

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

4610 English: Individual Authors: J.R.R. Tolkien

English Student Research

Fall 2017

Smaug the Magnificent: A Critical Analysis of J.R.R. Tolkien's Anarcho-monarchism

Michael Hayes
Marquette University

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/english_4610jrtr

Recommended Citation

Hayes, Michael, "Smaug the Magnificent: A Critical Analysis of J.R.R. Tolkien's Anarcho-monarchism" (2017). *4610 English: Individual Authors: J.R.R. Tolkien*. 14.
https://epublications.marquette.edu/english_4610jrtr/14

Michael Hayes

Dr. Canavan

English 4610

December 14, 2017

“Smaug the Magnificent:” A Critical Analysis of J.R.R. Tolkien’s Anarcho-monarchism

For all of the political machinations at work in *The Lord of the Rings*, there is astonishingly little detail paid to political institutions in it or any of J.R.R. Tolkien’s works. Although readers may use such resources as *The Lord of the Rings’* monolithic series of appendices to trace the names and deeds of kings back to the Elder Days, the author has surprisingly little to say about how governments throughout Middle-earth actually function; so much attention is paid to the figure who occupies the throne that little to no description is provided as to what kingship actually entails in Tolkien’s world. In a universe where rulers are the primary actors, this seems like a striking omission.

Even so, ever since the beginning of Tolkien’s mainstream success readers have been fascinated by the regimes of Middle-earth and have sought to peer deeper into their designs. As far back as 1969, scholars like Malcolm Barnett evaluated the different political structures of Tolkien’s works and consider the implications of each (383). Such analyses have only proliferated in modern times, as Peter Jackson’s critically acclaimed cinematic adaption of *The Lord of the Rings* reintroduced Tolkien into popular culture. For the most part, authors have looked at Middle-earth politics through a democratic lens: theorists like Dominic Nardi seem largely interested in the legendarium’s attitudes toward democracy and the ways in which authoritarian regimes display varying levels of liberalization within their hierarchies (109). Such expeditions for governmental liberalism reflect the changing political climate of the twentieth

century, a period marked by an unprecedented number of democratic transitions. Though born in the nineteenth century, Tolkien's entire legendarium was written during this volatile period – leading modern scholars to scour it for insights into the shifting societal dominance of democracy.

Tolkien's own political leanings, however, do not fall so neatly into a democratic lens. Instead, the author was a disciple of a governmental structure known as “anarcho-monarchism, a surprisingly anti-democratic theory of governance. A letter to his son Christopher, written during the Second World War, illustrates this radically different ideology:

...the most improper job of any man, even saints (who at any rate were at least unwilling to take it on), is bossing other men. Not one in a million is fit for it, and least of all those who seek the opportunity... (“Letter”)

This quotation is only a brief selection from the correspondence, in which Tolkien elaborates on his distaste for overreaching political entities. The author was staunchly opposed to the authority and importance that most people cede to national governments; indeed, in the letter he further declares, “it should be an offence to write [government] with a capital G” (“Letter”). If one must suffer a regime, Tolkien argues, it ought to be an entity uninterested in interfering in the lives of the people, ideally “a king whose chief interest in life is stamps, railways, or race-horses,” an “‘unconstitutional’ monarchy” that wields absolute power only in times and ways that are absolutely necessary (“Letter”). This hands-off, unobtrusive ruler lies at the heart of the anarcho-monarchy – the idea of the faraway sovereign, the king one never sees yet lives under the auspices of.

Such a governmental structure makes possible what David Hart calls “radical subsidiarism,” an environment “in which authority and responsibility for the public weal are so

devolved to the local and communal that every significant public decision becomes a matter of common interest and common consent” rather than some royal decree. Such a self-deterministic structure was imperative to Tolkien, who lived during an age in which monarchs and dictators (like Adolf Hitler) wielded near absolute power over the lives of their subjects. In addition, anarcho-monarchism rejects the large-scale populism that Tolkien saw as the primary danger of democracy. In yet another of his letters, he cautions his son Christopher that democracy translated directly merely means “mob-rule” (qtd. in Nardi 107), a foreshadowing of the distrust that the author had of the way in which a corrupt electorate or unjust majority could seize power. Anarcho-monarchism, then, is the result of Tolkien’s rejection of both totalitarianism and democracy.

