

January 2015

Harry Potter and Control: An Inherent Power Narrative in the Wizarding World

Daniel Archer

Abilene Christian University, daniel.archer@acu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/conversations>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Archer, Daniel (2015) "Harry Potter and Control: An Inherent Power Narrative in the Wizarding World," *Conversations: A Graduate Student Journal of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Theology*: Vol. 2 : No. 1 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/conversations/vol2/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Conversations: A Graduate Student Journal of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Theology* by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ ACU.

Harry Potter and Control: An Inherent Power Narrative in the Wizarding World

Daniel Archer (M.A.)
Abilene Christian University
English

Abstract

Throughout recent years, fans and readers alike have come to see the magical world of *Harry Potter* as just that: magical. The seven-part series has become a must-read for children and adults, even raising intellectual questions among scholars. Nevertheless, there are merely a handful of topics whose discussion has left much to be desired within research concerning *Harry Potter*. One aspect of research in particular that is lacking is the research of magic as a method of control and the moral ambiguity of the Unforgivable Curses when used by protagonists. My paper will examine the Unforgivable Curses (Killing, Cruciatius, and Imperius) in *Harry Potter*. I will investigate Foucault's ideas in his work *Discipline and Punish* concerning docile bodies, and the relationship between these ideas and the full control over others' bodies that the Unforgivable Curses grant their casters. In addition, Tolkien's concept of "the Machine" is highly relevant in this discussion, and will be brought into conversation with Foucault's ideas and my own.

“You’re a wizard, Harry!” is a phrase that changed the lives of an entire generation. Since J.K. Rowling wrote those fateful words in 1997, children have fantasized about receiving their very own messenger owls carrying letters to inform them of their acceptance into Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry. Magic took the world by storm, but not for the first time. We have long been fascinated with the idea of magic and have even wished it to be real at times to either facilitate our daily lives or just for the “cool factor.” Despite this fascination, the scientific world has still neglected to consider the repercussions of a world governed by magic (either out of naiveté or simply by not taking the time to consider a magic society in depth). J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter* series is a hero story, one that comfortably follows all of the aspects of a quest narrative. It has brought children’s and young adult’s literature to the forefront and has charmed readers of all ages for almost two decades. Nevertheless, Rowling’s narrative is troubling because of its power-centric ideas, positing its stories as a struggle for power in addition to the more commonplace struggle between good and evil. Furthermore, *Harry Potter* functions as a reflection of the “other” both through direct and indirect examples. Perhaps the most obvious problematic tool of achieving power is that of the characters’ usage of the Unforgivable Curses. These curses are troublesome in many ways; but most importantly, the methods of domination over others and the creation of docile bodies make them formidable threats to the balance of power in wizarding society and to the way wizards wage war. When read through the lens of Michel Foucault and J.R.R. Tolkien’s theories of control and power, the *Harry Potter* series focuses on a struggle for power that envelops various characters and creates questionable distinctions between “good” and “evil.” However, Harry Potter’s character is able to transcend the power struggle occurring around him and, despite several inherent flaws, is able to redeem his use of the Unforgivable Curses in the series.

When referring to the “hero story,” I speak of narratives that closely adhere to Joseph Campbell’s monomyth pattern (more widely known as The Hero’s Journey) from his work *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Equally important in these narratives is the establishment of fundamental dualisms that have defined our stories in Western civilization for centuries. In *Deconstructing the Hero: Literary Theory and Children's Literature*, Margery Hourihan points out that “Plato and Aristotle articulated the basic dualisms when they asserted the superiority of humans to animals, free men to slaves, men to women, reason to passion and should (or mind) to body” (2). Hourihan acknowledges that social reform has had an effect on these fairly distinct separations since the classical age of Aristotle and Plato, but that our current society has not completely relinquished its grasp on these dualisms. They are now present in subtler terms, in ideas that reflect the “other” of cultures of the time. For example, “James Bond and his like defend democracy against communism and these concepts are likewise added to the pattern and defined as, respectively, good and evil” (Hourihan 3). In these aspects, *Harry Potter* is no different. It is interesting, then, to place a theoretical finger on what Rowling portrays as “other” in *Harry Potter*’s works and what that means in terms of a power struggle, and what we as an audience view as a threat to such a balance of power. Nonetheless, we must admit to ourselves the possibility that, in reality, we are succumbing to ideas of dualism presented by yet another author of children’s literature.

