

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

SOLIDARITY IN TOLKIEN'S NOVEL *THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING*: DURKHEIM PERSPECTIVE

^{1*}Mohsen Hanif, ²Abbas Razzaq Hameed al-Thabhwae

^{1*}Ph.D. Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Literature and Humanities Kharazmi
University, Tehran, Iran

²PhD Candidate, Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Literature and
Humanities Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

^{1*}Mohsen Hanif, ²Abbas Razzaq Hameed al-Thabhwae: Solidarity In Tolkien's Novel The Fellowship Of The Ring: Durkheim Perspective-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(6), 1-14. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords:- Solidarity; mechanical solidarity; organic solidarity; Tolkien's the fellowship of the ring; Durkheim's theory of The Division of Labor in Society

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This paper reports the results of reading Tolkien's *The Fellowship of the Ring* based on Durkheim's theory of *The Division of Labor in Society*.

Methodology: To this end, mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity as two basic fundamental components of the theory as well as Durkheim's functionalist notion were adopted to scrutinize the novel.

Main Findings: Finding out whether *The Fellowship of the Ring* is a traditionalist society (a mechanical solidarity) or a modernist society (an organic solidarity) and the direction towards which it moves and whether Tolkien aims at creating a functional-oriented or individual-oriented society were the main objectives of the article. The results of the study revealed that the society created by Tolkien in *The Fellowship of the Ring* prioritizes a mechanical solidarity over an organic solidarity. Accordingly, it was revealed that the society created by Tolkien is individual-oriented rather than functional-oriented.

Applications of this study: This study will be beneficial to those who are enthusiastic to understand more about the uniqueness of variations as an integrated aspect that shapes a larger social culture rather than having a simple holistic view.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study is unique since no studies have been done on *The Fellowship of the Ring* based on Durkheim's theory *The Division of Labor in Society*.

1. INTRODUCTION

Applying Durkheim's theory of *The Division of Labor in Society* for literary reading can potentially inform us about the type of society we are dealing with in terms of division of labor. Durkheim's theory categorizes society into two types "mechanical and organic solidarity" ([Durkheim, 1984, xvii](#)). The first, is a type of society where we observe relatively limited division of labor because "mechanical solidarity, its cohesion and integration comes from the homogeneity of individuals people feel connected through similar work, educational and religious training, and lifestyle." ([Mkandawire, 2011, P.5](#)). The second type of society is observed with highly specialized roles and responsibilities of complex division of labor. Durkheim asserts that complex society is "a system of different organs each of which has a special role, and which are themselves formed of differentiated parts" ([Durkheim, 1893, P. 181](#)). Dividing and classifying social elements might be implied as an effort to prioritize some social elements against/over others under Durkheim's theory. However, the focal point of Durkheim's theory is to stress the vital interconnectivity of the social elements rather than their divisibility for or against a part of the whole parts. Durkheim's thought of society as being "a complex system of interrelated and interdependent parts that work together to maintain stability" ([Griffiths, 2017, P.15](#)). Durkheim's theory approached the external issues (e.g. collective social values, collective social consciousness, and collective social rules, etc.) rather than internal issues (e.g. individual motivation, individual desires, individual emotions, etc.). In other words, Durkheim prioritized elements of functional society over elements of individual affective factors by emphasizing on the interrelatedness of the parts and that any change at the part level can potentially affect the whole system for better or for worse. The main contribution of the present study is the provision of a comparison between traditional versus modernist views of societal elements by applying them for literary reading purposes.

The present study traced for the aforementioned dimensions of Durkheim's theory, the nature of society (functional or individual) and the type of society as well as the direction towards which the society moves in Tolkien's *the fellowship of the ring*. Tolkien creates an imaginary world which provides a rich setting for comparing the old days characterized with mechanical solidarity with modern days characterized with science and rationalism. To apply the aforementioned dimensions of Durkheim's theory, the following research questions were addressed in the present study:

RQ1. Is the society created by Tolkien in *The Fellowship of the Ring* a traditionalist society (a mechanical solidarity) or a modernist society (an organic solidarity)? How does it contribute to our social understanding of it?

