A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER IN *HARRY POTTER SERIES*:
SPECIESISM AND DISCRIMINATION BASED ON BLOOD STATUS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

SÜMEYYE GÜLLÜ ASLAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

AUGUST 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bilal Kırkıcı
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez   (METU, ELIT) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro (METU, ELIT) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin   (Atılım Uni.,ELIT)_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Sümeyye Güllü, Aslan

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER IN *HARRY POTTER SERIES*:
SPECIESISM AND DISCRIMINATION BASED ON BLOOD STATUS

Aslan, Sümeyye Güllü

M.A., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

August 2018, 134 pages

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the power relations and the power discourse in the seven sequential books of the *Harry Potter Series*, written by J. K. Rowling from a Foucauldian point of view. Foucault contradicts the common belief, and suggests that power is an entity that cannot belong to or held by anybody. It surrounds people, and is fed by and feeds the discourse it exists in. Although power cannot be seized by one person or a group of people, it still can be abused by those who seek personal interests and privileges in social life. Truths extracted from individuals can be manipulated in ways to support the existing discourse, and institutions help with the creation and preservation of it. Through inherently learnt expectations of the society, one is normalised into a product of the discourse. The disciplining of people towards becoming this product is maintained through methods of control such as fixed schedules and activities, and most importantly, surveillance mechanisms. In the *Harry Potter Series*, the already existing discourse of discrimination; both towards non-humans (speciesism) and amongst humans (discrimination based on blood status) is made use of by Voldemort and his followers so as to maintain a privileged status and individual interests. Making use of group psychology, they encourage the

humans and non-humans alike in the series to keep a discriminative stance towards out-group members. This "divide and rule" methodology leads to a polarised society that is easier to manage and thus serve the interests of Voldemort and his followers. The magical society is under constant surveillance to make sure they are disciplined through and for the survival of the discourse of power. In addition, when the members in each group is taken into consideration, it becomes clear that the truth about discrimination is manipulated in a way that those who support Voldemort's system and those who oppose it are camped, rather those from different species or with different blood-quantum as is asserted. Thus, the philosophy of Voldemort and his followers is completely discursive. Dolayısıyla, seri Foucault'nun fikirleri ile aynı çizgidedir.

ÖZ

HARRY POTTER SERİSİ'NDE İKTİDARIN FOUCAULTÇU BİR OKUMASI: TÜRCÜLÜK VE KANA BAĞLI AYRIMCILIK

Aslan, Sümeyye Güllü

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

Ağustos 2018, 134 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı J. K. Rowling tarafından yazılan *Harry Potter Serisi*'nin yedi kitabında yer alan iktidar ilişkilerini ve söylemini Foucaultcu bir bakış açısıyla değerlendirmektir. Foucault genel inanışın aksine, iktidarın elle tutulan ve bir kişiye ait olmayan bir olgu olduğunu savunur. İktidar insanları çevreler ve içinde var olduğu söylemden hem beslenir hem de onu besler. Öte yandan, iktidar bir kişi ya da kişiler tarafından elde tutulur olmasa da kişisel menfaatler ve sosyal hayatta elde edilecek ayrıcalıklar için kötüye kullanılabilir. Bu durumda, insanlardan elde edilen bilgiler var olan söyleme uyacak şekilde manipüle edilebilir ve kurumlar söylemin oluşturulması ve korunmasına yardımcı olur. Kişinin kendi kendine keşfettiği toplumun beklentileri, onu söylem tarafından normalleştirilmiş bir ürün haline getirir. İnsanları bu hale getirilen disiplin süreci ise sabit çizelgeler ve aktiviteler ve en önemlisi gözetim gibi kontrol mekanizmaları ile sağlanır. *Harry Potter Serisi*'nde toplumda hâlihazırda var olan hem insan olmayan türlere karşı (türcülük) hem de insanların kendi aralarında olan (kana bağlı ayrımcılık) ayrılıkçı söylem Voldemort ve takipçileri tarafından ayrıcalıklı bir statü elde edip onu korumak ve kişisel çıkarlar elde etmek amacıyla kötüye kullanılır. Grup psikolojisinden faydalanılarak insanların

ve insan olmayan türlerin aralarına diğerlerini dışlayan ayrılıkçı çizgiler çektirilir. Bu "böl ve yönet" metodolojisi daha kolay yönetilecek ve Voldemort ve takipçilerinin hizmetine hazır hale gelecek bir kutuplaşmış toplumun oluşmasına sebep olur. Sihirli toplumun fertleri iktidar söylemi tarafından disipline edilip edilmedikleri ve bu söylemi koruyup korumadıklarının devamlı gözetimindedirler. Dahası, ayrıştırılan grupların bireylerine bakıldığında bilginin manipüle edildiği daha net bir şekilde anlaşılmaktadır. Zira ayrılık, türcülük ve kana bağlı ayrımcılıktan ziyade Voldemort'un sistemini destekleyenler ve ona karşı koyanlar şekline gelmiştir. Bu durumda, Voldemort ve takipçilerinin felsefesinin de bir tabanı yoktur; tamamen söylemseldir. Dolayısıyla, seri Foucault'nun fikirleri ile aynı çizgidedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Harry Potter Serisi, Foucault'ya göre iktidar söylemi, ayrımcılık, türcülük, kana bağlı ayrımcılık