Establishing *Harry Potter* as a hero story, and consequently as a power-centric narrative, makes unfair assumptions regarding the true narrative trajectory of Rowling’s series. A number of other works that employ this narrative structure have, by comparison, very clear lines drawn between what is ethical and what is not. Hourihan delves further into this idea when examining Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings* trilogy:

None of the characters in *The Lord of the Rings* has to struggle to understand what he should do. Those who do evil do it knowingly. They are not faced with situations where there seem to be no clearly good options available. The simplistic oppositions of the text deny the possibility of doubt or confusion about ethical issues. The moral difficulties, the indeterminacies and uncertainties, the 'bitter furies of complexity' (Yeats [1933] 1950: 281) which are intrinsic to the human condition are absent in Tolkien and denied absolutely by the closure. (Hourihan 53)

As a series, *Harry Potter* does not have the luxury of an erasure of moral difficulty. The majority of the characters have flaws that have caused them to make questionable decisions throughout their lives; and even if this is not the case, other characters are presented with difficult moral dilemmas to overcome. Many ethical and moral lines become blurred over time in this narrative, especially in the later novels. The foundational aspect of this analysis, the Unforgivable Curses, is perhaps one of the most fitting examples of blurred lines in *Harry Potter*. Both antagonists and, eventually, protagonists make use of these powerful spells. What does this say about these clear-cut dualisms that we are to explore, then? Conceivably the seemingly universal usage of the Unforgivable Curses speaks more toward a power struggle from both sides of the story at hand. The fact that both sides of the narrative use the Unforgivable Curses contributes to a deconstruction of the traditional binary good vs. evil hero narrative. The implications of main characters that we see as "good" using these Unforgivable Curses are problematic at best.

In order to discuss this problematic aspect of magic in *Harry Potter*, we must first define the curses under consideration. The most straightforward of these curses is the Killing Curse, which, as the name implies, kills its target upon the utterance of the words *Avada Kedavra*. With

the second curse, the Cruciatus Curse, an exclamation of the word *Crucio* inflicts debilitating pain upon its victim. *The Goblet of Fire* describes the pain as “intense” and “all-consuming” like “white-hot knives . . . piercing every inch of [one’s] skin” (661). This curse acts as a primary means of torture, whether inflicted directly on the person who is the source of information or on someone close to him or her. Finally, the Imperius Curse places its victims under complete mental (and by extension, physical) control of the curse-caster when he or she utters the spell-word *Imperio*. Little is known about the amount of magical power required to cast these spells, but it is no small feat. In *The Goblet of Fire*, impostor Moody says of the Killing Curse in particular, “*Avada Kedavra*'s a curse that needs a powerful bit of magic behind it—you could all get your wands out and point them at me and say the words, and I doubt I'd get so much as a nosebleed” (217). Not only do the curses need powerful magic, but they also require a trait or something within a person that can probably be considered villainous. When Harry tries to cast the Cruciatus Curse on Bellatrix Lestrange in *The Order of the Phoenix*, she experiences only a brief moment of pain before laughing and shrugging it off: “You need to *mean* them, Potter! You need to really want to cause pain—to enjoy it—righteous anger won't hurt me for long” (810). Thus, casting these curses requires not only a certain amount of magical power but also a desire to inflict these effects on others, consequently creating a recognizable moral dilemma that goes hand-in-hand with the decision to cast an Unforgivable Curse.