As these facets make clear, anarcho-monarchism differs immensely from the predominant liberal ideologies of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. As a result, it can be quite difficult to decipher what such a regime would look like. Luckily, Tolkien provides examples of anarcho-monarchism sprinkled throughout the legendarium, yielding ample evidence to explore. This paper seeks to provide an in-depth analysis via a side by side comparison of two regimes from within Tolkien’s works, a comparison whose results have serious implications for the author’s political thought.

ELESSAR, THE IDEAL MONARCH

Although finding political descriptions within Tolkien’s works may at times be a daunting task, the author is quite explicit in exalting the character whom he thinks of as the exemplar of governance: King Elessar of Gondor, born Aragorn, son of Arathorn. It is under the auspices of

Elessar* that Sauron, the second Dark Lord, is finally cast down and a Fourth Age begins in Middle-earth. The fact that Tolkien ends the novel with Elessar upon the throne, as well as emphasizing throughout the work his kingly stature, royal lineage, and divine right, points to this idea of Elessar as the ideal ruler. In accordance with Tolkien's political beliefs, it is under his scepter that Middle-earth will be able to heal after the horrors of the War of the Ring; he and he alone is able to usher in a new era of the world.

As Tolkien's chosen model for ideal governance, the reign of Elessar can be investigated through a lens of anarcho-monarchism to great effect. Such an investigation yields three main hallmarks of Elessar's limited government that are very much in line with Tolkien's own political opinions: (1) a lasting and stable peace; (2) the presence of trade, wealth, and regional prestige; and (3) Tolkien's idealization of racial and ethnic sequestration. What follows will be a closer examination of these themes, with attention paid as to how Elessar's reign fits into the anarcho-monarchic worldview.

(1) Lasting Peace

The first facet of Elessar's reign to consider is the ushering in of a new era of peace. Although he is a fierce warrior at Helm's Deep and the Battle of the Pelannor Field, Elessar also proves to also have a great capacity for ending conflicts and hostilities. With the specter of Sauron removed from the world, there are two major antagonistic groups that Elessar must deal with as he consolidates his power: the Orcs and the Men who fought under the former Dark Lord. This first group is dealt with swiftly, as without the dominion of Sauron holding them in

* Although this character is referred to as "Aragorn" throughout the majority of *The Lord of the Rings*, he will be referred to as "Elessar" in this paper as a way to reinforce his title as King of Gondor.

thrall the creatures of shadow are unable to endure the might of the Lords of the West (as Elessar’s contingent at the Black Gate is called). The following is an excerpt from the conclusion to this battle:

... so the creatures of Sauron, Orc or troll or beast spell-enslaved, ran hither and thither mindless; and some slew themselves, or cast themselves in pits, or fled wailing back to hide in holes and dark lightless places far from hope. (“LOTR”[†] 949)

Even from the inception of his reign, Elessar inspires fear in the enemies of his kingdom, and drives them to utter despair. Following this initial rout, Orcs across his kingdom are hunted down and exterminated – a tactic without moral repercussions due to the wholly malevolent nature of Orcs in Tolkien’s works. To a modern reader, these actions may seem outright genocidal; to Tolkien, however, Aragorn’s eradication of the Orcs is a largely symbolic action, displaying the efficient way in which Elessar is able to deal with the final vestiges of absolute evil.

The second group, the Men under Sauron’s command, are perhaps even more important in detailing Elessar’s ability to maintain peace within his kingdom. Rather than slaughter the Easterlings and the Southrons like he does the Orcs, the King instead seeks a long term, diplomatic solution to the differences between his kingdom and the two peoples. Tolkien describes the way in which “the King pardoned the Easterlings that had given themselves up, and sent them away free, and he made peace with the peoples of Harad” (“LOTR” 968), actions that not only provide a peaceful resolution to the War of the Ring, but that ensure goodwill and stability between the nations in the years to come. In a similar vein, the text details Elessar liberating Sauron’s own slave population and giving them “all the lands about Lake Nurnen to be their own” (“LOTR” 968). Rather than pursue a “scorched earth” policy as many figures

[†] For the sake of brevity, “LOTR” is used as an abbreviation for *The Lord of the Rings*.

throughout history have, Elessar seeks to rehabilitate the lands of the Enemy as a way to ensure that Mordor never again becomes a stronghold of evil that could threaten his own realm. In all of these ways, Elessar guarantees the continued protection of those in his stead. And although in his later writings Tolkien vaguely references various other wars that Elessar wages over the years, his characterization at the work's conclusion leads the reader to assume that any such conflicts were pursued purely for defensive reasons ("New Shadow" 410). Without the need for an ever-expanding standing army and an insatiable military-industrial complex, the king effectively withdraws the military state from people's lives as soon as conflict comes to an end. This commitment, then, strongly adheres to anarcho-monarchism's promises of minimum subject-ruler interaction.