To Those I Consider Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVATIONS

Philosopher	*Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*
Chamber	*Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*
Prisoner	*Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*
Goblet	*Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*
Order	*Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*
Half-Blood	*Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*
Deathly	*Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*
Archaeology	*Archaeology of Knowledge*
Discipline and Punish	*Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*
Sexuality	*The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*
"Politics"	"Politics and the Study of Discourse"
"Subject and Power"	"The Subject and Power"
"Why is Speciesism Wrong?"	"Why Speciesism is Wrong: A Response to Kagan."
"Animal Liberation Movement"	"The Animal Liberation Movement

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aim and Importance of the Thesis

In the popular *Harry Potter Series*, on the surface, it seems as if the battle between the good and the evil were the core of the plot. However, with a more detailed look and a scholarly study with more depth, it is understood that the novels are mainly about discourse of power and power relations.

This thesis aims at examining power relations and power discourse in the *Harry Potter Series* based mostly on the ideas of Michel Foucault, with references to his understanding of truth, knowledge, discipline and discourse; through the speciesist discrimination and discrimination based on blood status in the magical society.

1.2 Methodology and Theory

For the theoretical background of this thesis, Foucault's work has been examined, and the correspondences to the *Harry Potter Series* have been studied. The power relations in the novels can be explained through Foucault's understanding of how power works. For Foucault, power is an entity that is present in every sphere of life, and is exerted in various ways to cater for the personal interests of certain people. It feeds and is fed by the discourse that it creates. The discourse of power in *Harry Potter Series* is formed through discrimination. Speciesism and discrimination based on blood cater for the power discourse. Taking into account Foucault's understanding of power and power discourse, the events in the novel series overlap with his concepts, which make his theories applicable to the novel series.

The concepts of truth/knowledge, surveillance/discipline and discourse are vital in understanding power in Foucault and the relation to Foucault's work to the

1

series. This thesis explains each concept in detail with relation to each other and state how they relate to the novel series.

Truth is a production of the power discourse, for Foucault. The truths produced by the power compile into scientific disciplines; which determine the limits of the power discourse. How obedient people are to the power discourse is ceaselessly controlled by control mechanisms, or disciplinary mechanisms. Surveillance of people, explicit or hidden, ensures that people live within the limits of the power discourse created. This forms a cyclical relation where people act according to the discourse, yet they also feed the discourse in this way; which becomes the discourse that they act according to.

Such power discourses exist in the primary world as well, and are studied by several philosophers interested in politics and power relations. Michel Foucault, the famous French philosopher of the 20th century claims power discourses to be everywhere and that they swallow individuals and crush them in their own grinds, making them a part of the discourse as well. There is no single "creator" of the discourse and "holder" of power although there may be some who benefit from it more than others (Foucault & Deleuze 215). Deleuze asserts that although we can name the people who "exploit", "profit" or "govern", we cannot pinpoint those who hold power due to its diffusive nature, and although the power structure does not appeal to the interests of some, they may still support it (ibid 214).

Similarly, in the fantasy world of the *Harry Potter Series*, we cannot easily define holders of power. There may be none, in fact. We can, however, indicate those who may profit from the discriminatory discourse. In addition, akin to the primary world, those who gain no profit from the discrimination may contribute to its existence. Furthermore, we can recognise characters that define themselves out of the discriminatory discourse of power, yet somehow maintain it.

In the books, certain "truths" about humans and non-humans are embedded in the daily lives of the magical society. Centuries-old depictions of non-humans as uncivilised creatures and humans who do not possess pure magical blood as unworthy beings form an epistemological hierarchy in the magical world. Unwritten hierarchies

of privileged and unprivileged groups cause dispersion of the society, which makes it easier to control and discipline them.

In a Foucauldian sense, the magical world is made to believe that non-humans are strictly below humans in social standing. Within humans, however, there is another ranking from pure-bloods as the most worthy of magical education and living in the magical sphere to muggle-borns and squibs, who are people who come from non-magical parents or cannot produce magic, respectively. This social caste system causes each group to turn into itself and move away from the members of other groups. This system of speciesism that exists in the magical society and that is based on the rate of magical blood one possesses is used by Voldemort and his Death Eaters to maintain the power discourse that serves themselves as a controlling mechanism of the magical populations.

The fact that the underlying rationales of these discriminations are remotely factual suggests, as Foucault explains, that they are discursive. That is, the produced discourse depicts each group of humans or non-humans in a way that it helps the cause of certain people rather than being empirically factual and benefitting the society in general. The *production* of truths supporting the superiority of pure-blood humans over other humans, and humans in general over other species, leads to the *production* of the discourse that supports the sustainability of this system of dispersion and exploitation.