There is a distinct difference between using dangerous weapons (in this case, magic) for self-defense or self-preservation and using them for wrongdoing or selfish gain. For instance, we will, without hesitation, fault an individual for forcefully entering a house that is not his own and murdering whoever is inside in cold blood. On the other hand, we will generally not blame an individual for choosing to defend himself against the previously mentioned individual and killing

the intruder in self-defense. This same concept can apply to the Unforgivable Curses. As an audience, we may admit that it is a flaw of Harry Potter's character that he chooses to employ the Imperius Curse in *The Deathly Hallows*. And yet, we do not fault him but rather view it as a necessary measure to take in the present situation. However, Harry's use of the Cruciatius Curse in *The Order of the Phoenix* is difficult to come to terms with. After all, it was not cast out of a need for self-defense, but instead was used out of pure hatred and a thirst to exact revenge. As readers, we struggle with this twofold display of both powerful and questionable character. Nevertheless, Harry's desire to cast this spell is seemingly overshadowed by the fact that he is unsuccessful in his attempt to inflict such pain on Bellatrix, and hence our minds as an audience are at ease.

Throughout the *Harry Potter* series, numerous instances are demonstrated specifically in the novels where both "good" and "evil" characters employ the Unforgivable Curses. The motives behind these scenarios vary on a case-to-case basis, but the nature of the Unforgivable Curses remains the same. That being said, the Unforgivable Curses are not necessarily true to their namesake, at least outside of a legal standpoint. While it is true that the Ministry of Magic deemed these curses "unforgivable," this manifestation of the term only holds true in the sense that the use of these curses is punishable by a life sentence in the wizarding prison of Azkaban. However, the necessity of naming these curses "unforgivable" creates an understanding of the severity of these curses that makes them unforgivable outside of a legal standpoint as well. As human beings, we are reluctant to forgive even minor transgressions, let alone murder, torture, or nonconsensual control. Even from an outside perspective, we are exceptionally hard-pressed to find justification in these actions when performed by characters we perceive as "good." This holds true, though perhaps to a lesser extent, even when the recipients of these actions are

perceived as “evil” or merit these actions. As a society, we are disinclined to visualize the punishment of criminals or those “deserving” of punishment. Consequently, we are made to feel uncomfortable when we see the hand of justice taking part in acts that are deemed morally reprehensible in order to enact punishment upon criminals. Foucault outlines this idea in addressing the changes in methods of punishment over time: “In the worst of murderers, there is one thing, at least, to be respected when one punishes: his ‘humanity’” (74). Even in the cases of those individuals whom we convict of the most serious crimes, we find ourselves unable to reject their humanity. It takes actions that are quite extreme to cause us to believe that other people are not actually human; and even then, we feel as if they might be forgivable in terms of punishment. These sentiments of disinclination toward displays of violence or harmful acts toward others on behalf of protagonists manifest themselves various times in *Harry Potter*.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault discusses the concept of “docile bodies” and their usefulness both in military and industrial settings: “A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved” (136). According to Anne Schwan, Foucault splits the body into two registers as an object of study: “Analyzable body,” on the one hand, and “Manipulable body” on the other, which combine to form the idea of “docility” (98). These ideas preserve the concept of personal freedom and choice, but also enforce the notion that submission is important in the process of improving or controlling human beings for a workforce or military. I posit that the Unforgivable Curses are important in this aspect because they eliminate one of these two important stages, creating a docile body with ease. In essence, casters of these spells are able to instantly create docile bodies to do their bidding, at least in the case of the Imperius and Cruciatus curses (and the latter only to a certain extent). In his book *One Fine Potion: The Literary Magic of Harry Potter*, Greg Garrett further elaborates on this idea of removing one’s