RQ2. Is the society created by Tolkien in *The Fellowship of the Ring* functional-oriented or individual-oriented? How does it contribute to our social understanding of it?

2. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted some notions introduced by Durkheim as the theoretical framework in reading Tolkien's *the fellowship of the ring*. Among them is, The Division of Labor concentrating on the move in social orders from a straightforward society to one that is increasingly complex and intertwined based on the specializations and responsibilities because "the environments ... become more and more complex, and, consequently, more and more changeable" ([Durkheim, 1893, P. 52](#)). Durkheim contended that conventional social orders were comprised of "homogeneous mass whose parts were not distinguished from one another" (Durkheim, 1893, 174). However, modern social orders are interestingly comprised of a complex division of labor, convictions, and foundations. In conventional social orders, the aggregate cognizance administered, social standards were solid, and social conduct was very much managed however, in modern social orders, basic awareness was more subtle, and the guideline of social conduct was not so much corrective but rather more restitutive, intended to reestablish ordinary action to society.

Durkheim puts forward two major concepts to depict the way elements of any society are at work at two complex and simple modes of Mechanical Solidarity and Organic Solidarity. Mechanical solidarity happens when people inside basic units are indistinguishable and independent because it "allows society to enclose the individual more tightly, holding him strongly attached to his domestic environment and, consequently, to traditions" ([Thilakarathna, 2019, 310](#)). For instance, in conventional social orders, individuals developed their own nourishment, made their own garments, and had a little requirement for broad social contact with others since they didn't need to depend on others for everyday needs. Organic Solidarity on the other hand is the point at which a huge populace is stratified into highly specialized basic units where there is an elevated level of the relationship among people and structure, however, there is as yet a division of individuals along the lines of work or type ([Durkheim, 1893, P.131](#)). As a notion, solidarity in its distinctive enlightening faculties alludes today to a sort of association with others, to different individuals from a gathering, huge or little. Durkheim was persuaded "that without stable social bonds, without social solidarity, individualism would lead to the decay of society" ([Durkheim, 1995, P. xiv](#)). One may likewise portray different aspects, for example, activities, inspirations, and mentalities as pretty much solitary. Solidarity might be utilized to portray and clarify the typical request and regulating social combination in social orders or networks. Durkheim confirmed that "social solidarity is a wholly moral phenomenon which by itself is not amenable to exact observation and especially not to measurement" ([Durkheim, 1984, P.24](#)). However, it additionally might be utilized to allude to pretty much progressive basic social developments reprimanding the ordinary request and the common shameful acts. Durkheim confirmed that "We can then measure the part it plays in general social integration according to the fraction of the complete system of juridical rules which penal law represents" ([Durkheim, 1992, P. XV](#)). Solidarity may reign in little networks, confrontational political developments, or in whole social orders, even the entire mankind as indicated by a few. The concept of solidarity can likewise

seemingly be isolated from equity and general obligations. Solidarity is constantly inner to some solid network, while widespread ethical quality and equity expect one to withdraw oneself from the inward obligations of solid networks. Therefore, Solidarity is constantly halfway or operator relative "we-thinking" while equity speaks to a fair-minded, specialist nonpartisan viewpoint. Durkheim pointed out that "we see what this real solidarity consists of; it directly links things to persons, but not persons among themselves. In a strict sense, one can exercise a real right by thinking one is alone in the world, without reference to other men" ([Durkheim, 1995, P.116](#)). The situational vacillation of solidary conduct results particularly from our restricted observational capacity; we can't watch all the components of various circumstances. We have contending interpretative structures in each circumstance; circumstances are seen through systems formed by various objectives and connections. The relationship of the idea of solidarity to worldwide reasoning is one of strain. Mechtraud states that Durkheim's view of "solidarity is the essence of social organization and the cause of all morality" ([Mechtraud, 1955, P. 25](#)).

