hobbits chose to pursue, but it was the *only* choice they had.

By this evidence, it is clear that Hobbits became victims of subconscious oppression by the Free Peoples. The Free Peoples did not acknowledge any profitable outcome from trading and conversing with Hobbits, deeming them uninteresting, and perhaps undeveloped and inferior, similarly to the Oriental. They proceeded to fall out of the geopolitical interplay of Middle-earth, and the Free Peoples were unaware that Hobbits were willing to adapt their nationality and cultural customs to be more or less part of the international community. Liebherr shows how this reflects colonial subjectivity:

> the Hobbits become a fictionalised representation of the ideal colonial subject as they willingly adapt their culture, including their language, to coincide with those of the

nearby peoples to ensure their continued existence. In addition, through their initial invisibility to other peoples and their omission from history the Hobbits also appear to reflect the experience of the real-world colonised subject. (188)

Hobbits, therefore, sacrificed parts of their cultural customs in an attempt to save themselves in the global interplay between races but remained invisible to the Free Peoples. To cope with this reality, they fully realised the autonomous government and proceeded to be Self-sufficient and oppressed to live within fixed social and physical borders. Ultimately, the typical interpretation that Hobbits are happy with the essential elements they have in the Shire results from how they were oppressed to normalise that mindset. Why live miserably as outsiders of the global arena when they could make the best out of a bad situation: live the best life they could in their secluded bubble.

3.3   Hobbits in *LotR*

From the start of *LotR*, the narrator directs the interpretation of Hobbits toward inferiority and establishes the readers' view of them as they continue to read. From the first page of *FotR*, in the prologue, the narrator distinguishes the Hobbits as 'small' by stating that '[e]ven in ancient days they were, as a rule, shy of "the Big Folk", as they call us' (*FotR* 1). The narrator speaks to the everyday human reader when writing 'us' and invites the reader to look down on the contrary 'small folk', meaning the Hobbits. The Occidentally-aligned narrator also makes an appearance by affiliating the readers and others than Hobbits as 'us', contrary to 'them'. As Battis argues, the reader colonises the Hobbits because they 'must negotiate an increasingly complex system of looks that seek to either subject, disembody, or distort them.' (909) and 'we are colonizing the hobbits as we read them … we are, indeed, "reading" them into a corner, driving them up and up, against the breathless altitude of our own controlling and classifying knowledge' (916). Based on 'our own discrete and appropriate hermeneutics' (ibid.), Battis discusses how the reader judges the Hobbits in particular episodes which might not follow 'safe binaries'. Because of the Hobbits' initial presentation regarding their 'smallness', the reader has already judged the Hobbits' inferiority and will continue to do so as they read.

The only reason why Hobbits have re-emerged on the global scene in *The Hobbit* and *LotR* is that they can triumph in dangerous quests that others cannot and therefore are relevant to the

events of the Free Peoples. Day explains why especially Hobbits fit the best for the perilous quest in *LotR*:

> The hobbit is too frail and all too human to appear initially as a likely candidate for the role of questing hero … In the end, however, it is the human qualities of compassion and humility in the hobbit that are required to prevail in the quest. The deep wisdom of compassion found in the human (or Hobbit) heart succeeds where heroic strength cannot. (128)

Frodo seems to go along with Gandalf's proposition, although with fearful thoughts: 'I have sometimes thought of going away, but I imagined that as a kind of Holiday … this would mean exile, a flight from danger into danger, drawing it after me … I feel very small, and uprooted' (*FotR* 82). The venture from the Shire to Rivendell while carrying the Ring was already frightful, and Frodo feels increased terror in the council of Elrond when being anxious about having to contribute any more to this dangerous quest, 'A great dread fell on him, as if he was awaiting the pronouncement of some doom that he had long foreseen and vainly hoped might after all never be spoken' (352). During this situation, Frodo also makes it clear to the reader that he did not want to be a part of this quest, 'He wished he was far away.' (321). Frodo ends up offering to take the Ring on a journey but clearly shows fear and hesitation towards it.

Even though Frodo seems to take the Ring at the council of Elrond willingly, one could argue that Elrond covertly pushed him to do so. Elrond seems to realise during the council that Frodo possesses the abilities required for the quest:

> Of the tales that we have heard this day the tale of Frodo was most strange to me. I have known few hobbits, save Bilbo here; and it seems to me that he is perhaps not so alone and singular as I had thought him. The world has changed much since I last was on the westward roads. (*FotR* 345)

Elrond suggests that Frodo possesses the same strong mentality as Bilbo. Bilbo's presence proves that he avoided manipulation while protecting the Ring, but his old age might not suit

the qualifications for this mission. Frodo is then the next best thing and proves an excellent candidate because he is somewhat a younger version of Bilbo. Before Frodo even volunteers, Elrond points out: '[t]his quest may be attempted by the weak with as much hope as the strong. Yet such is oft the course of deeds that move the wheels of the world: small hands do them because they must, while the eyes of the great are elsewhere' (*FotR* 351). Tall and tough races of the Free Peoples are present at the council, suggesting that Elrond is primarily directing this encouragement towards Frodo, who reflects both 'the weak' and 'small hands'. The only other candidate would be dwarves because of their shorter stature than Men. In Frodo's eyes, this speech wouldn't be aimed at them, given that he considers them with great admiration and knows their strength from Bilbo's stories (297). It seems that Elrond confirms his intentions after Frodo volunteers, 'I think this task is appointed to you, Frodo' (353). Therefore, there is a good chance that Frodo feels compelled to take the Ring.

It is also possible to argue that Gandalf exploits Frodo and takes advantage of his trust. Gandalf was confident that the Hobbits are the only candidates for this specific quest, 'I think, Elrond, that in this matter it would be well to trust rather to [the Hobbits'] friendship than to great wisdom' (*FotR* 359). *The Silmarillion* describes that Saruman and Gandalf travel to Middle-earth in their sole mission to fight the growing threat of Sauron (277). In the 2000 years of dwelling in Middle-earth, Gandalf sought power and strategy to rid himself of Sauron (233). Only in *LotR* does Gandalf find that the Ring was in the Shire and that Hobbits have not been as corrupted by it as many other races would have been and could help destroy it. Gandalf seems to be quite loyal to his mission and his superiors, 'he would have no ties and no allegiance, save to those who sent him, and he would abide no place nor be subject to any summons' (*The Silmarillion* 277-278). One could wonder if Gandalf would deprioritise his 80-year long friendship with the Hobbits, given that his quest in Middle-earth has lasted already for 2000 years. After the council of Elrond, Gandalf admits to having omitted crucial information to the Hobbits, presumably to make sure they go along with the quest, 'it is true that if these hobbits understood the danger, they would not dare to go' (*FotR* 359). Because Hobbits are pushed to the Shire, they lack knowledge of anything outside their borders, and Gandalf took advantage of this and persuaded them to join regardless. David Miller points out that, '[t]he Ring-bearer is to be a suffering servant, not a conquering hero' (101), and Gandalf might have believed this. He might have appeared as a kind soul and would not want to force the Hobbits to make such a dangerous journey to Mordor. Although, just because Gandalf is portrayed positively, does not confirm he was not following orders and did not do whatever he

could to make the Hobbits take part in the Ring-quest. Elrond and Gandalf might be the only ones who truly see the capabilities of the Hobbits. This section will elaborate on how the other Free Peoples underestimate Hobbits instead.