For both the separatism between non-human species and human species and the separatism amongst humans, the in-group bonding and out-group prejudice serve Voldemort. Making use of group psychology, Voldemort and Death Eaters read how members of each group are expected to behave. When beings invert into their own groups, it is easier to maintain control over them.

The disciplining of the society towards the discourse of power is done through mechanisms of surveillance. The magical society is under constant surveillance and control by several practices. For example, the Ministry's invisible intelligence systems report the actions of performing magic to the Ministry. Also, during

Voldemort's regime, witches and wizards are tracked and reported to unknown officials via registration bureaus.

Scientific disciplines; that is, pedagogical practices can also work as disciplining mechanisms; and the curriculum of Hogwarts also contributes to the discriminative discourse of power, raising speciesist generations. The creation and maintenance of the discourse of power that is based on discrimination also, in turn, feeds discriminative practices, leading to a higher level of disciplinary procedures such as the control over bio-power.

In short, the produced truth that caters for the discourse of power is maintained and strengthened through disciplinary practices, which check how obedient the society is to the discourse, making them productions of the discourse of power. Therefore, consciously or unconsciously, the magical society contributes to the discrimination reinforced by the discourse. Each of the above-mentioned concepts in the novels will be elaborated on in the following chapters.

The underlying references to dictatorships such as the Nazi regime, the acts of genocide in Bosnia and Sudan, and the system of African-American slavery is an apt parallel to some of these issues in the novels. With reference to the American acceptance of slavery, Henry Louis Gates Jr. notes that "[t]he novelty of American innocence is, … , the refusal or failure to recognize evil while participating in that evil" (qtd. in Howard 38), an act akin to those of what many Nazi-sympathizers claimed after the war, and to the larger wizarding community in the novels. They may be innocent, good people; yet in a direct or indirect way, they aid the unjust system to survive and are complicit in its thriving; which, ultimately serves for the dictator's – here Voldemort's – purposes. The unjust system is not of Voldemort's invention; it was always there, but its existence and prevalence provides a basis for the divisions in the society that he exploits, and makes him stronger. Thompson states that "Voldemort is not responsible for all the racism in the wizarding world; nonetheless, he publicly enacts his solitary masculinity through tyranny, oppression, enslavement and murder" (Thompson 43), and in some cases, good wizards may help his cause.

4

Thus, when the novels are inspected in more detail, the discriminatory system of the power discourse seems manifold and more complex than simply rooting from pure evil. Discrimination seems to be serving the interests of those who aim at maintaining a status-quo in the magical society. That is, a certain power discourse, a discourse of discrimination to retain certain interests, is cultivated so as to balance opposing forces in such a way that the status-quo inclines to neither side. According to Foucault, the aim of power discourses is to maintain the existing system within a balanced order (Foucault & Deleuze 216), which suggests that the discriminatory discourse is there to protect "the coherence in the wizarding society" (Lipińska 122) in a way that assigns certain privileges to one group of people. Discrimination, therefore, is a means to power rather than an end.

Thus, by making use of fantasy genre, J. K. Rowling seems to create a ground on which she can depict the deep relations of power. Her fantasy world draws parallels to the real world that she herself lives in, and the power structures in the novel are comparable to those in real life. The plot of the novels delves more deeply into these power structures than depicting a plain "fight of the good versus the evil". Upon a brief introduction, this thesis will continue with Chapter 2, which is allocated to the more detailed theoretical explanation of Foucault's understanding of power and power relations. Concepts of truth/knowledge, surveillance/discipline and discourse are described and discussed.

Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 will examine the two pillars of discrimination in the *Harry Potter Series*; namely "speciesism" and "discrimination based on blood status" respectively as ways to sustain the power discourse. Each chapter studies the concepts in detail, and demonstrates examples from the books for each term before relating them with how they are used by characters in the series to establish and maintain the Foucauldian power discourse.

CHAPTER 2

POWER, POWER RELATIONS AND DISCOURSE IN FOUCAULT

The backbone of the *Harry Potter Series* is the power discourse. Foucault's ideas on power discourse overlaps with the discourse in the books. In order to grasp the power relations in the magical world, understanding Foucault's concepts of power through truth/knowledge, discipline and discourse is requisite.

2.1 Old vs. Modern Understanding of Power

Michel Foucault's studies on power have shown that the concept of power in the modern sense is very different from the socio-political conceptions of it in more traditional senses. In order to understand the terminology one has to refer to such other terms as truth, knowledge, discipline, discourse and governmentality.

The traditional understanding of power as a force that is exerted on humans perhaps stems from the first stages of the evolution of the phenomenon itself. For Foucault, the entity of power has evolved from something that one person could hold to something that cannot be held by one person any more. The functions and apparatuses of power have also changed in the meantime (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 103-104). According to Foucault, since the Middle Ages, sovereignty had been the source and definer of power. Monarchical institutions took on the duty of determining laws and prohibitions, which eventually became the limits of the exercise of power. Power was defined and limited within the limits of law and prohibitions asserted by the ensuring legal institutions. This form of "juridical power" indicated the sovereign as the maker of those very laws that defined legality and illegality, held power. This understanding of power, thus, ultimately pointed at the monarch (Foucault, "Truth and Power" 155). In this way, legal thought revolved around royal power. Foucault believes that the resurrection of Roman Law by

monarchs during twelfth century functioned as a rationale for "the establishment of the authoritarian, administrative, and, in the final analysis, absolute power of the monarchy" (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 94).