Throughout the entire existence of the idea, the accentuation has been on restricted gatherings with common plans, difficulties, interests or a typical decent to share, and maybe add a typical enemy or foe. Customarily it is taken that Solidarity is fundamentally inside to a gathering, while worldwide philanthropy is then named a matter of compassion, benevolence, good cause, or regard for human rights that contrasts from Solidarity. 'Solidarity' in whole social orders shows itself in various manners, contingent upon the point of view and control. One approach to talk about solidarity is to consider it the social paste, or the concrete of the general public. As one of Durkheim's critics charges, Durkheim deals with the concept of solidarity "as a gradual process of social differentiation that necessarily produces ... social solidarity" instead of genuine invention ([Bottomore, 1981, P. 912](#)). This alludes to the sorts of social bonds that can't be followed back to coercive force or personal responsibility. It is in a natural way that people group together, that they cooperate in their social relationships. According to Mechtraud, solidarity "is precisely the teleological nature of man which orientates him also to companionship, to society, to solidary interhuman relations" ([Mechtraud, 1955, P. 27](#)).

Solidarity is a focal idea likewise in the investigation of political developments. The term is firmly associated with the historical backdrop of the class battle of the work development, mechanical strikes, and to political developments. Durkheim demonstrates that solidarity "is more and more becoming one of the fundamental bases of the social order" ([Durkheim, 1893, P. 41](#)). The center of solidarity is battling together against shameful acts for instance, by protesting. Intra-group solidarity is fundamental in battling Solidarity, however, another significant trademark is the ethical help of untouchables. One articulation for this is on account of a strike, different gatherings or associations may take to the streets to show support. Be that as it may, the battles are not constantly about treachery; once in a while battling

Solidarity can be shielding benefits previously conceded just as seeking after new advantages.

Solidarity of the whole mankind might be any sort of cultural, political, and moral solidarity stretched out to the entire humankind. It tends to involve cultural Solidarity applied to a worldwide society, or it might involve political 'Solidarity' on a worldwide scale, or when it might involve good, compassionate universalistic solidarity. According to Mechtraud, "Durkheim makes moral evaluations of solidarity. For him solidarity is the essence of social organization and the cause of all morality" ([Mechtraud, 1955, P. 25](#)).

In any case, the transcendent acknowledged practices and understandings as per which the focal types of harmony are sorted out can maybe be called a verifiable Solidarity contract. Marryatt explains that:

when examining a particular society to ascertain its relative level of social solidarity, there are two economic factors to examine. Firstly, whether the population has their basic needs met, and secondly if they have their basic needs met how equally the wealth in society spread around is. ([Marryatt, 2014, P. 35](#))

Contemporary originations of Solidarity and practices of collection, fellowship, and joint obligation are constantly being contemplated, addressed, and modified. Contemporary speculations of equity regularly spread issues of essential freedoms and social uniformity, so it is lighting up to move toward the evaluative and regulating nature of Solidarity in contrast with the perfect of equity. Solidarity is associated with equity in at any rate two distinct ways. To start with, the perfect of 'Solidarity' can influence the substance of the standards of equity. Hence, solidarity might be a factor relating to the working of the standards of equity.

3. RESULTS

The findings of the study are presented in order of the research questions as follows:

RQ1.

***The Fellowship of the Ring* a traditionalist society (mechanical solidarity) or a modernist society (organic solidarity)**

Drawing on Durkheimian view that characterizes the preindustrial societies as traditionalist societies that stand on the one end of the spectrum compared to postindustrial societies that stand on the other end, it can be argued that in *The Fellowship of the Ring* we are faced with a society favoring mechanical solidarity where the collective habits originate from tradition rather than rationalism and science. For example, in the following extract from Tolkien's *The Fellowship of the Ring* we observe that societal rules are rooted in the tradition rather than science because "they attributed to the king of old all their essential laws; and usually they kept the laws of free will, because they were The Rules (as they said), both ancient and just" ([Tolkien, 1954, P. 12](#)).