(2) Trade and Regional Wealth

The second notable effect of Elessar's reign is the resurgence of wealth and trade into the regions under his rule. Throughout *The Lord of the Rings* (and, indeed, throughout much of the legendarium in general), there is an overwhelming sense that the world is fading, that everything is getting worse: the glory and beauty of the Elves is fading, the riches of the Dwarves are vanishing, and Men are constantly being marauded and worn down by the servants of the Enemy. As Gandalf and Pippin arrive in Minas Tirith, the capital of Gondor, Tolkien describes the city as "falling year by year into decay" ("LOTR" 752), slowly becoming only a shadow of the citadel that it once was as citizens flee from its walls. Even the "great house[s] and court[s]" ("LOTR" 752) of the wealthy are abandoned, emphasizing widespread economic decline. These two images are largely indicative of the state of Gondor and the surrounding lands as Elessar ascends the throne: seemingly past their prime and trapped in a state of overall decline.

As Tolkien’s ideal monarch, however, Elessar is able to reverse this seemingly global trend. The latter chapters of *The Return of the King* are filled with descriptors detailing the resurgence of wealth and glory in Minas Tirith. Tolkien elaborates how “in [Elessar’s] time the City was made more fair than it had ever been, even in the days of its first glory,” how “it preserved the memory and the glory of the years that were gone” (“LOTR” 968). Even beyond solely glory, an emphasis is put on the way in which riches are once again flowing into the city. As Elessar goes about restoring Minas Tirith, “its gates [are] wrought of mithril and steel, and its streets [are] paved with white marble” (“LOTR” 968), evidence of the copious amounts of wealth that are flowing into the revitalized kingdom.

Prosperity is not, however, even wholly centered in Gondor, the heart of Elessar’s realm. As the hobbits journey home towards the end of the book, they comment on how “the Greenway will be opened again” (“LOTR” 993), linking the northern lands to the wealth that is emerging in the south. Even in light of this oncoming trade connection, the Shire (itself a province under Elessar’s crown) is said to have an autumn wherein “everywhere there was so much corn that at Harvest every barn was stuffed” (“LOTR” 1024). Although the King may not be directly responsible for the plentiful harvest experienced in the Shire, it is important to note how he does not in any way attempt to seize the riches of the people who live there. In a similar way, rather than spend extravagantly on his own desires, Elessar uses what wealth he does accumulate for the betterment of his subjects in Minas Tirith. This is perhaps the most important feature to note about the way in which Tolkien perceived anarcho-monarchic rulers and economics; subjects are allowed the fruits of their labors, and can live and function in a society wherein they are able to succeed and flourish without any outside interference. The state, rather than drain citizens of resources, instead only augments their good fortunes.

(3) Sequestration of Racial/Ethnic Groups

The final effect of Tolkien's ideal regime to consider is the geo-ethnic divisiveness that Elessar institutes within his borders. This may seem like a strange ideal to have in a government, but the legendarium consistently praises those racially homogenous societies that enclave themselves off from the world. This ties back to Hart's idea of "radical subsidiarism" – rather than see such divisions as discriminatory, Tolkien praises distinct ethnic regions as far more conducive to self-rule than cosmopolitan ones. As a result, although racial sequestration may strike readers in the modern day as a vice rather than a norm, such divisions are essential to Tolkien's ideology of anarcho-monarchic governance.

Under Elessar there are varying degrees to which such sequestrations are instituted, but all point to an ideal in which ethnically defined regional sub-states answer to the crown. Although they still retain their own monarchs, the appendices state that the northern kingdoms of Dale and Erebor (Men and Dwarves, respectively) "were under the crown and protection of the King of the West" ("LOTR" 1095). Bree, a city solely consisting of Men and a few hobbits, is guaranteed that it will be "let alone" ("LOTR" 976) and retain its isolated existence even under the new government to the south. More dramatic than these examples are the decrees of Elessar himself that define ethnically homogenous "safe zones." Both the Shire and the lands of the Wild Men receive guarantees that they will be free from any outsiders for as long as they endure; by order of the King, "Men are not to enter the Shire" ("LOTR" 1097) and no folk but the Wild Men are allowed in the "Forest of the Druadan" ("LOTR" 976) without their permission. Each of these examples highlights the high regard that Tolkien had for local self-determination – the "radical subsidiarist" component of his anarcho-monarchic framework.