free will, and takes it a step further in describing the Imperius Curse in particular: “The Imperius Curse is rightly condemned, for a successful curse does what not even the most totalitarian regime could ever accomplish: It takes away the option of dissent, hidden though it might be” (27). One can not only create a docile body for personal gain using the Imperius Curse, but also do so knowing that the curse comes along with no actual resistance from the recipient. In the manner of military, then, one can create the ultimate soldier (devoid, perhaps, of the pinnacle of human physical capabilities but with magical capabilities, instead), willing to do the bidding of his commander without dissent. The Cruciatus Curse also intends to torture its victim into submission, either to extract information or to exert control over future actions. In their article “Magic, Science, and the Ethics of Technology,” Benjamin J. Bruxvoort Lipscomb and W. Christopher Stewart explain the aspect of domination present in the nature of the Cruciatus Curse: “As a number of philosophers who have written about torture have noted, the goal of torture is to pull to pieces the person being tortured, sometimes in order to turn him or her into a tool, but always to remove him or her as a potentially opposing force” (84-85). Accordingly, torture is yet another form, and perhaps the most effective form, of complete and total domination.

This idea of creating and controlling “docile” bodies then raises further questions about a magical world in which those seeking power use this mind-control tactic as a weapon of war. First, the technique of using curses to create docile bodies for one’s own purposes assumes that without magic, these bodies would be disorderly and resistant. Granted, a person can be forced to obey the bidding of another if there is a certain amount of leverage present, but there are still instances where the person being coerced in this manner is able to have some ideas of resistance. As a result, the removal of disorderly minds is essential in maintaining this control. Without

thoughts of dissent or feelings of resentment, there are no mental obstacles preventing a “soldier” from doing the bidding of his commander (in this case, the caster of the Imperius Curse). War in the wizarding world, therefore, can prove far more catastrophic than war in our own world. Rowling’s writing does not dig into this quality of waging war all too deeply, but the possibilities, quite frankly, are endless. Creating a world of paranoia where any acquaintance or close friend could be under someone else’s control makes for a terrifying aspect of both wizarding wars described in the series. However a magical world naturally requires magical powers in order to control magical people. Though these curses are a requirement for controlling potentially uncooperative bodies, those that are able to effectively wield these curses find that controlling even magical people is relatively simple. The use of magic and the Unforgivable Curses simplifies the process of control as imagined by Foucault.

Are the wills of wizards and witches, then, presumably more powerful than those of Muggles? It is difficult to say. But the wizards’ magical power seems to be able to bind Muggles to curses that wizards may be able to escape. In fact, the only example of a Muggle under the effects of the Imperius Curse results in severe mental damage that is never healed (*Half-Blood Prince* 17). The simplest counterargument to the idea that wizards have stronger wills rests in the Muggles’ lack of magical power as well as their tenacity in continuing to resist wizard control until overwhelmed by the wizard’s curses. Of course, the Imperius Curse’s effects are still incredibly difficult to overcome and require an amount of willpower that is rare even among wizards. Among other possible cases, the only mentions of people who manage to escape the effects of the Imperius Curse include Harry Potter, Barty Crouch Jr., and Barty Crouch Sr. The latter two nevertheless were exposed to the curse various times before growing resistant to its effects. Furthermore, resistance to the Imperius Curse seems to inflict mental damage to Barty

Crouch Sr. (*Goblet of Fire* 554-560). What, then, are we to say regarding the creation of docile bodies for use in magic-based wars?

In one of his letters to Milton Waldman, Tolkien highlights his idea of “the Machine” both in opposition to and as similar to magic:

By [the Machine] I intend all use of external plans or devices (apparatus) instead of development of the inherent inner powers or talents—or even the use of these talents with the corrupted motive of dominating: bulldozing the real world, or coercing other wills. The Machine is our more obvious modern form though more closely related to Magic than is usually recognized . . . The Enemy in successive forms is always “naturally” concerned with sheer Domination, and so the Lord of magic and machines. (Tolkien 146)

In short, Tolkien describes this Machine as composed of technological tools used to dominate others beyond, and instead of, their own personal powers. Tolkien points out that in our modern perspectives, magic and technology are usually separate entities and have no intersection.

However, in this letter he argues that technology and magic are closely intertwined in their origins and intentions. After all, science is essentially the successor to the failures of magic.