3.3.1 Relations

As discussed in the chapter about Orcs, the narrator reflects a western perspective, and the Hobbits receive much attention from the narrator. Deborah C. Rogers explains that 'hobbits are Tolkien's "normal people" *par excellence*: the race and kind of character from whose point of view we see the doings in which we become involved' (67, italics in original). In the Orcs chapter, I argue that the narrator is affiliated with the Hobbits and the other Fellowship members because the reader experiences most of the plot through the Hobbits' actions and thoughts. Battis mainly discusses Sauron because of his 'imperial gaze' and the 'mindless stare' of Shelob, another enemy that the Hobbits have to face. While Battis is right to point out the looks that seek to 'subject, disembody, or distort' Hobbits, her discussion does not cover the looks imposed on them from the other central *LotR* characters. This section will focus on how Boromir of Gondor, Gandalf, a couple of Elves, and Men of Rohan address Hobbits in a way that others them and judges them as inferior.

3.3.1.1 To Men

The first significant representative of Men that the reader meets is Boromir of Gondor. He portrays a superior mindset over Hobbits and reinforces the reader's perception that the Free Peoples are condescending. Boromir could not single-handedly represent the attitudes of his people, but this portrayal is what the readers get and what they initially know about the Men of Gondor. Boromir continuously refers to Hobbits indirectly in the third person as 'halfling' (*FotR* 322, 480), 'little folk' (381), and Frodo as 'Ring-bearer' (466). Scull conducts an informative analysis of Boromir's state of mind and argues that 'he seems to enjoy fighting for its own sake and the glory he earns by it' (154), representing his desire for personal glory. Only when matters are essential to Boromir's intentions and desires does he address the Hobbits other than in the third person. When he is assumed to help the Hobbits to seem like a hero, Boromir addresses Pippin as 'Master Peregrin' (*FotR* 381). 'I was afraid for you, Frodo' (518), repeatedly calls Frodo 'my friend' (520, 521). Later, Boromir is overtly manipulating Frodo, who is aware of this danger, 'the warning of my heart … against trust in the strength and truth

of Men' (518), and Boromir responds, '[Y]et that strength has long protected you far away in your little country, though you knew it not' (518). A reader who pays attention might have noticed that Aragorn once uttered this fact as a presumed insult towards Boromir, 'You know little of the lands beyond your bounds. Peace and freedom, do you say? The North would have known them little but for us.' (323). The condescending tone Boromir provides by saying 'you knew it not', and a certain expectance for Frodo to appreciate this protection that Boromir falsely takes credit for clearly shows that he is only after his personal gain. Even though Boromir redeems himself when dying to protect the Hobbits Merry and Pippin, the reader gets no counterweight to his condescending attitude until they meet Faramir, also a Man of Gondor who slowly seems to appreciate the Hobbits.

3.3.1.2 To Elves

Elves have a clear condescending tone toward Hobbits. They address most other races than themselves in such tones, but Elves condescend to the Hobbits particularly because of their short stature and helplessness. In *LotR*, the Elven Legolas speaks little toward and with the Hobbits. What eventually raises his attention is Pippin who seems to offend Legolas by questioning the defence of the Woodland/Elven realm: 'Then dig a hole in the ground … if that is more after the fashion of your kind. But you must dig swift and deep, if you wish to hide from Orcs.' (*FotR* 445). The sarcastic tone and slight exaggeration in this comment seem to indicate that Legolas considers the task too difficult for the helpless Hobbits. Shortly after, Legolas condescends to the Hobbits' carelessness by pointing out that '[Elves] say that you breathe so loud that they could shoot you in the dark.' (ibid.). By insinuating that the naïve Hobbits are easy to kill, Legolas makes them feel small and unimportant. The Elven Gildor further indicates that Hobbits are insignificant by not acknowledging the Hobbits' primary settlement, the Shire, 'But it is not your own Shire … Others dwelt here before hobbits were; and others will dwell here again when hobbits are no more.' (109). Gildor takes away the Hobbits' claim to the one thing they consider their own. One could argue that Elves have another perspective on life given that they are immortal and have supposedly seen several races exist and die out. This might explain Gildor's condescending tone toward the Hobbits when he so lightly claims that their race will be 'no more' one day as if their race did not have the national integrity to endure the test of time. Legolas and Gildor do not seem to take the Hobbits seriously, and most importantly, it does not make them feel remotely relevant or appreciated, as Sam comments '[t]hey seem a bit above my likes and dislikes, so to speak … It don't seem to matter what I think about them. They are quite different from what I expected' (113-114).

The Elves' condescension ultimately disappoints the Hobbits, especially Sam, who greatly admired them. The Hobbits' realise how the arrogant Elves perceive them, signifying a strained relation.

3.3.1.3 To Others

Besides Elves and Men of Gondor, other Peoples, such as the Men of Rohan, show that Hobbits have become wholly unknown in parts of Middle-earth. Éomer, the future king of Rohan, does not even know they exist, 'Hobbits? … And what may they be? It is a strange name' (*TT* 565). Another man of Eomer's people blurts out when hearing about Hobbits through another name, 'Halflings! But they are only a little people in old songs and children's tales out of the North.' (ibid.). This ignorance suggests that perhaps the knowledge of the Hobbits in Rohan comes from tales and songs, indicating that they might not acknowledge the Hobbits' existence at all. Given that Hobbits were pushed out of existence in the past, it suggests that the horse-lords of Rohan, ignored Hobbits like other Free Peoples. Through many generations, the Hobbits' existence was lost and reduced to fairy tale form. Because Hobbits seem like fairy tales to them, it suggests that this results from past oppression contributing to making the Hobbits disappear from the international stage.

During *LotR,* Hobbits are prone to underestimation by Peoples who do not intend it. Scull argues that '[e]ven when [Aragorn] has decided that [the Hobbits] are friends, he at first underestimates them' (154). Aragorn acknowledges their strength and courage, but occasionally he finds himself referring to their childlike features, like when he explains Hobbits to Eomer as 'small, only children to your eyes' (*TT* 565). As Scull unravels the dilemma of Aragorn, she also points out another important aspect: 'Open-mindedness is as relevant in our world as it is in Tolkien's Middle-earth. So many of our problems have their source in intolerance, nationalism, and closed minds' (156). Open-mindedness could indeed prevent much of the prejudice that Hobbits experience in *LotR*, but the next section might prove that there are still many closed minds in Middle-earth, even though the smallest protagonists saved the Free Peoples.

3.4 Post-War Identity

During *LotR* events, the Hobbits Frodo, Sam, Pippin, and Merry grow exponentially because they learn more about the world around them. Langford discusses that the Hobbits Frodo, Sam,

Pippin, and Merry go through a process of maturation in parallel with natural aging, but one can also discuss this learning experience through colonial means. Frantz Fanon describes the 'native intellectual' who is 'utilizing techniques and language which are borrowed from the stranger in his country' (*Wretched of the Earth* 223). In this case, the 'stranger' means the Free Peoples that the Merry, Pippin, Sam and Frodo meet on their journey in *LotR*, and they meet them outside the Shire and not in their country. The four Hobbits all represent the 'native intellectual' because they save the Shire based on their newly acquired skills from the West. While Langford argues that the Hobbits go through a maturation process because they grow mentally from their experiences, one can also say that the Hobbits become 'Western-educated' and are therefore more experienced than the rest of the Shire. When using a post-colonial perspective on their experience, the reader can abstain from perceiving the Hobbits as immature (as do Aragorn and Boromir) and instead consider them as colonial subjects. This perspective also encourages a supportive analysis for the Hobbits instead of enforcing patronisation.