Classic juridical theory takes power as a right that can be possessed, and thus can also be transferred or given up. The cession of this "concrete power" by individuals and the transfer of it to authorities, as if it were a commodity, constructs political power, according to this theory (ibid 88). In brief, the views that an authority or a group in authority holds power because individuals have given up theirs; and thus the idea of power is a transferrable solid entity is based on this classical theory; and, as Foucault claims, monarchs acted upon this understanding, determining the limits of legality, which, in turn, rewarded them with more control and more power in the classical sense.

However, Foucault believes that the era of royal power has ended, and the way power works changed with it; thus, obsessively studying this kind of power and trying to relate it to the modern sense of power is useless. He believes that "we need to cut off the king's head" in political theory so that we can move on to a more useful theory of the power that we encounter nowadays (Foucault, "Truth and Power" 155-156).

The King's rights and the power that came with it set the limitations of what is legal thought and knowledge. The King's subjects had to submit to this sovereign power in order to remain within the boundaries of legitimacy (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 95). However, such an absolutist regard of power became almost impossible. From the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries on, sovereign power could no longer encompass "the totality of the social body"; that is, it became impossible for a direct sovereign-subject relationship to be maintained (ibid 104). Instead, a more modern kind of power emerged. With the shift from monarchical power to modern power, power has become more and more fluid and abstract. We cannot point to a single authority that holds power any more, because the state has become less and less dominant in control of matters. Although the state still has the

apparatuses of control, the power relations between the apparatuses have surpassed the limits of the state.

For Foucault, unlike sovereign power, modern power is "neither given, nor exchanged, nor recovered, but rather exercised" (ibid 89). Its function is to repress "nature, the instincts, a class, individuals" (ibid 90). Foucault believes that the modern type of power is there to control penal rights and people's psychology and sexuality (ibid 92). Today, human beings are controlled in ways that are invisible to them. Power is exerted in such a way that staying beyond its sway has become impossible. Every individual is repressed by the discourse of power, truth that the discourse creates, and the discourse created through the very discourse it exists in.

In parallelism with Foucault's understanding of power, the power in the *Harry Potter Series* corresponds to the modern version of power. No governing or controlling body; namely the Ministry, Hogwarts or any family is the holder of power in the magical world. There are those who try to exert power over others; yet even that can be illusionary given that the power discourse embodies each and every partner of the society in itself rather than belong to anyone. Not a single person or entity holds power in the wizarding world.

Although it seems that Voldemort stands for the old understanding of a holder of power; he too, is actually a constituent of modern power. Voldemort is never the only ruling person in the magical society like a sovereign. Voldemort's effect can be felt; yet he is not the ruler of power relations. Even Voldemort is a product of power discourse. He does make use of power, but paradoxically, he is also the production of the existing discourse of power. Just as nobody in the text is immune to power, neither is Voldemort. He does not exist out of its context. Thus, although he might be "governing" or "controlling" the magical society for a certain time, he cannot "hold power" in it.

2.2 Instrumental Modes of Power and Creation of Discourse

Although Foucault himself never clearly defines what he means by discourse, we can deduce the meaning and scope of it. McHoul and Grace explain Foucault's

discourse as a combination of (1) disciplines; that is, "bodies of knowledge", and (2) disciplinary practice; that is, forms of social control (McHoul and Grace 26). Weedon puts Foucault's discourse into words as:

> [w]ays of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the 'nature' of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional lives of the subjects they seek to govern (Weedon 108).

Foucault pays special attention to instrumental modes, institutions and rationalization in the creation of discourse. He believes that there are especially two points of reference in the explanation of power. Firstly, there are "rules of right that provide a formal delimitation of power"; and secondly, there are "the effects of truth that this power produces and transmits, and which in their turn reproduce this power" (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 93):

> In a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated, nor implemented without the production, accumulation and circulation and functioning of a discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 93).

This means that discourse is the working mechanism that shapes the social body and the power relations in it; yet it is also shaped by those power relations. It is "whatever constraints – but also enables writing, speaking and thinking within … specific historical limits" (31). Discursive formation happens through cultural archive of a society, which refers not only to texts but also to the different mentalities

throughout history. These make up the set of rules that define the limits of expressibility, conservation, memory and reactivation (Foucault, "Politics" 14-15). That is, the limits for what to say, think and do can be understood as discourse.

The creation of discourse depends heavily on the production of truth that is taken from individuals, and that their ideas of truth are, in turn, produced by discourses of power. For Foucault, power ceaselessly interrogates in its pursuit to create its own truths, which is necessary in the making of the discourse the society demands or needs, in order to function. Truth is a product of the discourse of power, which then uses the concepts of "truth" it promotes to validate itself as power.