Perhaps we may argue that magic may play a part in Tolkien’s idea of the Machine. We may accept magic as a predecessor of science and technology in order to raise the question of the separation of the two that is prevalent in modern thought. Technology is never mentioned in a serious light in *Harry Potter*. One of the few concrete mentions of technology throughout the series is Arthur Weasley’s fascination with Muggle objects, which are seen as useless or obsolete to a wizarding society. Nevertheless, it is through this use of technology that control has been established in the non-magic world following the failures of magic in the hands of Muggles.

After all, Muggle society is responsible for its own supervision and law enforcement, which were achieved, contrastingly, without magic.

The use of the Unforgivable Curses in *Harry Potter* illustrates that technology is not the only aspect of the Machine that is employed for the purposes of domination and control. The “Lord of magic and machines” referred to in this quote is most adequately portrayed by Lord Voldemort and his natural concern with “sheer Domination” and lordship over the magical (and, by extension, non-magical) world in large part through the use of these Unforgivable Curses as well as other dark magic. The Unforgivable Curses are a manifestation of a desire for control and a thirst for power among the dark wizards of the wizarding community. Voldemort is certainly no exception. These curses may merely exist as stepping stones to more powerful magic techniques such as the creation of Horcruxes, but their association with Tolkien’s Machine is undeniably relevant. The Unforgivable Curses reflect the use of wizards’ talents “with the corruptive motive of dominating” and subjecting others to their control and their bidding (Tolkien). However, the Unforgivable Curses do not exist as a completion of the Machine. They are only just a part, an important one perhaps, but nevertheless only just a part. Despite the moral reprehensibility of these Unforgivable Curses, they are not the fulfillment of the Machine entirely without the irredeemable motivation of desiring to control other bodies for questionable purposes. To complete the Machine, the Unforgivable Curses must coincide with self-corruption and disregard for human life. For this reason, we cannot assume that the use of Unforgivable Curses will infallibly lead to a desire for total government of other bodies. There is an unquestionable danger associated with the use of the Unforgivable Curses, but it does not presume to be all-consuming.

In considering the seeming mutual exclusivity between magic and technology in the *Harry Potter* series, it is interesting to take into account the systems of power in place in this wizarding society and the tools they use to remain in power. After all, powerful people are not necessarily “in power.” Cornelius Fudge is never perceived to be a powerful wizard, but he does hold the title of Minister of Magic. What makes Cornelius Fudge powerful in this sense, then, is his ability to be the image of power the magic-wielding community needs after the downfall of Lord Voldemort. When Voldemort falls, the wizarding community is in need of rebuilding and recovering after the First Wizarding War. Chaos is still very much a widespread agent in this society, and so wizards turn to a figure that can establish and maintain order in a world that now finds it necessary. Fudge is able to establish this order and fights to maintain it not through magic, but by means of technology. In a world ruled by magic, it is fair to join journalism and newspapers into a group more technological than magical. The Ministry of Magic, then, heavily relies on such publications as *The Daily Prophet* to ensure the public remains oblivious to potential threats and is made to believe that all is well in the wizarding world. Even after the days of Fudge, the Ministry of Magic becomes a source of propaganda that furthers the agenda of Voldemort and his Death Eaters during the Second Wizarding War. Despite the seeming absence of technology in a magical world, we are able to observe examples of how technology works to further the agendas of those seeking to maintain their positions of power. These pursuits are not necessarily undertaken by powerful people, but they *are* pursued by those in power who wish to maintain it—an important distinction to make.