The four Hobbits participated in The War of the Ring because of their oppressed background, and due to becoming western-educated, they become socially detached from their nation. Because the Hobbits have a clear sense of Self-identity and belief that the Shire should have everything a Hobbit would need, the four main Hobbits disrupt this notion of Self and become subject to interior othering. Langston points out that Frodo might have been well-aware of being othered by leaving the Shire already in the second chapter of *FotR*, '[Frodo] realizes that in order to save the Shire, he may have to sacrifice his own place in it – a recognition which in the end proves more true than he had expected.' (6). Miller elaborates on Frodo's awareness but takes it even further by arguing that 'Frodo is no longer a whole hobbit – he has given up his hobbitness' (97). Frodo consciously sacrifices his hobbitness but seems to be unprepared in being othered by his people, and ultimately travels westwards because he can never settle in the Shire again comfortably, '[the Shire] has been saved, but not for me.' (*RotK* 1346). Even though Frodo might have suffered the most from the Hobbits' experiences, the Shire inhabitants could never imagine the mission's perilous circumstances, given their unawareness of the outside world. Merry, Pippin, and Sam were less affected than Frodo, but 'Pippin and Merry have drunk of the entwash: they too are no longer mere hobbits. Sam is the least affected of all the hobbits, yet he also is not the same.' (Miller 97-98). Because all the four Hobbits ventured beyond the Shire, collaborated with the Free Peoples, and participated in international affairs, they were affected by the West and othered.

Pippin and Merry should be othered on the same level as Sam and Frodo, but they manage to overcome it. Fanon highlights that '[T]he native intellectual who comes back to his people by the way of cultural achievements behaves in fact like a foreigner' (*Wretched of the Earth* 223). Even when Pippin and Merry have borrowed western language when 'they [are] indeed more fairspoken … than ever before' (*RotK* 1341), they are still regarded by the other Hobbits as 'large and magnificent, … unchanged' (ibid.). Fanon further presents how a native who has spent time in Western regions, 'returns home radically transformed' (*Black Skin*, 3). Pippin and Merry earn admiration by saving the Shire from colonisation and make such a great impression on the Shire-inhabitants that they triumph against the effects of interior othering. The following section will therefore elaborate on the Shire's rescue from Saruman's colonisation during the penultimate chapter of *LotR*: 'The Scouring of the Shire'.

3.5 Anti-colonial resistance

The Hobbits finally re-emerge on the global scene and their level of oppression becomes clear as Saruman colonises them. In the penultimate chapter of *LotR*, 'the Scouring of the Shire', it is revealed that the Shire has been thoroughly subjugated to Saruman's forces for quite some time. Given the previous discussion on Saruman's superior mindset, his colonisation of the Shire was presumably led by the perception that Hobbits are weak and easily subjugated, as Liebherr argues: 'it would appear that [Saruman's] decision to colonise the Shire was also motivated by the fact that he perceives the Shire-folk as the weakest, most submissive of the inhabitants of Middle-earth' (155). Saruman's perception of the Hobbits as weak could be a result of their oppressed identity, and I will present here that Saruman was right in his assumption and, only because the Hobbits become 'Westernised', they save the Shire.

The first indication that there is something amiss shows up when one of the native Hobbits points out that, 'I am sorry, Mr. Merry … but it isn't allowed … Taking in folk off-hand like, and eating extra food, and all that' (*RotK* 1308). As pointed out earlier, having rules and government, in general, was unnatural for Hobbits, and refusing to take in visitors, as a rule, seems off. The Hobbit also points out a fact which indicates the presence of new, strange people in charge:

> We grows a lot of food, but we don't rightly know what becomes of it. It's all these

'gatherers' and 'sharers', I reckon, going round counting and measuring and taking off to storage. They do more gathering than sharing, and we never see most of the stuff again, (ibid.)

All the stocks seem to have gone. We do hear that waggon-loads of it went away down the old road out of the Southfarthing, over Sarn Ford way. That would be the end o' last year, after you left. (1309)

This suggests that the new people in charge have taken over the governing of the Shire's supplies, food resources and simultaneously taking most of the resources for themselves. The Hobbit also informs that these things started happening after the four Hobbits left the Shire, but it is hard to say if this happened due to them leaving, because they did not occupy serious societal positions. Shortly after, a 'Shirrif' insists on arresting Frodo for breaking the rules in question:

It's the Chief's orders that you're to come along quiet. We're going to take you to Bywater and hand you over to the Chief's Men; and when he deals with your case you can have your say. But if you don't want to stay in the Lockholes any longer than you need, I should cut the say short, if I was you. (1310)

The 'Lockholes' indicate that a prison was built in the Shire, and a police force is surprisingly carrying out tasks on other Hobbits, while in the past, such a force was 'more concerned with the strayings of beasts than of people' (*FotR* 12-13). This Shirrif also seems notably loyal to their new, strange Chief, which in Hobbit-like fashion would be unnatural because the Shire was more accustomed to solidarity. This questionable loyalty could indicate that the ones following this Chief's orders are doing so based on fear, and they need saving. In general, noticeable changes have occurred to the Shire, unusual for their race, indicating that a foreign invasion threatens the peaceful, harmonic Shire-life.

Parallel to Fanon's idea on national culture, Merry and Pippin reflect the three phases of formulating national culture. The first phase represents how a selection of natives attempts to copy 'the cultural fashions of the colonising power' (McLeod 104), which is reflected in the Hobbits Merry and Pippin, who learned the skills of battle and war from the Men of Rohan and

Gondor. In this case, the 'colonising power' is the Men of Rohan and Gondor because they have functioned as the prominent races who contributed to the oppression of Hobbits in the past. The second phase explains that 'the native intellectual grows dissatisfied with copying the coloniser and instead becomes immersed in the cultural history of the people' (ibid.). This relatively parallels the Hobbits' call for home after being involved with the Western affairs (The War of the Ring). In this case, Merry and Pippin correlate with this phase's focus on detaching from the coloniser and emphasises the focus on their people instead, because they come home and focus on the Shire's concerns. In this phase, the native intellectual is no longer part of the people, and by recollecting Langford's come-of-age essay, it is possible to argue that Merry and Pippin only now have 'exterior relations' (Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth* 222) with their people because they have been Western-educated and matured beyond the common Hobbit.

Merry and Pippin are central heroes in the Scouring of the Shire. War breaks out between the Hobbits and the Ruffians and Merry and Pippin ensured victory and sovereignty for the Hobbits. The two Hobbits' achievement bring them much admiration from their fellow Hobbits. Fanon's third phase, 'the fighting phase' (*Wretched of the Earth* 222), explains that the native intellectual 'turns himself into an awakener of the people' (223). Merry and Pippin step into the awakener-role by saving the Hobbits from colonisation. During the attack on the ruffians, Merry significantly steps into the role of a leader, '[w]e'll try to deal with them neatly, but we must be prepared for the worst. Now I've got a plan.' (*RotK* 1321) and valiantly 'slew the leader, a great squint-eyed brute like a huge orc' (1329). Pippin functioned as the leader of his great family, 'The Tooks … marched in, a hundred strong, from Tuckborough and the Green Hills with Pippin at their head.' (1328) and alongside Merry ended the Battle of Bywater which awarded them both the 'very considerable rise in the fame and fortune of the Cottons … at the top of the Roll in all accounts stand the names of Captains Meriadoc and Peregrin' (1329). Most of the honours from the Scouring of the Shire went to Merry and Pippin, as there is little interest from other Hobbits in the adventures of Sam and Frodo, '[f]ew people knew or wanted to know about [Sam's] deeds and adventures; their admiration and respect were given mostly to Mr. Meriadoc and Mr. Peregrin' (1342). It is clear that the Hobbit people only acknowledged the deeds in the Shire and uninterested in what happened beyond its borders. Therefore, Merry and Pippin assume the position of leading and changing the Hobbits' oppressed situation.