Under Durkheimian perspective we observe an attempt to detraditionalize the society by means of intellectualization and rationalization

processes at the cost of devaluing the old simple interconnections between societal members by highlighting the significance of industry, science, and technology over all conventional orders of the society. According to Vaillant, who depicted a hierarchy of importance in which intellectualization is delegated a masochist protection system. Here, intellectualization is portrayed as a deliberate and over the top utilization of unique ideas, speculations, and coherent clarifications as both insurances against encountering compromising feelings and to forestall the statement of inadmissible motivations. Intellectualization additionally betokens an expanded concentration for lifeless things to maintain a strategic distance from relational closeness, consideration on outer reality to keep away from familiarity with inward sentiments, and an emphasis on unimportant subtleties to stay away from the impression of the entire (Vaillant, 1992, p. 247). Despite the fact that intellectualization is usually used to improve information and understanding without prompting challenges or issues, useless utilization of "intellectualization" can prompt over the top enthusiastic and distrustful indications. Despite the fact that "intellectualization" can speak to a versatile capacity to aggregate information and enhance knowledge in regular daily existence, from a psychodynamic point of view, intellectualization can likewise be utilized as a protection component by segregating awkward feelings and driving forces from cognizant mindfulness. In contrast to Durkheimian perspective we observe that traditionalist values and conventions compared to intellectualization are not only preserved and in power but also present "By the end of the first century of the Fourth Age":

At the end of the Third Age the part played by the Hobbits in the great events that led to the inclusion of the Shire in the Reunited Kingdom awakened among them a more widespread interest in their own history; and many of their traditions, up to that time still mainly oral, were collected and written down. The greater families were also concerned with events in the Kingdom at large, and many of their members studied its ancient histories and legends. By 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. (Tolkien, 1954, P. 18)

Durkheim admits the failure of this enlightenment project when he addresses the contemporary crisis of European societies during the postmodernist era with respect to the religion. Coexistence of traditional religious habits that are characterized as old/simple and modern religious habits that are characterized as rational/complex is another notion emphasized in his theory *The Division of Labor in Society*. Durkheim illustrates the main role of traditions during the evolution of society, saying that:

Doubtless, if we compare the final days of one society with the beginnings of the one that follows it, we perceive a return to traditionalism. ... With us ancestral customs have never been the object of superstitious worship such as that devoted to them at Rome. (Durkheim, 1997, p. 237-238)

Durkheim considers religion as an unavoidable component of every single human culture, be they "crude" or the present day. Since religion

establishes the general public's most treasured qualities, Durkheim contended, innovation can't mean the finish of religion, yet rather involves its change. In his article "Durkheim and Individualism", Chandler points out that Durkheim at first "recognized that contractual re-lations (organic solidarity) could only be maintained within the context of non-contractual rules (mechanical solidarity), but he did not equate the latter with moral individualism ... The cult of personal dignity, he wrote, 'does not constitute a true social link'" ([Chandler, 1984, P. 572](#)). While Seigel asserts that "in 'Individualism and the Intellectuals' the religion of individuality was required because the continuing progress of labor division, and the differentiations it brought left modern men with nothing in common save their humanity" ([Seigel, 1987, P. 504](#)).

Seigel reacts to the accusation that liberal intellectualism's independence made ready for political agitation, issue, and hostile to social pride. As a part of political theory, Lukes explores Durkheim's view of liberalism which creates limits for political obligation, stating that "Durkheim derives individual rights from an overriding principle of respect for persons, according to which the 'human person ... is considered as sacred ...', and which has the status of a moral ... absolute" ([Lukes, 1969, P.14](#)). Very despite what might be expected, Durkheim contended that in present-day society, the independence shielded by Kant's Enlightenment logic just as Rousseau's Romanticism establishes. In contrast to this view we observe in the following extract another issue highlighted by Tolkien that is not explainable by science and belongs to the traditional preindustrial era "hobbits are, or were, no concern of his. Yet he is great among the Wise. He is the chief of my order and the head of the Council. His knowledge is deep, but his pride has grown with it, and he takes ill any meddling" ([Tolkien, 1954, P.63](#)).

Tolkien depicts a character who is not affected by the time and it seemed that age did not touch him, an issue that cannot be explained by science and this irrational traditional human reality need to be juxtaposed with the rational modern one. Characterizing traditionalist society as mechanical solidarity society and modernist society as an organic solidarity society by Durkheim betokens his view of segmentary societies. While in mechanical solidarity society, tradition is in control of individual behavior and consciousness, in organic solidarity, science is in power. In contrast to Durkheim's view of the priority of science over tradition we observe in the following extract that it is the tradition which is prioritized by Tolkien:

You should see the waterways of Dale, Frodo, and the fountains, and the pools! You should see the stone-paved roads of many colours! And the halls and cavernous streets under the earth with arches carved like trees; and the terraces and towers upon the Mountain's sides! Then you would see that we have not been idle. ([Tolkien, 1954, P. 299](#)).