Voldemort, in his rise to and maintenance of power, employs magical innovations that border on technology. The most prominent example of this use of magical innovations for dark purposes is his invention of the Dark Mark. The Dark Mark has two manifestations within the

Harry Potter series: The first is as a tattoo on the arms of Death Eaters, and the second is as an image in the sky matching the one tattooed on Death Eaters. The latter operates as a sort of terror tactic created by Voldemort and employed by his Death Eaters. When it appears in the sky, it is safe to assume that death accompanies the Dark Mark. The image is unmistakably one of fear and darkness among wizards, and thus operates as a way to incite chaos within this society and add a dark twist to “traditional” magic. The Death Eaters’ tattoo is very important as well. Upon touching the tattoo, Voldemort is able to create a burning sensation in the arms of his followers, which acts as a summons to his presence. Not only are Voldemort’s followers branded in a way reminiscent of soldiers or prisoners, but they are to obey this call to Voldemort’s side if the mark is activated. Though magic-based, it is clear this facet of magic is indeed one that reflects a technological asset of communication between soldier and commander. We do not see Voldemort and his followers utilizing devices resembling walkie-talkies, as this would destroy the image of magic within the series. However, this specific use of magic assumes the role that would normally be played by technological devices. Therefore, when reading through Tolkien’s argument, a narrative that is based in a magical world demands a separation from technology. However, this does not keep these worlds from containing magical applications that closely resemble technological devices of the same nature, fulfilling in this way Tolkien’s conversations regarding the Machine and its technological demands.

In “Sneaking out after Dark: Resistance, Agency, and the Postmodern Child in JK Rowling’s ‘Harry Potter’ Series,” Drew Chappell argues that Harry Potter is not a “cookie-cutter” protagonist in terms of abiding by defined power structures within various aspects of the wizarding world. Instead, Harry’s character represents a postmodern example of childhood in Rowling’s works and serves as a direct contrast to the idea of the modern child, characterized in

Chappell's words as "an extension of the state, a resource in need of preservation and training ... Historically, these children and child characters were subject to control; their bodies and minds were trained to ensure maximum productivity and servitude" (283). Harry fights this aspect of control as the years pass realizing that there are power structures in place and that he, if he so chooses, can fight them and not simply settle for assimilation. Resistance in this manner is manifested in the series both literally and metaphorically. Harry is able to literally resist both the effects of the Imperius Curse as well as the forceful interactions between Ministers of Magic Cornelius Fudge and Rufus Scrimgeour for their own selfish purposes.

Nevertheless, Harry is not a flawless character by any stretch of the imagination. As an audience, we must still on occasion wrestle with the fact that Harry chooses to do things that we might not consider just or right. As addressed earlier, we are able to forgive him for using the Cruciatus Curse on Bellatrix if for no other reason other than because it did not actually work, therefore denying the idea that a "dark side," in fact, exists within our hero. However, we must also consider other instances in which Harry uses the Unforgivable Curses throughout the series. Though unsuccessful in *The Order of the Phoenix*, he is successful in casting a Cruciatus Curse in *The Deathly Hallows* when Amycus Carrow spits in Professor McGonagall's face at Hogwarts (593). Furthermore, Harry casts the Imperius Curse on a goblin and a Death Eater at Gringotts in order to break in and steal one of the Horcruxes belonging to Voldemort (*Deathly Hallows* 531). The latter occurrence can be written off as a necessity, a part of the operation that would have failed if the necessary measures had not been taken. In this context of "doing what needs to be done," we tend to be able to forgive protagonists quite easily for using these controversial measures. After all, if these actions work toward saving the world, they are likely justified in our minds. There are some courses of action that we will find problematic in these circumstances

such as the killing of innocent people or the unreasonable torture of another, even if the narrative deems it necessary for a greater cause. Rowling, however, very effectively portrays the victims of Harry's Imperius Curse as "other," as deserving of what just hit them. Goblins are easy to portray in this way, particularly since they are always perceived as unpleasant creatures. It is also not difficult to portray a Death Eater as deserving of this treatment for the advancement of the operation. Consequently, as an audience, we do not greatly struggle with this instance of a protagonist casting an Unforgivable Curse.