As a result, the third phase is complicated because Merry and Pippin fail in acting on the '[W]ill of the people' on an international plane. The native intellectuals Merry and Pippin fail to

transform the nation and reflect the nationalist victory because of John McLeod's point about the third phase's pitfall: 'the old seats of colonial government are simply occupied by a new indigenous elite' (107). The new indigenous elite is Merry and Pippin who are now western-educated and more experienced than other common Hobbits. Fanon points out that the true anti-colonists who would replace the national bourgeoisie could easily fall into a pitfall of national consciousness because 'unity can only be achieved through the upward thrust of the people, and under the leadership of the people' (*Wretched of the Earth* 164) and would therefore have to act on, 'the [W]ill of the people' (McLeod 107). In the early stage of the Scouring of the Shire, the Hobbit inhabitants are miserable and seem uplifted when the returning Hobbits bring a fighting spirit, 'So it's begun at last! I've been itching for trouble all this year, but folks wouldn't help' (*RotK* 1319). In the aftermath, the narrator highlights that the Hobbit people are happy with the result and indicate a mood that everything is back to normal, 'they moved on. And no one was ill, and everyone was pleased, except those who had to mow the grass' (1339). Merry and Pippin succeed in saving the Hobbit people from the ruffians and free them from colonisation because that represented the 'Will of the people'. Because the Hobbits' Will does not apply outside of the Shire, Pippin and Merry's newly acquainted relations with the Free Peoples become the first step in fighting the oppression of the Hobbits on the international stage.

3.6 Future projections

Merry and Pippin are the only chance the Hobbits have to become more involved in the geopolitical interplay in Middle-earth, but they already have a disadvantage. Because of the interior othering in the Shire, Merry and Pippin are already western-educated and not wholly Hobbits anymore. They do not reflect their nationality perfectly, making them unfit to be the leaders in a colonial resistance. The Hobbits' Will seems to only apply to the battle against colonialism in the Scouring, proven by the Hobbits' satisfaction after the battle. Fanon's third phase characterises the native intellectual as 'the mouthpiece of a new reality in action' (*Wretched of the Earth* 223). Merry and Pippin stand on the metaphorical border between the subconsciously oppressed Hobbits and their opportunity to undo that oppression with their new relations to the Free Peoples. Sam and Frodo are irrelevant in this case because they didn't receive the same admiration from the Shire-inhabitants in the same degree as Merry and Pippin did. If the Hobbits, in general, were aware of their oppression and desired to change it, Merry

and Pippin would be the key to doing that. But because the Hobbits' collective desire is to live in seclusion, Merry and Pippin fall into the pitfall of national consciousness since they don't follow the same Hobbit Will. The two Hobbits therefore fail to fulfil Fanon's third phase and seem to only maintain their good relations with the Free Peoples for their own sake.

The remaining Hobbit protagonists except Frodo took important positions of office in its community. Sam became mayor of the Shire seven consecutive times, Pippin became Thain, and with Merry, the three become the counsellors of the Northern Kingdom, in which the Shire now obeyed (*RotK*: Appendix B 1441). Because of their new knowledge of the outside world, the four Hobbits ventured more freely, whereas Merry frequently visited Rivendell, 'Meriadoc obtained assistance and information from Rivendell, which he visited more than once.' (*FotR* 20) and Sam travelled to Gondor, 'Master Samwise and his wife and Elanor ride to Gondor and stay there for a year' (*RotK*: Appendix B 1441-1442). The four crucial Hobbits all receive high honours when their last days are upon them. Shortly after their return to the Shire, Frodo travels across the sea to the West, the land of Elves and higher beings, while Sam receives the same offer when his wife dies of old age (1443). Pippin and Merry were buried next to King Aragorn's grave in Minas Tirith, which also meant among 'the great of Gondor' (ibid.). Langford points out that the appreciation for the four Hobbits:

> began to change with the quest of the Ring. For the first time since the fall of the North Kingdom over a thousand years before, hobbit representatives are present as active participants in the affairs of the outside world, playing key roles in the return of the king and restoration of the kingdom. (8)

The narrative concludes that the Hobbits' achievements 'led to the inclusion of the Shire in the Reunited Kingdom' (*FotR* 18), and Scull argues that 'the Shire could not but become gradually more involved in the affairs of the wider world' (152). There is no doubt that the Hobbits were appreciated and proved themselves worthy because of their war efforts. The question remains if this is enough to bring the whole Hobbit race properly into the Reunited Kingdom and permanently undo their oppression.

Aragorn is perhaps the most important factor in allowing the Hobbits to become better known and free themselves from their social exclusion in the Shire. Aragorn proclaims that 'though

your people have had little fame in the legends of the great, they will now have more renown than many wide realms that are no more.' (*RotK* 1275). However, it becomes problematic when Aragorn figuratively shuts down the Shire, presumably to respect the Hobbits' wish to be left alone, 'King Elessar issues an edict that Men are not to enter the Shire, and he makes it a Free Land under the protection of the Northern Sceptre.' (1441). Because he is one of few who seems to understand the Hobbits' nature fully, he would know that the Hobbits would be most happy being left alone and untroubled by the affairs outside of the Shire. This is then arguably the reason behind issuing the edict, but ironically, he steps into the shoes of his forefathers and unconsciously repeats history. As the Hobbits were protected by the High King of Fornost many years ago, they gradually faded into the background and were forgotten by the Free Peoples. In those times, the Hobbits were more open to international relations, as previously discussed, and were still overlooked and ignored. Now the Hobbits prefer seclusion. Given that it is considered an unhobbitlike act to leave the Shire, the Hobbits would probably not pass those borders to explore Middle-earth. Apparently, the Hobbits' interests conflicted with the priorities of the Free Peoples in the past, and now the Free Peoples could be willing to build relations with Hobbits, when Hobbits are too familiar with their seclusion. If the Hobbits' and Free Peoples' interests had coincided at first, their situation could have been quite different during *LotR*. This does not bode well for the Hobbits' gradual emergence onto the global scene but instead promotes the subconscious continuation of oppression they have lived under throughout their history in Middle-earth.

Merry and Pippin's efforts to undo this oppression might not be in vain if the traces they left behind in Middle-earth had a significant impact on the future. As previously discussed, Hobbits had a noticeable interest in writing history and a love for genealogy. The events of *LotR* amplified their interest and gave them more material to register, and '[b]y the end of the first century of the Fourth Age there were already to be found in the Shire several libraries that contained many historical books and records.' (*FotR* 18). Merry and Pippin seem to be getting much of the credit for the books that filled these libraries, 'Since Meriadoc and Peregrin became the heads of their great families, and at the same time kept up their connexions with Rohan and Gondor, the libraries at Bucklebury and Tuckborough contained much that did not appear in [Frodo and Bilbo's book]' (20). Merry managed to produce many works dealing with the History of Rohan and comparisons between its realm and the Shire, where he expanded the knowledge of Hobbits and their endeavours by also including other prominent races of Middle-earth (ibid.). While Pippin was Thain of the Shire, he made sure that a copy of the Red Book

of Westmarch, a full record about the events of *The Hobbit* and *LotR* from a Hobbit's perspective, made it to the libraries of Gondor, 'that book was a copy, made at the request of King Elessar, of the Red Book of the Periannath, and was brought to him by the Thain Peregrin' (19). Previously, the Free Peoples excluded the Hobbits from their recordings, and these new indexes could correct this exclusion. Bilbo, Frodo, and Sam wrote the Red Book, but if it were not for Merry and Pippin, its contents might not have made it out of the Shire. Therefore, thanks to Merry and Pippin, a foundation for the Hobbits' future presence in the Reunited Kingdoms is established.