For this purpose, institutions are established and professionals, who forge the processes through which subjects are constituted, are reared (ibid 93, 97). These are among the strategies of power to "subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours etc." (ibid 97). Individuals are thus, *made* by power, yet they are also the "vehicles of power", but not the "points of [its] application" (ibid 98). Through all the systems that an individual has to go through and live in, s/he becomes the "prime effect" of power (ibid 98). That is to say, individuals in society are neither the creators, nor the receivers of a concrete, solid kind of power. Instead, they are made to live within a repressive society that demands the truth of them in order to form the power discourse in which they live. They make and are made by the system they live in because they are made to reproduce the truth produced by the power discourse.

The magical world is not immune to the effects of discourse, either. They also exist in a discourse of power that shapes their thoughts around believing that some species are superior to other groups of species. Humans believe themselves to be superior, while goblins and centaurs would disagree and assert that *they* are superior. Furthermore, humans tend to have sub-groups within their own species. Regardless of whether an epistemological superiority actually exists or not; each group exists in the power discourse that requires them to think of themselves as better than others.

The answer of how such a mechanism of power could work lies in the apparatuses of the society. Power relations do not appear and develop arbitrarily.

According to Foucault, certain points are essential for power relations. First of all, a system that works on the differences between people is necessary. Such differences can be "juridical and traditional differences of status or privilege; economic differences in the appropriation of wealth and goods, differing positions within the processes of production, linguistic or cultural differences, differences in know-how and competence, and so forth" (Foucault, "Subject and Power" 344). The second essential point is "the types of objectives pursued by those who act upon the actions of others". These people may aim at maintaining privileges, exercising authority or accumulating profits (ibid 344). It is noteworthy that Foucault does not refer to these people as those who hold power but rather as those who "act upon the actions of others". The third point in understanding power is related to understanding "instrumental modes"; that is, the methods through which power is exercised such as speech, economic disparities or arms. Complex systems of surveillance, rules and other means of control fall under this topic (ibid 344). Another point crucial in understanding power is the "forms of institutionalization". Institutions that interact with each other inside the power structure and contribute to it could include legal structures, families, such hierarchical structures as the military and the state (ibid 344). Finally, "the degrees of rationalization" are important in power relations. How effective instruments of power are and can be determines how rational using a method is (ibid 344).

Foucault asserts that the existence and maintenance of these mechanisms depend on how economically and politically useful they are to the bourgeoisie. However, still, it is not the bourgeoisie who decide (like a royal authority of power used to) on what is useful or not to them, but it is their economic and political interests. Exercises such as the exclusion of the delinquent from the society and surveillance over infantile sexuality at one point were important to the global mechanisms and the entire State system to continue their existence; and thus had to be exerted. For Foucault, the reason was the lack of economical benefits of such to the bourgeoisie, which meant they had to be "controlled, pursued [and] punished" when necessary (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 101-102).

11

The magical society also has its Foucauldian mechanisms that serve the power discourse. A group of people who try to enhance and maintain their privileges make use of the existing discourse of power that relies on discrimination. In the same line with what Foucault states, the magical discourse of power is also based on a system of differences. Differences of species and blood status are not only designated but also emphasized. In fact, the differences are exploited further by those who aim to use the power discourse for their interests. Anatomical differences, economical differences and ideological differences are encouraged to keep the society from collaborating. A society that has clear lines between different groups is spurred. In addition, similar to Foucault's explanation of how discourse of power works in our world, there is a group of people who "act upon the actions of others" in the magical world as well, so as to maintain and enhance the limits of their privileges. Moreover, instrumental means of control and institutionalisation, which will be further discussed in the following chapters, are also employed by Voldemort and the Death Eaters. Finally, the wizarding community has rationalised discriminatory ideology believing that humans are by default superior to other species; and that within humans, only those who have pure-magical blood are worthy of the magical world because only pure-blood witches and wizards could have naturally gained their skills. The existence of non-pure-blood witches and wizards is rationalised by the statement that others could only have usurped the ability to perform magic, and are thus, not real witches and wizards. The discourse of power in the magical society necessitates such factionalism so as to maintain itself. Every move of the society has to be controlled, and this is easier to manage when they are dispersed. The discourse, thus, encourages an ethnocentric self-importance.

The existence of any discourse does not eliminate the possibility of resistance to the discourse. However, they are the very organisms that need to be controlled. Foucault states that in order to control, pursue and punish delinquency, mechanisms of power require apparatuses of control. As mentioned above, sovereign power aimed at controlling whole bodies of populations; which became impossible after a while with criticisms regarding monarchy (ibid 105). Despite these criticisms and

the movement away from monarchies to democracies, "the king's head still hasn't been cut off" (Foucault, "Truth and Power" 156); however, it is replaced by a new system of control: disciplinary power. The mechanisms of control come into being at this point. This new type of power is "one of the greatest inventions of the bourgeois society" for Foucault (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 105).