The casting of the Cruciatius Curse on Amycus Carrow, on the other hand, is vengeful and has malicious intent behind it. After witnessing Carrow spit in McGonagall's face, Harry is filled with venomous anger and immediately strikes Carrow with this torturous curse. As an audience, we can begin to identify with the sheer anger felt by Harry at this occurrence. In fact, an invested audience that has kept up with the series so far would likely share the same sentiment toward the "victim" of this curse. This sympathy does not make the action any less problematic at its core, however. The fact remains that Harry cast an Unforgivable Curse out of a complete and utter desire to hurt someone, to inflict pain, something that he was unable to do in *Order of the Phoenix*. It would be possible to take time initially to point out a certain amount of inconsistency in how Harry is able to cast the curse this time when someone close to him is hurt, but not when his father-figure is killed. Aside from merely calling attention to it as a point of interest, the discussion inherent to that inconsistency is one to be saved for a later discussion. Still, it does act as a source of confusion for the audience. Harry's ability to effectively cast the spell this time could be for one of several reasons. It can be inferred to an extent that Harry's character has "darkened" considerably throughout the last two books, an idea that complicates his character as part of his maturing and growing up. As we establish this idea, we realize that

there is a point at which the purity of the boy from the beginning of the series is lost or tainted as a result of power structures acting around Harry and his efforts to rid himself of them. We are able to forgive Harry's use of the Cruciatus on Amycus Carrow because we can feel that he was entitled to acting on behalf of those who would not do so on their own, but we cannot deny that Harry's character has grown more complex and, well, human. Rowling does not set out to portray Harry as a flawless character. Far from it, Rowling demonstrates how an individual's struggle to act outside of power structures can change him, force his hand in certain situations, and cause him to act questionably in others.

In a narrative that revolves around power and the struggle to acquire and keep it, we are presented with a very human depiction of a character that chooses to fight these power structures and stay true to his own person, whoever that might be. Additionally, we are shown that even the tools used by those striving for power can be used by Harry in his fight to keep away from it. Even throughout the various instances of his casting of the Unforgivable Curses, Harry's intention is never to rise to power or procure permanent control. On the contrary, Harry's goals are fairly short-term when taken into perspective: defeat Voldemort. When read through the lens of Michel Foucault and J.R.R. Tolkien's theories of magic and the Machine, the *Harry Potter* series is one that focuses on a struggle for power that envelops various characters and creates questionable distinctions between "good" and "evil." However, Harry Potter's character is able to transcend the power struggle occurring around him and, despite several inherent flaws, is able to redeem his use of the Unforgivable Curses in the series. Ultimately, the Boy Who Lived was able to transcend powers that threatened to control his life from the very beginning. Thus, despite needing to occasionally resort to the tools used by the enemy, Harry Potter is able to finally

break free of the power structure and destroy it from the inside, effectively ending Voldemort's grip on dominance. In the end, "all was well" (*Deathly Hallows* 759).

Works Cited

- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1949. Print.
- Chappell, Drew. "Sneaking out after Dark: Resistance, Agency, and the Postmodern Child in JK Rowling's 'Harry Potter' Series." *Children's Literature in Education* 39.4 (Dec. 2008): 281-293. Web. 16 Sept. 2014. <http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE|H1420114857&v=2.1&u=txshracd2478&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w&asid=b6de852503909d63dca15823b184ef50>.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977. Print.
- Garrett, Greg. *One Fine Potion: The Literary Magic of Harry Potter*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010. Print.
- Hourihaan, Margery. *Deconstructing the Hero: Literary Theory and Children's Literature*. New York: Routledge, 1997. Print.
- Rowling, J.K. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. New York: Scholastic Inc., 2007. Print.
- . *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. New York: Scholastic Inc., 2000. Print.
- . *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. New York: Scholastic Inc., 2005. Print.
- . *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. New York: Scholastic Inc., 2003. Print.
- Schwan, Anne. *How to Read Foucault's Discipline and Punish*. London: Pluto Press, 2011. eBook.
- Tolkien, J.R.R. "To Milton Waldman." 1951. Letter 131 of *The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien*. Ed. Humphrey Carpenter. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981. 143-61. Print.