It would seem necessary to discuss precisely how solid this foundation is. Is there any guarantee that Hobbits will not once again turn into imaginary children's tales? Once Pippin arrives in Gondor with '[t]he most important copy' (*FotR* 19) of the Red book, 'it received much annotation, and many corrections' (ibid.). Since the narration omits any information about exactly what changed, perhaps the book was annotated to a point where it no longer highlighted the Hobbits' credit and perspective. The book could therefore work against preserving the Hobbits' presence in the Reunited Kingdom, but it is hard to conclude without any confirmation. Oral storytelling could either support the effect of written history or they could both be ineffective. When the Hobbits enter Minas Tirith after the victory of The War, there is one civilian who describes the Hobbits as 'four small figures that many marvelled to see … [T]hey are not boys … [T]hose are Periain, out of the far country of the Halflings, where they are princes of great fame, it is said … [T]hey are small, but they are valiant … [T]hey are dear friends, I hear.' (*RotK* 1266). Interestingly enough, this civilian refers to the Hobbits by the name given to them by Elves (Periain) and Men (halflings), but not their correct national name: Hobbit. The four Hobbits in this scenario have already strayed from hobbitness by participating in The War, so it might be intentional that they are addressed by the name given to them by relative strangers. This also complicates the image of Hobbits for the Free Peoples in the future.

Because Merry, Pippin, and Sam are the only Hobbits who venture beyond the Shire, they alone visualise their race for the Free Peoples. They would be the only Hobbits visible to the Free Peoples, especially after Aragorn passes the edict that no Men are allowed to enter the Shire. Therefore, it is implied that the Hobbits' are only a visual influence on Free Peoples until Sam, Pippin and Merry die. From then on, the only way the Hobbits would continue to exist in the minds of the Free Peoples, is through written records, such as books or through continuous oral communication. The Gondor citizen is the only record of any person who speaks of the Hobbits other than Aragorn, Éomer and Faramir. If this verbal exchange between the Free civilians

wouldn't be maintained, in their eyes, the Hobbits might revert back to folktale again, so they only exist as they did for the Men of Rohan, in 'children's tales out of the North' (*FotR* 565). The only other way the civilians could maintain respect for Hobbits would be to read the Red Book of Periannath in Gondor voluntarily. If the annotations would stay true to the Hobbits' credit, it would only be necessary for the civilians to be interested enough to study Hobbits themselves.

The best chance of making the Hobbits gradually less oppressed in the Reunited Kingdoms is the spread of influence through generations. The narration indicates that the descendants of Sam and Pippin especially were significant, 'many copies [of the Red Book] were made [for] … the descendants of the children of Master Samwise' and '[t]he most important copy … was written in Gondor, probably at the request of the great-grandson of Peregrin' (*FotR* 19). In the Shire, these new relations only interested a few: '[t]he greater families were also concerned with events in the Kingdom at large, and many of their members studied its ancient histories and legends' (18). If the greater families involved those whose family trees are presented in Appendix C in *RotK*, it would seem that only Pippin and Sam bore forth new generations for these great families (1447-49). Given the closed border into the Shire and the three Hobbits' volunteering to travel, it suggests that these Hobbits' descendants would grow up open-minded to all of the Reunited Kingdom's lands and peoples. Scull argues that 'individuals may grow greatly in understanding, but attitudes of the population in general change only slowly' (153). Considering that an open-minded nature would pass on to Pippin's son and Sam's thirteen children, it could be a substantial start to gradually integrate the Hobbits further into the geopolitical interplay in the Reunited Kingdoms and change the Free Peoples' perception of Hobbits.

3.7 Conclusion

The everyday reader might perceive Hobbits as the clear protagonists of the plot and praise them for their valiant achievements. It is presumably less clear in between the lines exactly how they are recruited for the mission and how insecure their future is after The War. I have shown how Frodo was unjustly persuaded to partake in the Ring-mission and one might wonder if the wounds and pain he suffered afterwards made it worthwhile. Following Frodo was Sam, Pippin and Merry, who were more or less unharmed from The War, but highly admired by both great Free Peoples and their fellow Shire-Hobbits. Their hobbitness is complicated because of this interconnectedness with other Peoples, but they could encourage the next generation to further

the positive inclusion of Hobbits into Reunited Kingdom. The four Hobbits receive high honours after The War from Aragorn, Éomer, and Faramir, but those Peoples keep in touch with only Merry, Pippin and Sam individually afterwards, with less to no relation to the race collectively. Aragorn forbidding any Free Peoples from entering the Shire complicates the Free Peoples in getting more acquainted with Hobbits. Hobbits themselves have through a millennium grown increasingly afraid of the outside world, which eliminates any chance of them venturing there willingly. The written knowledge and verbal exchange from both sides would have a considerable effect on becoming more open and inclusive, although it is uncertain if Hobbits and the Free Peoples have enough mutual trust and interest to follow it up. The most important link between these two worlds is therefore Merry, Pippin, Sam and their children who could slowly open up the sceptical, scared minds of the Hobbits by teaching them about the world and encouraging them to explore more. They could also encourage the Free Peoples' interest in the Hobbits further with the books they have written, such as Pippin's son's writing endeavours. The Free Peoples and the Hobbits' interest in maintaining and increasing their relations, alongside the influence of Merry's and Sam's total of fourteen children, stand as the best chance for changed attitudes and proper inclusion in the future. Tolkien did not write more books about what the Fourth Age really entailed, so all we can do is speculate and assume what the outcomes will be, but ultimately depend on the inhabitants of Middle-earth to change their future for the better.

4 General Conclusion

Orcs and Hobbits have experienced the same treatment in the past and during *LotR*, and one can argue that their histories are quite similar. One difference remains: The Hobbits were oppressed because they were left alone, but Orcs were colonised because Morgoth, Sauron, and Saruman wouldn't leave them alone. When Hobbits wanted to maintain connections to other races, the Free Peoples didn't feel the same. Orcs were let down twice: rejected by their fellow Elves and subjugated by Morgoth because of it. At one point or another, both Hobbits and Orcs were cast away by Free Peoples, and their existence was ignored. Orcs as Avari Elves were rejected and disrespected by other Elves, and given their colonised state, they don't have a voice or any grounds to appear significant. Hobbits were ignored and slowly disappeared from history when Free Peoples deemed them unimportant and uninteresting. Both these cases occur in The Silmarillion or shortly in the prologue of *LotR*, making it difficult for the ordinary reader of *LotR* to know these complicated pasts.