Disciplinary power seems to be the opposite of visible and solid sovereign power. It is everywhere, yet difficult to see. Umberto Eco believes power to be similar to linguists' *given language* in that it is a coercive device constructed through and within a social environment, and is not an exertion of an individual decision (Eco 244). That is, it is created inside the social sphere, rather than brought by an authority. Similar to Eco, Foucault believes that power is not an entity that can be possessed (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 26), acquired, seized or shared (Foucault, *Sexuality* 94), as we have seen. He adds that "there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations" (ibid 94). A "general assent" is what power derives from (Eco 244); thus contrary to the common outlook toward power, it is not held by a single individual or a group of individuals, and their general assent is contributed by the discourses of power and truth.

Additionally, Foucault views power as a non-hierarchical mechanism. It does not flow from top-down (Fillingham 143). It is an ever-evolving phenomenon that is produced through relations. As long as there are human relationships, that is, power will persist to survive. Hence, rather than being a fixed unity that could cover other unities, it is always under construction; and is ceaselessly constituted "from everywhere":

> The omnipresence of power: not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. (Foucault, *Sexuality* 93).

2.2.1 Truth and Knowledge

Foucault suggests that power is mediated through institutions that professedly have no relation to political power. Institutions of education, which include family, university and schools are assigned with propagating knowledge so as to keep a certain class in power and exclude others from it. Similarly, institutions of foresight and care, medical and psychiatric institutions, are there to support the class in control of political power (Chomsky & Foucault 40-41).

All sorts of power draw their authority from scientific "truths" deriving from these institutions, whose history and therefore functioning may change from society to society; yet what they have in common is this way of functioning (McHoul & Grace 65). Here, again, truth is fluid. It is

> [to] be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements.
> "Truth" is linked in a circular relation with systems of power that produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it – a "regime" of truth (Chomsky & Foucault 170).

If truth is produced and sustained by power, this means that it is open to manipulation. This makes truth an entity that makes and is made by power relations, serving the interests of the dominant class; and institutions that provide knowledge/truth and convey it are vehicles of the sustenance of this power. Thus, the individual who provides truth and also is created by it is a "representation of society; but he is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power [Foucault has] called 'discipline'". Yet, power is not a negative term for Foucault because it is productive: "it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 194).

The origins of a produced form of truth is taken from individuals in various ways, and throughout history different techniques have been used to do so. In other

words, the production of truth is not a new phenomenon that comes with modern life. It is a practice from our pasts. With the introduction of "the state" system as the new kind of power, political power started rejecting a direct sovereign-subject relationship, yet became more individualizing and totalizing at the same time. The techniques that bring about this system are based on what Foucault calls "pastoral power" (Foucault, "Subject and Power" 332).

With Christianity, pastors became people who guaranteed salvation through people's confessions of their own sins. It is a form of power that assured individual deliverance at the expense of their own sacrifice: their secrets, the truth about them. It explores the souls of individuals and attempts at directing their conscience. Thus, it is different from political power in its being salvation-oriented. It is different from principle of sovereignty in its secludedness for each person, and it is different from legal power for it works in individual ways. It depends on the production of the truth of individuals (ibid 333), which makes individuals indispensable parts of the modern state rather than subjects of it on the condition that their individuality be shaped into the specific forms and patterns (ibid 334).

Modern state power, on the other hand, is a continuation of pastoral power. It is an evolved version of the original with a few differences. The first difference is the shift of where salvation is due. Old pastoral power ensured otherworldly salvation while the new system ensures salvation in this world. Secondly, while the officials of pastoral power were the clergy, the officials of modern state power are those such as the police, private and government institutions, medical and educational institutions. Finally, the gathering of knowledge on man had both a global and qualitative aim, and an analytical individual one. In this way, according to Foucault, the pastoral type of power, which was once only a religious institution, spread to the whole social sphere. Institutions such as family, medicine and psychiatry become the extractors and bearers of knowledge of man (ibid 335).

Similarly, in the magical society, the obtaining and production of certain truths is premeditated. Although not always legal, magical beings can reach

individual truths from each other in various ways including legilimency[1], the veritaserum potion[2], the Pensieve[3] and more ordinary yet brutal ways of torture. These methods more or less correspond to Foucault's understanding of the discipline of psychiatry. It must be noted, however, that not every truth taken from an individual source is complete or pure. Memories can be modified or erased, and some people can block others from reaching their minds via Occlumency, the art of making one's own mind impenetrable to others. The power discourse in the magical world depends more heavily on the production of more macro-level truths or knowledges such as the so-believed superiority of humans over other species and origins of the ability to perform magic. Magical beings live in a society that promotes such ideas, which they believe in. Because they believe in the assertions of discrimination, they become the bearers of the power discourse. Living a life based on the truths imposed upon them, the magical society puts barriers between themselves and other groups. Each institution bequeaths the discriminatory mentality to the next generation, who become the bearers of the mentality to their successive generation. Thus, the produced truth becomes the pillar of the mentality, and thus the discourse, whether it is based on empirical facts or not. Most humans do not question the speciesist understanding because they are the privileged group that benefits from it. They do, however, when it comes to discrimination that faces themselves; yet the magical society is so dispersed and the discriminative discourse becomes so intrinsic by then that discriminated humans can barely raise their voices.