Overall, Tolkien clearly maintains Elessar’s rule as an idyllic one, the style of governance most conducive to a happy and peaceful citizenry. Throughout *The Lord of the Rings*, people constantly refer to the glory days of old, when there was peace, wealth, and harmony in Middle-earth. Elessar’s reign is defined by resurgences in all three of these categories, cementing his position, in Tolkien’s mind, as the ideal ruler.

SMAUG, AN IDEAL RULER?

Although the three effects described in the previous sections can be seen as the results of an idyllic ruler, there is another monarch from Tolkien’s legendarium (in this case *The Hobbit*) who seems to fit them quite well, though he may not quite fit the term “idyllic”: Smaug, last of the great fire drakes, King Under the Mountain. This may seem like an outlandish claim to make – what with Elessar being a mortal man and Smaug an ancient fire-breathing monster – but there are some very clear parallels between the two, especially in the areas that have already been outlined. Smaug definitely fits the “far off” description that Tolkien is looking for, as he spends the majority of his time holed up in the bowels of the Lonely Mountain. And one need not forget that Smaug, quite nearly, a king himself – he is the interim ruler of Erebor, the mighty Dwarven kingdom hewn at the roots of the Lonely Mountain in Wilderland. As such, I believe that an argument can be made that, according to the three criteria (peace, wealth, and sequestration), Smaug’s reign can be considered to be “good.”

(1) Lasting Peace

Under the auspices of Smaug, the areas surrounding the Lonely Mountain are surprisingly free of conflict. Although they are a persistent threat throughout *The Hobbit*, neither

Orcs nor wolves seem to cause conflict within Smaug's realm during his reign. The Elves of Mirkwood may have to deal with spiders in their western reaches from time to time, but overall they seem to face no major threat from their eastern flank, which lies nearest the heart of Smaug's realm. The Men of Lake-town, the community at the very foot of the king's door, do not seem to have any fear of Orc attacks either. It is only after the dragon's demise that this stability falls into utter ruin, as Orcs flood into the region and help to instigate the gruesome and bloody Battle of the Five Armies ("Hobbit" ch.17).

Perhaps even more surprising than the lack of Orcs is the absence of a historically more dangerous group: the Easterlings. The appendices of *The Lord of the Rings* are filled with stories of invasions from the eastern lands of Middle-earth, campaigns that have brought mighty kingdoms like Rohan and Gondor close to total annihilation ("LOTR" 1085). Their absence, then, is rather surprising: in the hundreds of years that the dragon reigns, the appendices do not note a single Easterling attack within the vicinity of the Lonely Mountain. Once again, upon Smaug's death this threat, like that of Orcs, is no longer stayed. During the War of the Ring a huge host of Easterlings engage the kingdoms of Dale and Erebor, bringing the two nations to their knees; both Brand and Dain, the respective kings of each realm, are slain by the invaders ("LOTR" 1095). Clearly the threat from the lands to the east is a very real one; it is only through the shielding influence of Smaug that the lands around the Lonely Mountain are able to remain free from outside invasion.

(2) Trade and Regional Wealth

In addition to keeping his kingdom safe, Smaug's influence is also conducive to commerce and wealth within his realm. Although his lands may lie in an area of Middle-earth

known as “Wilderland” (or the Wilderness), the societies of Men and Elves that live in the dragon’s domain do maintain a surprising degree of economic development. The Elves of Mirkwood inhabit a “great hall with pillars hewn out of the living stone” (“Hobbit” 148), a testament to the craftsmanship of their people. This cave is further described as the Elven king’s “palace, and the strong place of his treasure” (“Hobbit” 145) – a descriptor that both enhances the idea of an ornate dwelling and emphasizes the presence of further wealth. This same king maintains a cache of treasure that Tolkien describes as “rich” (“Hobbit” 145), even further emphasizing the comfort in which the Elves of Mirkwood live.