In the first chapter of this thesis, I aimed to discuss that Orcs are a colonised race. Because of this, the Orcs appear as misunderstood villains, and the narrative directs the reader to ignore their real colonised situation. This discussion aimed to fill the gap on Orcs' research because their underlying complexity has yet to be fully explored. My representation of their humane and surprising characteristics aimed to explore why they have been portrayed as irredeemable monsters when emotions such as fear, empathy, and concern don't match the portrayal. The effects of colonisation seemed to be present, and I have discussed the possibility of Orcs' colonised past and the possibility of colonisation during *LotR*. In light of this, I have discussed how the negative representation of them could lead most readers to demonise them and ignore their human traits.

When discussing Orcs' summarised history and identity, colonisation and Orientalism intertwined to provide a functioning theory. As a result of Morgoth's colonisation, the Orcs became Oriental: perceived as undeveloped, feral, aberrant, and inferior. They were demonised, feared, controlled, and oppressed. As I discussed the various periods that Orcs appeared colonised or independent, at least one Orientalist dogma was relevant to either the Orcs' appearance or perception by others. Therefore, I discussed the relevance of Orientalism throughout the chapter to provide the most precise portrayal of colonised, Oriental Orcs. Orcs happened to qualify for Said's first, third, and fourth dogma, explaining how they are perceived as villains in *LotR*. Therefore, Orientalism proved helpful in seeing the Orcs in a post-colonial

perspective and simultaneously seeing their representation in a new, sympathetic light. By being Oriental, the Orcs were completely demonised by other races, and no one has questioned their nature and why it is acceptable to kill them. Because of this disregard, I discuss, during 'Colonisation', that Orcs are re-colonised by Saruman and Sauron. The use of Orientalism revealed that Orcs fit into nearly every aspect of the Oriental as discussed in the respective chapter. The Orcs were portrayed as inferior, undeveloped, aberrant, unable to identify themselves and in general necessary to fear or control. Only one single term in Said's third dogma does not fit completely: uniform. Because the Orcs as Oriental are not evil simply because they belong to a distinct, uniform Eastern region, one cannot qualify them for this meaning of Oriental. One could, however, argue that Orcs, in the reader's eyes, affiliate with the East, since Orcs and the East are similarly, negatively portrayed. Additionally, it could be said that a uniform Eastern region is established when the Orcs receive the Núrnen region, located in the far East of Middle-earth, but little is said about whether or not the Orcs settle there at all. Nor is it clear if the Orcs qualify for Said's second dogma: 'abstractions about the Orient, particularly those based on texts representing a "classical" Oriental civilization, are always preferable to direct evidence drawn from modern Oriental realities' (300). Given that this thesis has abstained from discussing Tolkien's background and inspirations for writing *LotR*, it would be impossible to discuss this dogma. Therefore, with certain constrictions and few inconsistencies with Orcs' connection to Orientalism, it is still possible to label them Oriental.

The second chapter discusses Hobbits as an oppressed race which is highly misinterpreted in *LotR*. Hobbits have, like Orcs, an elaborate history. Many critics have analysed the Hobbits' nature and identity, but the connection between their origin and portrayal in *LotR* has yet been explored. The Hobbits reveal an oppressed state in their early days in Middle-earth, motivated by their survival in a world largely dependent on strength alone or collectively in alliances. Purely based on the nature of their race, the Hobbits were oppressed and pushed to the Shire for at least 1300 years, until Gandalf's intervention in *The Hobbit*. During this time, they had partly accepted being excluded and appear content with their identity and lifestyle when portrayed in *The Hobbit* and *LotR*. Because their oppression has lasted for so long, the Hobbits, in general, cannot acknowledge that they are deliberately excluded from worldly affairs, which complicates a potential anti-colonial resistance.

The Hobbits Merry and Pippin fit perfectly as resistance leaders to bring Hobbits out of this oppressed state but predictably fail based on the Hobbits' collective blissful ignorance. Fanon's ideas on national culture have proven that Merry and Pippin were likely to fail and that they no longer fit into the Hobbit nationality. Because of the Hobbits' position in-between Orientals and Occidentals, they appear inferior, undeveloped, but not under direct authority from the Free Peoples, making them a middleman. Orientalism proved to be less relevant in the Hobbits' case, but Fanon's ideas fit relatively well. In *LotR*, four Hobbits act as main protagonists and are therefore given much attention and praise when victory is established, but only a resistant, close reading of their treatment and history, truly reveals their racial oppression. Many scholars discuss the Hobbits in *LotR*. These studies tend to focus on a specific event or theme, but this thesis aims to combine separate arguments into a larger picture. With help from Battis who investigates Hobbits as colonial subjects throughout *LotR*, I will provide a full picture of the Hobbits' history. By seeing the bigger picture, I confidently conclude Hobbits as oppressed peoples. The Hobbits' history seems simple in some ways to acknowledge the disregard from Free Peoples as oppression, but more post-colonial theory would be beneficial to strengthen this argument. Fanon's ideas on national culture helped explain why the Hobbits would not succeed in fighting their oppression, which brings this thesis to predict the Hobbits' possibilities in the future.

Neither Orcs nor Hobbits want to be a part of The War, clearly indicating that they are forced and miserable. Both Hobbits and Orcs are involved in the plot due to The War, and they have to act out one single duty. The only reason that Gandalf includes Hobbits in the narrative is that he discovered that they had one ability that other great people did not: not caring about power. Considering that the Hobbits have been conditioned over generations to like their powerless situation, it is precisely what makes them resistant to the Ring of Power. One could then wonder if the Hobbits were specifically oppressed from the start to carry out the quest of destroying the Ring in *LotR*. Orcs are also without a doubt exploited, but because of their demonisation, it becomes difficult to see it as exploitation and realise that both Saruman and Sauron are using them against their will. One could also compare Frodo's unwillingness to the Orc Shagrat, who daydreams about The War being over and is troubled and scared about his position. Both Hobbits and Orcs are equally crucial for the novel's plot, but they are similarly exploited and therefore inhabit the same oppressed state relative to their respective factions. One could say that because of their equal standing, the Hobbits use the voice they're given in *LotR* to raise attention to the Orcs as well. The narrator mentions the Orcs rarely, but on multiple occasions

indirectly through Hobbits, as they become the Orcs' voice in their colonised situation. The Hobbits' intermediacy gives the reader access to the Orcs' situation, feelings, and behaviour, providing the Orcs with a second chance at the reader's understanding and sympathy. By being completely disregarded and ignored by the Free Peoples for a long time, Hobbits, more than anyone, might be said to recognise how that treatment feels. They naturally feel compelled to acknowledge the Orcs. In a way, one can assume that the Hobbits indirectly fight oppression and colonisation by raising attention to Orcs when the Hobbits had just received a somewhat central position in Middle-earth.