It is emphasized that the scientific progress is nothing compared to the traditional developments. For Durkheim, societies generally move from mechanical solidarity towards organic solidarity and this transition is caused by division of social labor by a collective consciousness transformation process that consists of the interplay of a variety of societal elements. In other words,

even the modern organic solidarity functions in parallel with mechanical solidarity elements without contradicting each other. This affinity is evident in the following extract from Tolkien's *the fellowship of the ring*

Hobbits are relatives of ours: far nearer to us than Elves, or even than Dwarves. Of old they spoke the languages of Men, after their own fashion, and liked and disliked much the same things as Men did. But what exactly our relationship is can no longer be discovered. ([Tolkien, 1954, P. 2, 3](#))

Tolkien highlights the juxtaposition of the traditional society and modern society and the nearness and affinity of the members who liked and disliked almost the same things. For Durkheim tradition is sloping downward and this decline occurs over the history regardless of the time to time revival of history which never returns to the original power and dominance anywhere in the world of humanity. The decline of tradition over history and transformation of traditions that are almost forgotten in the history are highlighted by Tolkien: The beginning of Hobbits lies far back in the Elder Days that are now lost and forgotten. Only the Elves still preserve any records of that vanished time, and their traditions are concerned almost entirely with their own history, in which Men appear seldom and Hobbits are not mentioned at all. ([Tolkien, 1954, P.3](#))

This extract reflects Durkheim's argument that "the authority of custom is continually diminishing" ([Durkheim and Lukes, 2013, p. 233](#)) and it can be interpreted that Tolkien's society in *The Fellowship of the Ring* gradually moves towards an organic solidarity.

RQ2.

***The Fellowship of the Ring* a functional-oriented or individual-oriented society**

Drawing on Durkheimian it is Affinity of societal characters in terms of collective habits by members of the society which taps the concept of division of labor. Tolkien refers to the collective habit of building farmhouse by the Hobbits who "wore dwarf-boots in muddy weather" ([Tolkien, 1954, P. 8](#)). According to Durkheim, rules are formed as a consequence of intense, frequent, and long-term connections between actors, institutions, and functions. He argues that "There are certain ways of reacting upon one another which, being more in accordance with the nature of things, are repeated more often and become habits. Then the habits, as they grow in strength, are transformed into rules of conduct" ([Durkheim, 1992, p.302](#)). Durkheim holds a highly optimistic view of science and considers it as a god. A god capable of solving and clarifying social problems from individual-oriented problems to functional oriented ones. For instance, we note the presence of specific acts, all introducing the outer trademark that they inspire from society the specific response called discipline. We establish them as a different gathering, to which we give a typical mark; we consider each rebuffed demonstration a wrongdoing, and wrongdoing accordingly characterized turns into the object of an extraordinary science, criminology. As indicated by Durkheim, characterization of social realities as typical or irregular according to social sorts and species is a piece of the lead-in to the primary assignment of human science, which is that of clarification. Durkheim has been scrutinized for these

announcements. One analysis is that he assumed that the confirmation of the presence of a target certainty was that it was impervious to change, similarly as issue opposes alteration. The subsequent analysis is his humanism an intrinsically traditionalist inclination since it caused it to appear as though the regular condition of social marvels was static and that there were no inborn powers making for dynamic change. In contrast to this view, Tolkien highlights the forgotten skills of the past “Glo’in began then to talk of the works of his people, telling Frodo ... We make good armour and keen swords, but we cannot again make mail or blade to match those that were made before the dragon came” ([Tolkien, 1954, P.299](#)).