The Elves, however, are not alone in their good economic fortune. Their own wealth is linked to the Men of Lake-town via “barrels... brought up the Forest River” (“Hobbit” 152) and “river tolls” (“Hobbit” 167) along the way, suggesting a highly developed trade network not unlike the Greenway that was promised to flourish under Elessar. Rather than describe Lake-town as a poverty-stricken hovel at Smaug’s feet, Tolkien instead proclaims that the town “throve” (“Hobbit” 152) prior to the coming of Thorin Oakenshield’s company, a very definite positive descriptor for the state of the town. Beyond trade with the Elves, he even goes on to mention that the Men participate in trade on “the great river from the South” (“Hobbit” 165), suggesting that under Smaug the denizens of the region are able to create even more complex economic networks that extend far beyond even his kingdom. To many readers, this glowing characterization may seem a bit of a stretch – although it is important to note that these excerpts from *The Hobbit* provide one of the strikingly few descriptions of trade in the entire legendarium. As such, all of these descriptions seem to describe not a completely desolate wasteland, as some might expect, but rather, as Tolkien himself put it, a “thriving” kingdom in many respects analogous to Elessar’s own.

(3) Sequestration of Racial/Ethnic Groups

The final factor to consider pertaining to Smaug's dominion is the way in which different ethnic groups are organized. While one might think that the peoples of the area would be unified against a tyrannous, fire-breathing dragon, Tolkien makes it clear that the Men, Elves, and Dwarves who live in the lands surrounding the Lonely Mountain exist in racially distinct and isolated societies. The Elves keep to themselves on the border of Mirkwood, the Dwarves dwell in their fastness in the Iron Hills, and Men inhabit the city of Lake-town at the foot of the mountain. The text is even explicit in describing Lake-town as "not a town of elves but of Men" ("Hobbit" 165), differentiating it from the realm of the Silvan Elves both geographically and ethnically. Although trade does exist between some of these groups (as was detailed in the previous section), the races largely keep to themselves; the Elven boatmen are the only example to be found of members of one nation visiting the domain of another. As such, Smaug's rule is definitely characterized by geographically bounded ethnic regions.

Not only does Smaug's rule facilitate this idealized ethnic enclavism, but the dragon's dominion also staves off dangerous racial hostilities that characterize much of Tolkien's legendarium. Prior to the dragon's demise, it is stated that the Men of Lake-town "were friends with the Wood-elves" ("Hobbit" 165), with the two groups maintaining a profitable and mutually beneficial existence. There also appears to be no ill will toward the Dwarves of the Iron Hills, who, although located farther away than the other two aforementioned groups, historically struggle with Elvenkind. Upon Smaug's death, however, this harmony is utterly shattered. Prior to the arrival of the Orcs at the onset of the Battle of the Five Armies, there is a standoff that is split solely along racial lines, with the Dwarves of Thorin Oakenshield's company and his allies

from the Iron Hills standing directly against the combined might of the Men of the Lake and the Elves of Mirkwood (“Hobbit” ch.17). These hostilities come directly from the power vacuum left behind by the dragon’s disappearance, and reinforce the vitally important role that Smaug has in maintaining the racial harmony of the lands around the Lonely Mountain.

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE WITH PURE ANARCHO-MONARCHISM

As this paper has shown thus far, the reigns of both Elessar and Smaug yield surprisingly similar effects, characterized here by the three attributes of (1) lasting peace, (2) trade and regional wealth, and (3) the sequestration of racial and ethnic groups. To really drive home the similarities between the dominions of the two monarchs and Tolkien’s own definition of anarcho-monarchy, there are two quotations that are worth special consideration. The first comes from Barliman, the innkeeper of Bree, who describes his view of the newly crowned Elessar:

... [The king is] sitting in his big chair up in his great castle, hundreds of miles away. And drinking wine out of a golden cup... (“LOTR” 995)

And the second is a selection of how the Men of Lake-town think about Smaug:

...The men remembered little of all that... the coming of the Dragon, and the fall of the lords of Dale... (“Hobbit” 165)

Though a little different, these quotations yield images of the two monarchs that are wholly in line with Tolkien’s own ideal of anarcho-monarchy. Both Elessar and Smaug are described as distant, unreachable sovereigns, leaders who are disconnected from their subjects and accordingly occupy little concern in the minds of those same subjects. This mirrors Tolkien’s sentiments about “a king whose chief interest in life is stamps” and the like: for Barliman or the Men of Lake-town, it is utterly irrelevant what their ruler is actually up to. Their daily lives are

completely unimpacted by government and bureaucracy, and the two are left largely to their own devices. This is the heart of Tolkien's political stance, his ideal way for people to exist in a world with government.