In the end, once again, the Hobbits and Orcs are denied and cast away. Both races will likely suffer the same backslide into oppression and colonisation. Because both Orcs and Hobbits seem to have a negative outlook after *RotK*, the chances are that they find themselves in an endless loop, destined to be disregarded by the majority of Middle-earth. Given the Orcs' Oriental role, the Free Peoples will continue to ignore them as much as possible, if they don't have to resort to violence. Orcs proved to have little to no knowledge of organising a society, no leadership skills, and no conscious desire to avoid conflict. The most probable outcome is that Orcs will continue to suffer the same chaotic, feral, survivalist lifestyle. They would then continue to wage war and bring conflict and problems to the Free Peoples, and continuously be chased and killed by them. Receiving their sovereignty from Sauron and Saruman differs little from being freed from Morgoth's colonial rule, indicating that they will eventually repeat their fate: being colonised. Naturally, they could suffer another fate: disappearing entirely, starving to death due to their territory being deprived of fertility and distanced from other potential plunder-victims. One could ask whether this fate would prove more beneficial for them than being colonised for a third time. The Hobbits receive a relatively milder fate, considering that they cannot become more oppressed by the Free Peoples and therefore continue to live blissfully ignorant. The race in general has after all gotten through the worst historical period; being aware of the exclusion and living miserably secluded. Hobbits now live happily in the far corner of Middle-earth. Whether or not Pippin's and Sam's children slowly bring change to the Hobbits' minds, it will probably not have much impact on their state of mind. Surely, being more included in the Reunited Kingdom could benefit them technology-wise and bring excitement from new relations, but in general, I reckon that Hobbits would be apathetic. Aragorn's edict to shut down the Shire indicates that the general perspective on the Hobbits amplifies their exclusion, and the Hobbits and Free Peoples have a mutual understanding that the Shire will stay hidden physically and metaphorically. The generations following Sam and

Pippin could provide a general knowledge that Hobbits exist, but I am sceptical that they would bring about significant change for the Hobbit race.

This pessimistic prediction for the Orcs' and Hobbits' future brings a new approach to the ending of *LotR*. Because the end of *RotK* indicates a positive outlook and a prosperous time for the Reunited Kingdom with the valiant Aragorn at the top, a typical reader is left with a positive impression, believing that this is a happy ending for all of Middle-earth. This thesis argues that the ending bodes ill not only for the Orcs, but for the main protagonists, the Hobbits. One could wonder if even the individual Hobbit heroes achieved positive outcomes from The War, since they were othered by their society. Frodo certainly did not achieve happiness, because of his misery from being wounded. The three other Hobbits were labelled as 'unhobbitlike' and had to live the rest of their days as such. It would seem that the relation they gained with the Free Peoples could make up for the interior othering in the Shire, but in the end, was it genuinely worth losing their national connection to get more acquainted with the Peoples who barely knew they existed before The War?

This thesis portrays Orcs and Hobbits as more complex races than anticipated. The Hobbits and Orcs both present false images of themselves in *LotR* if the reader is unfamiliar with their pasts. Both appear simple: the monstrous enemy or the harmless weakling. Hobbits had a more complicated history, being excluded from everything around them and tending only to themselves. This complexity also sparks a second look at the Free Peoples, revealing tendencies toward superiority and condescension. One could also question whether Gandalf exploits Hobbits, complicating his character, which on the surface appears supportive and kind. The vicious Orcs could prove the reader's first impression completely false, given their struggling past with rejection from their people and being colonised for several millennia. When considering their tragic past and present as colonised, the colonists Morgoth, Sauron, and Saruman appear as worse villains, increasing the complexity of their roles as villains in *LotR*. A *LotR*-fan might forever see Tolkien's novels in a new light and pay more attention to the actualities behind the different Peoples of Arda. This new reading sparks a sympathetic reconsideration of Orcs and increased fear and disgust of the real villains, the colonists.

While other scholars do not delve further into the post-colonial elements found in *LotR*, there is certainly potential for it. Tally discusses Orcs to a considerable degree, showing how they earn the reader's sympathy, but he says little about what he believes is the background for their human portrayal. With this thesis, I have added a potential theory as to why Orcs can appear as

rational and unfortunate creatures who deserve better treatment, but I also encourage others to resist the conventional reading of *LotR*. The role of Orcs as convenient and apparent enemies of the fantastic narrative functions well in said narrative, but a resistant reading also gives the villains a second chance at redemption, so the audience is aware of who exactly is the main villain: the colonisers. The Orcs, like classic misunderstood villains such as the Phantom of the Opera and Disney's Maleficent, can help show that those who are initially perceived as evil might not be so. The Orcs could, for most readers, receive the same treatment as Frankenstein's Monster, who is often misconceived as Frankenstein himself. It is Frankenstein, the creator of the monster, who is in actuality the villain, not the monster. Similarly, Orcs receive an unjustified stigma as the horrendous enemy when their colonists should receive all the blame for their unfair treatment.

This thesis is first to describe Orcs and Hobbits as colonised. Liebherr only goes so far as pointing out the similarities between the colonial subject and Orcs but never explicitly states that they are, in reality, colonised. Liebherr additionally brings many examples of Hobbits as oppressed but never expressly that they are either, as I have. In hopes of further focus on post-colonial themes, I welcome others to challenge this thesis' conclusion so that Orcs and Hobbits might see some more justice than what has been given previously.

This thesis has stated clearly that it does not aim to label Tolkien as imperialist, racist, or similar terms, but only to discuss potential themes in the novel. Looking at *LotR* in light of Orientalism or post-colonial critical analysis proves that the fantasy genre is timeless. By focusing on Tolkien's particular inspirations for *LotR* and how the ideologies and events of his time affected the narrative, we limit his work to the twentieth century. When looking at the work unrelated to Tolkien, discussions on topics such as colonisation, exploitation and Orientalism become increasingly relatable to contemporary society. Grounding the Orcs and Hobbits on colonialism and oppression makes a general connection that the modern reader can relate to contemporary events, so that the message of *LotR* can be applied to concerns central to the modern world. As long as the real world is still affected by exploitation such as slavery and child labour, this new, alternative way of reading *LotR* will show the saga's relevance. A standard reading of *LotR* conveys that the smallest protagonist can be the last hope in saving the world, and that being small doesn't mean being insignificant. This, like many other oft-discussed messages in *LotR*, is important. But the debate of exploitation seems lacking in Tolkien's work. Therefore, this thesis has brought more attention to such an essential and recurring theme in Tolkien's world, and I welcome more elaboration on and contradiction to my argumentation.

4.1 Limitations

This thesis certainly acknowledges several limitations to the investigation. Most importantly, this thesis discusses how the Western-aligned narrative and portrayals establish various interpretations and readings, while the thesis has mostly added Western scholarship as support for all findings. Any Eastern viewpoints could add a valuable contribution in the West-East binary which seems present in *LotR*. This also points to another limitation, that the studies mentioned in the thesis are in the English language only, limiting myself in looking at potential foreign language papers, journals, and other publications.

There are many avenues open for further research on colonialism and oppression in Tolkien. In this thesis's investigation of the creation of Orcs, it was noted that Trolls might have been corrupted from Ents in the same way that Orcs were corrupted from Elves. By looking further into that fact, one could add to this thesis's argument and the history and understanding of the Ents, perhaps helping to explain why the Entwives were lost and the Ents are on the brink of extinction. It would be beneficial to investigate if trolls have an interesting background or if Goblins are more distinct types of Orcs than anticipated. Considering that Gollum is portrayed as something 'unhobbitlike' in *LotR* and The Hobbit, a Goblin study could be enlightening to clarify if Gollum is still a Hobbit, or perhaps a hybrid between Hobbit and Goblin. Concerning Hobbits, perhaps indigenous studies would broaden the understanding of Hobbits and their exclusion from Middle-earth because of their comparatively undeveloped society.

In light of Orientalism, more discussion could broaden its relevance to *LotR*. I chose to see Orientalism as a dynamic between the Free Peoples in general and the Hobbits and Orcs. Elves seem wholly different and superior to certain Peoples at times, and perhaps Orientalism could be applied to Elves contrary to Middle-earth. There is no doubt that Elves and mightier beings, such as Wizards, inhabit the lands to the West in Arda. Further investigation could bring light to this Elven West as Occidental to the contrary Oriental Eastern Arda, including Middle-earth. The theory of Orientalism became essential in this thesis' discussion and not in a racist-inducing way, as few scholars might believe the theory to be. Perhaps its use in investigating fantasy literature might bring a new attitude towards the theory and the literature. Colonialism, exploitation, and post-colonial criticism, such as Orientalism, seem to bring new insight into *LotR* and Tolkien research, which could fascinate scholars and readers alike.