Durkheim believes in the power of science in the functional-oriented society to overcome modern crises originating from the traditionalist practices of the societies. Science under a functional-oriented perspective makes it possible to make attributions to behavioral acts as well as subjective concepts with more precision and accuracy compared to individual-oriented one. Durkheim would have liked to show that an individual's perspectives and imparting about such things as space, time, and causality owed much more to their way of life than had recently been suspected and that these ideas assumed a significant job in assisting with holding society together, for example through creation moral principles conceivable. Durkheimian human science of information may have really added to the production of a scholarly atmosphere in humanities wherein the speculation of phonetic determinism would be genuinely engaged.

In contrast to Durkheim's notion that science and rationalism is the solution to any problem we observe in the following extract that science fails to explain why Tinúviel choses mortality and dies from the world to follow her love, Beren:

At the last Beren was slain by the Wolf that came from the gates of Angband, and he died in the arms of Tinu'viel. But she chose mortality, and to die from the world, so that she might follow him; and it is sung that they met again beyond the Sundering Seas, and after a brief time walking alive once more in the green woods, together they passed, long ago, beyond the confines of this world. ([Tolkien, 1954, 253](#))

Durkheim as epistemological rationalist aimed at developing social structures than can juxtapose rational human behavior next to irrational human behavior by expanding sociological models converging elements of functional-oriented or individual-oriented societies. He sincerely believes in the importance and great potential of science. In his book, “*The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method*”, Durkheim confirms that his major aim “is to extend the scope of scientific rationalism to cover human behaviour by demonstrating that, in the light of the past, it is capable of being reduced to relationships of cause and effect, which, by an operation no less rational, can then be transformed into rules of action for the future.” ([Durkheim, 1992, p. 33](#)). Durkheim, on the other hand, would not acknowledge progress, Under those conditions, he expelled all importance from the idea of progress If the components basically constitutive of a

foundation are as of now present in its most straightforward social stage the progressions to which this establishment is accordingly uncovered don't add anything basically new to it Change is along these lines basically unimportant. The second issue which is tended to in the Introduction concerns the pretended by religion specifically and by the social association as a rule in the development of coherent classes. To Durkheim, the regulative property of the strict is the differentiation between the holy and the profane He likewise recognizes prohibitions as the lists communicating holiness sacrosanct things he will say are those which the bans ensure and disengage. Prohibition isn't anyway just an appearance of the consecrated ban presents the sacrosanct component to the definition. The strict character of an item isn't something inalienable in it yet rather superimposed on it. This thought is regardless of chances with the other thought that hallowed things contrast in nature from foul things they have completely extraordinary quintessence. Tolkien in the following extract aims at imposing the priority of functional-oriented over individual-oriented society by belittling any interest in listening to the old tales as 'crazy' "crazy about stories of the old days, he is, and he listens to all Mr. Bilbo's tales. Mr. Bilbo has learned him his letters – meaning no harm, mark you, and I hope no harm will come of it" ([Tolkien, 1954, P.31](#)).

Durkheim and Pickering explore Durkheim's notion of science. For Durkheim, science was responsible to clarify religion rather than refute it. He tried to use science to rationalize religion rather than rejecting it when he argued that "each moral system is rational ... since 'all moral systems have their own rationality'" ([Durkheim and Pickering, 2014, p.16](#)). Durkheim dedicates the Introduction of *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* mainly to the conversation of two significant issues one is the protection of the investigation of crude religion as hypothetically fundamental undertaking the other is an examination of the pretended by religion in the constitution of our sensible classes. Paradoxically, these distinctions and varieties are kept to a base in the strict frameworks of lower social orders by the excellence of the leeway improvement of singularity the little size of the gatherings, and the homogeneity of the earth. Therefore, to disclose social establishments having a place with given animal categories one will analyze its various structures among people groups of that species as well as in every single going before specie also. This strategy which might be called hereditary would give without a moment's delay the examination and the combination of the marvel For, from one viewpoint, it would show us the different components creating it by the very reality that it would permit us to see the procedure of accumulation or activity simultaneously on account of this wide field of correlation we ought to be in a vastly improved situation to decide the conditions on which depend their arrangement Consequently one can't clarify the social truth of any multifaceted nature aside from by finishing its total advancement every single social specie. He used science to justify religion both at individual and social level as a human need that need to be catered for. In *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Durkheim refers to the notion of the most barbarous or strange myths which can "translate some human need and some aspect of life, whether

social or individual.” ([Durkheim, 1995, p.2](#)). For Durkheim social reality is not governed by reason which indicates his preference for a non-rationalist approach to sociological issues such as religion and its future. He explains why he thinks that in future science will not be able to replace religion for good because of the close affinity of social reality and social sense.

4. CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that in contrast to Durkheimian view that characterizes the preindustrial societies as traditionalist societies that stand on the lower end of the spectrum compared to postindustrial societies that stand on the higher end of the spectrum, in Tolkien's *The Fellowship of the Ring* we observe that societal rules are deeply rooted in the tradition rather than science and rationalism. In another contradictory setting to Durkheim's notion of science and rationalism as a solution to any problem we observe that science fails to explain why Tinúviel chooses mortality and dies from the world to follow her love, Beren. In another instance as mentioned earlier, Tolkien depicts the coexistence of irrational traditional mechanical solidarity and that of modern scientific organic solidarity by employing a character who is not affected by the time and it seems that age has not been able to touch him. This issue on its own reflects the deficiency of rationalism to clarify problems around human being and the fact that science in the face of such irrational traditional human realities has no choice but to accept the juxtaposition of them along with the rational modern realities. According to the results it can be concluded that the society created by Tolkien in *The Fellowship of the Ring* prioritizes a mechanical solidarity over an organic solidarity. This sociological reading informs us about the nostalgic longing for the past that is justified by drawing on some old tales of achievements by humanity or some extraordinary instances that sciences is unable to clarify or explain. According to the results it can be concluded that the society created by Tolkien in *The Fellowship of the Ring* is individual-oriented rather than being functional-oriented since Tolkien refers to individual habits rather than collective habits or individual abilities rather than collective and social abilities. The main sociological implication of the study is the need to consider the individuality of differences as an intertwined characteristic that forms a broader collective society rather than taking a solely holist view.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Not applicable.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION: Abbas Razzaq Hameed al-Thabhawee was actually the brain behind proposing the topic. He also helped in proofreading all parts of the paper. He actually wrote all parts of the paper and finalized it after consulting with Dr. Hanif.

REFERENCES

- Lukes, S. (1969). *Durkheim's 'individualism and the intellectuals'*, 17(1), 14–30.
- Chandler, C. R. (1984). Durkheim and individualism: a comment on Messner, *Social Forces*, 63(2), 571–573.
- Durkheim, E. (1992). *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method* (W. D. Halls, Trans.). Houndmills, Basingstoke and London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). New York & London: The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *The division of labor in society* (W. D. Halls, Trans.). New York: The Free Press.
- Seigel, J. (1987). Autonomy and personality in Durkheim: an essay on content and method. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 48(3), 483–507.
- Vaillant, G. (1992). *Ego mechanisms of defense: A guide for clinicians and researchers*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1984). *The division of labor in society*, Palgrave Macmillan. (Steven Lukes & W. D. Halls, Trans.)
- Tolkien, J. R. R. *The lord of the rings: the fellowship of the rings*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954.
- Bottomore, T. (1981). "A marxist consideration of Durkheim". *Social Forces*, 59, 902–917.
- Durkheim, E. (1893). *The division of labor in society*. The free press of Glencoe.
- Mkandawire B. S. (2011). *Mechanical and organic solidarity*. bmsitwe.blogspot.
- Griffiths, H. (2017). *Introduction to sociology 2e*. OpenStax College, Rice University.
- Mechtraud, S. (1955). "Durkheim's concept of solidarity". *Philippine Sociological Review*, 3(3), 23–27. Retrieved September 24, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41853340>
- Durkheim É., & Steven Lukes. (2013). *The division of labor in society*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Durkheim, E., & Pickering, W. S.F. (2014). *Durkheim: essays on morals and education*. James Clarke and Co Ltd.
- Thilakarathna, K.A.A.N. (2019). "A critique on the Durkheimian concept of solidarity." *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 3(6), 307–313.
- Marryatt, N. (2014). *Comparing social solidarity across historical societies (thesis, master of social sciences (MSocSc))*. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/8992>