---

[1]Legilimency is the ability "to see inside another witch or wizard's mind" (Rowling on Pottermore).

[2] Veritaserum is the potion that makes the recipient tell the truth about themselves or a matter (Rowling on Pottermore).

[3] A Pensieve is a "wide and shallow dish" in which one can live through the memories of another (Rowling on Pottermore).

2.2.2 Institutions

Power becomes a play of relations between people or groups. It is a designator of relationships between partners (in ways such as hierarchy of tasks or division of labour), which happens through a grand network of communications. The communication between partners lead to a reciprocity and "the production of meaning"; which accumulate to an unequal system and the dominion of some over the other. The "field of information between partners" is directed and modified in such a way to serve power itself. Exercise of power implies obedience through training techniques and processes of dominion (ibid 338).

Educational institutions communicate the functioning of power relations. A system of coded obedience, hierarchies of knowledge or orders is embodied and internalized by schools by means of "power processes" such as surveillance or reward-punishment systems. All these goal-oriented, regulated systems of communication create disciplines for the society that are tightly interwoven (ibid 338-339).

Similarly, psychoanalysis, as a medical practice is a part of this knowledge-power system for Foucault. "Rooted in early Christian confessional practices, psychoanalysis is our modern theory and practice, and continues to fortify the priority of the subject established in Western thought since Descartes" (Bernauer & Mahon 157).

Psychoanalysis claims to give answers to us about ourselves through ourselves. It is this self-knowledge that draws people to psychoanalysis. We search for the truth of ourselves through the power relations we are in. In psychoanalysis, the truth of sexuality is the truth of self (ibid 157). Thus, man is like a new Oedipus pursuing his true identity hidden in his unconscious, lying in his desires and sexuality (ibid 156). However, Foucault believes that the Oedipal Complex is an imposition of psychoanalysis "for governing individuals" (ibid 157). That is, rather than shedding light on the human psyche, psychoanalysis is shaping our understanding of it. The Oedipus Complex becomes "a certain type of constraint, a relation of power which society, the family, political power establishes over individuals" (Foucault

17

"Truth and Juridical Forms" np) because it was used manipulatively in the nineteenth century by psychiatry that exchanged the father with the "bourgeois father-doctor", the psychiatrist; and in doing so, attempted at treating the patient in a way to adjust to the norms of the bourgeoisie. "Bourgeois normality, in short, is equated with psychic health" (Whitebook 320).

This is an example of Foucault's general understanding of the modern society. Institutions extract truths from individuals and manipulate this knowledge for the functioning of power relations; and while power is not a mere transfer of rights anymore, it still:

> incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; it releases or contrives, makes more probable or less … it constraints or forbids absolutely … it is always a way of acting upon one or more acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action. A set of actions upon their actions (Foucault, "Subject and Power" 341).

Foucault calls this type of "management of states" or the conduct of how to direct individuals or groups "government" – "the government of children, of souls, of communities, of families, of the sick" (ibid 341). The above mentioned institutions and many more exist to govern bodies of populations; power is exerted over humans through them. That is, power relations are so deeply rooted in the social nexus that "[t]o live in society is, in any event, to live in such a way that some can act on the actions of others. A society without power relations can only be an abstraction" (ibid 343).

Government of populations can only be achieved through certain mechanisms that depend on an epistemology. While sovereign power exerts itself through law and direct representation of authority, modern power depends on a sort of epistemic sovereignty that exerts itself through truth claims. Through truths, knowledge is constituted, rationalized and unified in the institutions of the society. The rationalized knowledge excludes other knowledges from the sphere of social functioning. The legitimized truth suppresses statements that do not conform to the

regime. Rouse explains this as "both knowing subjects and truths known are the product of relations of power and knowledge. On the other hand, it demarcates an aspiration to power, to the suppressing of all conflicting voices and lives, which Foucault saw as one of the chief dangers confronting us" (Rouse 107). This hierarchy of knowledge gives chance to some knowledge to overpower others, which is how discourses are constituted (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 85). He sees genealogy as an answer to this problem:

> By comparison, then, and in contrast to the various projects which aim to inscribe knowledges in the hierarchical order of power associated with science, a genealogy should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from that subjection, to render them, that is, capable of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. It is based on a reactivation of local knowledges – of minor knowledges, as Deleuze might call them – in opposition to the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges and the effects intrinsic to their power: this, then, is the project of these disordered and fragmentary genealogies. If we were to characterise it in two terms, then 'archaeology' would be the appropriate methodology of this analysis of local discursivities, and 'genealogy' would be the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges which were thus released would be brought into play (ibid 85).

As can be seen above, Foucault sees scientific disciplines as setting a suppressing discourse that disregards certain other knowledges by setting some knowledges above others. Power, in this sense, produces knowledge "and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful" but because "they imply one another" and "there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 27).

19

In short, power cannot exist without a produced, accumulated and distributed discourse that is functional. "We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth" (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 93).