Rather than be a boon to the anarcho-monarchic argument, however, this fundamental similarity instead points to a glaring and fatal flaw in such a political theory. Although the two kingships produce strikingly similar effects, one must consider the fact that Smaug is a murderous, conniving villain in Tolkien's legendarium, whereas Elessar is the culmination of the goodness imbued in the race of Men. Even for all of the positives brought about by Smaug's occupation of the Lonely Mountain, the final hours of his reign are characterized by the wholesale destruction and slaughter of his own subjects. He and Elessar are on completely opposite ends of the good-evil dichotomy that permeates every level of Tolkien's universe, which makes the parallels between the two terribly problematic. If both regimes fit into the supposedly idyllic mold of anarcho-monarchism, what can account for this critical difference?

The differentiating factor between the two is something quite surprising – for all of the emphasis on Elessar being the perfect anarcho-monarch, he is still fundamentally beholden to the people of his kingdom. Upon his long-awaited homecoming to Minas Tirith, the denizens of Gondor actively accept him as their king, assenting to his rule “with one voice” (“LOTR” 967) when asked by Faramir, the former steward of the land. Such an occurrence contradicts the very idea of the distant anarcho-monarch. The people *deliberately* and *directly* participate in selecting their ruler and having a say in the direction of Gondor's future instead of withdrawing from political life. This yields an inherently more involved role for citizens in the king's government and the affairs of the entire state. The king may wield sweeping, perhaps near total power and exist largely apart from his subjects, but Elessar's reign is wholly dependent on the continued

support of his subjects throughout the land. Through their political participation, then, the kingship both gains legitimacy and becomes directly bound to the will of the people.

Smaug’s reign, on the other hand, is grounded in the complete opposite of this concept: his rule is propped up by violence alone, violence which emphasizes why the dragon’s dominion falls short of Tolkien’s ideal. The beginning and end of Smaug’s habitation of the Lonely Mountain are marked by outbursts of extreme violence, characterized by his purges of the denizens of Erebor, Dale, and Lake-town in moments of widespread “mourning and weeping” (“Hobbit” 211). Gone is the accountability of Elessar’s regime, replaced instead by a totalitarian dictator with no actual regard for an isolated and disenfranchised populace – Tolkien notes that in his attack on Lake-town, Smaug slaughters a full quarter of the population (“Hobbit” 212). Although he may produce the very effects that Tolkien holds in high regard (and perhaps even characterizes the anarcho-monarch even better than Elessar), Smaug is clearly not revered as a model ruler in the legndarium..

All of this, then, points to the ultimate failure of anarcho-monarchism as a viable political theory. Although Tolkien repeatedly stressed his preference for a far off, disconnected government, his own idealized characterization does not in fact adhere to this schema. The fundamental difference between Elessar and Smaug – whose reigns are strikingly similar – emphasizes the need for governmental accountability and participation by the people in order to maintain a virtuous regime. Only through an involved government can citizens both be guaranteed the idyllic world that Tolkien envisions and the security to safely exist in it.

Works Cited

Barnett, Malcolm Joel. "The Politics of Middle Earth." *Polity*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1969, pp. 383-387.

Hart, David Bentley. "Anarcho-monarchism." *First Things*, 12 Nov. 2010,

<https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2010/11/anarcho-monarchism>.

Tolkien, J.R.R.. "Letter 52." 29 Nov. 1943. Accessed on *Peace Requires Anarchy*,

<https://peacerequiresanarchy.wordpress.com/2012/09/21/the-letters-of-jrr-tolkien>.

Tolkien, J.R.R.. *The Hobbit*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Tolkien, J.R.R.. *The Lord of the Rings – 50th Anniversary Edition*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 2004.

Tolkien, J.R.R.. "The New Shadow." *The Peoples of Middle-earth*, edited by Christopher

Tolkien, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996, pp. 409-421.

Nardi, Dominic J. Jr.. "Political Institutions in Tolkien's Middle-earth: or, How I Learned to

Stop Worrying." *Mythlore*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2014, pp. 101-123.