5 Works Cited

Battis, J. (2004). Gazing upon Sauron: Hobbits, Elves, and the Queering of the Postcolonial Optic. *MFS Modern Fiction Studies, 50*(4), 908-926.

Boahen, A. A. (1987). *African Perspectives on Colonialism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Brantlinger, P. (1985). Victorians and Africans: The Geneology of the Myth of the Dark Continent. *Critical Inquiry, 12*, 166-205.

Carpenter, H., & Tolkien, J. (2000). *The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien : a Selection.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Chance, J. (1995). Power and Knowledge in Tolkien: The Problem of Difference in "The Birthday Party". In P. Reynolds, & G. H. GoodKnight, *Proceedings of the J.R.R. Tolkien Centenary Conference* (pp. 151-156). Oxford: The Tolkien Society.

Chance, J. (2005). Tolkien and the Other: Race and Gender in Middle-earth. In J. Chance, & A. K. Siewers (Eds.), *Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages* (pp. 171-186). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chism, C. (2007). Racism, Charges Of. In M. D. Drout (Ed.), *J. R. R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment* (p. 558). London: Routledge.

Daviron, B. (2010). Mobilizing labour in African agriculture: the role of the International Colonial Institute in the elaboration of a standard of colonial administration, 1895-1930. *Journal of Global History, 5*, 479-501. doi:doi:10.1017/S1740022810000239

Day, D. (2011). The Genesis of the Hobbit. *Queen's quarterly, 118*(1), 115-129.

Donnelly, J. (2018). Nazis in the Shire: Tolkien and Satire. *Mythlore, 37*(1), 81-102.

Fanon, F. (1963). *Wretched of the Earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Fimi, D. (2010). *Tolkien, Race and Cultural History - From Fairies to Hobbits.* London: Palgrave Macmillian.

Flieger, V. (2017). The Orcs and the Others: Familiarity as Estrangement in *The Lord of the Rings*. In Y. Kisor, & C. Vaccaro, *Tolkien and Alterity* (pp. 205-222). Maryland: Palgrave MacMillian. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-61018-4_10

Ho, T. (1983). The Childlike Hobbit. *Mythlore*(34), 3-9.

James, E. (2012). Tolkien, Lewis and the Explosion of Genre Fantasy. In E. James, & F. Mendlesohn (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature* (pp. 62-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jarosz, L. (1992). Constructing the Dark Continent: Metaphor as Geographic representation of Africa. *Geografiska Annaler, 74 B*(2), 105-115. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/490566

Kim, S. (2004). Beyond Black and White: Race and Postmodernism in *The Lord of the* Rings Films. *Modern Fiction Studies, 50*(4), 875-907.

Langford, J. D. (1991). The Scouring of the Shire as a Hobbit Coming-of-Age. *Mythlore*(67), 4-9.

Liebherr, L. (2012). *Reimagining Tolkien: A Post-colonial Perspective on The Lord of the Rings.* Limerick: University of Limerick.

Livingston, M. (2006). The Shell-shocked Hobbit: The First World War and Tolkien's Trauma of the Ring. *Mythlore, 25*(1/2), 77-92.

Livingston, M. (2012). The Myth of the Author: Tolkien and the Medieval Origins of the word Hobbit. *Mythlore, 30*(3/4), 129-146.

McFadden, B. (2005). Fear of Difference, Fear of Death: The Sigelwara, Tolkien's Swertings, and Racial Difference. In J. Chance, & A. K. Siewers (Eds.), *Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages* (pp. 155-169). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

McLeod, J. (2010). *Beginning Postcolonialism.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Miller, D. M. (2003). Narrative Pattern in *The Fellowship of the Ring*. In J. Lobdell, *A Tolkien Compass* (pp. 93-104). Chicago, Illinois: Open Court.

Morris, J. (1968). *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire.* London: Faber and Faber.

Palmer, R. R., Colton, J., & Kramer, L. (2014). *A History of Europe in the Modern World.* New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Rearick, A. (2004). WHY IS THE ONLY GOOD ORC A DEAD ORC? THE DARK FACE OF RACISM EXAMINED IN TOLKIEN'S WORLD. *Modern Fiction Studies, vol. 50, no. 4*, 861-874.

Rogers, D. C. (2003). Everyclod and Everyhero: The Image of Man in Tolkien. In J. Lobdell (Ed.), *A Tolkien Compass* (pp. 105-113). Chicago, Illinois: Open Court.

Ruud, J. (2009). The Voice of Saruman: Wizards and Rhetoric in *The Two Towers*. *Mythlore, 28*(1), 141-153.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism.* London: Penguin Books.

Scull, C. (1995). Open Minds, Closed Mind in *The Lord of the Rings*. In P. Reynolds, & G. H. GoodKnight, *Proceedings of the J.R.R. Tolkien Centenary Conference* (pp. 151-156). Oxford: The Tolkien Society.

Smith, A. W., & Jeppesen, C. (2017). Introduction: development, contingency and entanglement: decolonization. In *Britain, France and the Decolonization of Africa* (pp. 1-14). London: UCL press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1mtz521.5

(1922). *Statistics of the Military Effort of the British Empire during the Great War, 1914-1920.* London: The War Office. Retrieved Jan 17, 2021, from https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/statistics-of-military-effort-of-british-empire

Tally, R. (2019, March 12). Demonizing the Enemy, Literally: Tolkien, Orcs, and the Sense of the World Wars. *Humanities, 8*(1), 54.

Tally, R. T. (2010). Let Us Now Praise Famous Orcs: Simple Humanity in Tolkien's Inhuman Creatures. *Mythlore, vol. 29, no. 1/2 (111/112)*, 17-28.

Tolkien, J. (1977). *The Silmarillion.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Tolkien, J. (2004). *The Return of the Shadow: The History of Middle-earth* (Vol. 6). (C. Tolkien, Ed.) London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Tolkien, J. (2006). *The Hobbit* (Third ed.). London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Tolkien, J. (2006). *The Silmarillion.* (C. Tolkien, Ed.) London: George Allen & Unwin.

Tolkien, J. (2008). *Fellowship Of the Ring* (Vol. 1). London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Tolkien, J. (2008). *The Return of The King* (Vol. 3). London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Tolkien, J. (2008). *Two Towers* (Vol. 2). London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Tolkien, J. (2015). *Morgoth's Ring: The History of Middle-earth* (Vol. 10). (C. Tolkien, Ed.)
London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Tolkien, J. (2015). *The Peoples of Middle-earth: The History of Middle-earth* (Vol. 12). (C.
Tolkien, Ed.) London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Winegar, A. (2005). Aspects of Orientalism in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*. *The
Grey book, 1*, 1-10.

Yatt, J. (2002, Dec 2). *Wraiths and race*. Retrieved March 15, 2021, from The Guardian:
https://www.theguardian.com/books/2002/dec/02/jrrtolkien.lordoftherings

Young, H. (2010). Diversity and Difference: Cosmopolitanism and *The Lord of the Rings*.
Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts, 21(3), 351-365.