2.2.3 Discourse and Normalisation

For Foucault discourse occurs within bodies of knowledge. Relations between disciplines (defined bodies of knowledge) and disciplinary practices (forms of control) form discourses (McHoul & Grace 26).

Knowledge is more than what truth suggests. It is a combination of assertions of social, historical and political circumstances; which eventually defines what will be counted true and what false (ibid 29).

Foucault states that the rules that define a certain society at a certain time; the limits and forms of that society is the discourse they formed (Foucault, "Politics" 14). McHoul and Grace simplify the definition of discourse as "whatever constraints – but also enables writing, speaking and thinking within … specific historical limits" (McHoul & Grace 31). Under these circumstances, "truth becomes a function of what can be said, written or thought" (ibid 33). Thus, some knowledges will be subjugated, "buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systemization" (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 81). The dominant discourse, or official knowledges will "normalise" and "occlude" other knowledges, separating the normal from the abnormal through discursive practices (McHoul & Grace 17). The discourse is set by the dominant group in the society who will somehow eliminate any activity that does not result in production (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 100).

The systems of differentiation, objectives of maintaining privileges or profits, various means of exercise of power (such as the army or means of surveillance), various institutions and degrees of rationalization are the pillars of a society that exists inside power relations. Foucault claims that the human body became a focus of power after the seventeenth century. It was both seen as a machine whose docility had to be made use of in order to optimize its capabilities, and it was seen as a

20

fundamental entity of biological processes, such as birth and health. Thus, it had to be controlled and supervised. Death was the only force that sovereign power could threat people with; surveillance and invisible control became the way modern power controlled actions of individuals and populations. This brought about the era of "bio-power":

> During the classical … period, there was a rapid development of various disciplines -universities, secondary schools, barracks, workshops; there was also the emergence, in the field of political practices and economic observation, of the problems of birthrate, longevity, public health, housing, and migration. Hence there was an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations, marking the beginning of an era of "biopower" (Foucault, *History of Sexuality* 140).

The control of bodies as machinery of production was an integral part of the economic policies in the modern world. The institutions, "the family and the army, schools and the police, individual medicine and the administration of collective bodies" (ibid 141) provided for the maintenance and inducement of this bio-power. They also created a system of segregation and hierarchy, "exerting their influence on the respective forces of both these movements, guaranteeing relations of domination and effects of hegemony" (ibid 141). Control of bio-power and human's productive processes became the essential way to achieve and maintain capital (ibid 140-141).

According to Whitebook, this kind of power intervenes in "the biological substratum of the society, that is, into reproduction, sanitation, nutrition, health, and family life, in a way that was historically unprecedented"; and sciences such as criminology and psychiatry were used as new means of social monitoring that registered, categorized and filed people, normalising people into a homogeneity as required by the interests of the bourgeoisie (Whitebook 332).

The understanding of bio-power is very similar to the understanding of keeping pure-blood lineages pure in the magical society. The control over

reproduction has reverberations to the use of bio-power for the discourse of power as explained by Foucault. As stated above, for Foucault the existence and maintenance of disciplinary mechanisms of the discourse of power depend on how economically and politically useful they are to the bourgeoisie. Sexual intercourse that leads to non-pure-blood offspring is energy wasted; thus, has no ends. In other words, the copulation between a pure-blood and non-pure-blood leads to the birth of an offspring that does not have pure-blood anymore. Moreover, the future generations of that offspring are to remain non-pure-blood forever. Therefore, the blood is "contaminated" by non-pure-blood; which is bio-power wasted.

Another point to consider about this issue is that with each such copulation, the number of half-bloods is on a steady rise. Once a pure-blood parent decides to have children with a non-pure-blood, that person's lineage is to remain half-blood. This is lost potential for pure-blood families. Because there is no returning to having completely pure blood, and because pure-blood can only be produced between two pure-blood parents (whose numbers are already low), with each generation, the number of people who will support the privileges of pure-blood families is to be ever-decreasing. Therefore, bio-power needs to be controlled and an anti-intermarriage discourse has to be set by the pure-blood families who are losing their influence over the magical society.

Sawicki states that Foucault is in alignment with feminists in believing that the normalisation of bio-power within the discourse calls for the resurrection of "subjugated knowledge", the knowledge that has been undervalued by the dominant apparatuses of power/knowledge (Sawicki 382). Bio-power refers to both disciplinary power and regulatory power in that the former occurs through control of individual bodies by means of such institutional practices as surveillance and teachings that derive from and give birth to discourses; and the latter as it refers to the human body as a "species' body" that could be manipulated and exploited. In both terms, power subjugates individuals in the name of "[securing] the "unity" required in liberal societies" through normalisation of society (ibid 382).

22

A very clear example of normalisation would be how the madman, the un-normalised man, is treated in society. During the seventeenth century, "the madman was expelled from the communicative nexus of the community and ceased to be a potential interlocutor with whom one could engage in a profound dialogue" (Whitebook 319). Those regarded mad were locked up in institutions, turning madmen, once functioning components of society into feared objects with whom a reasonable talk was impossible, which was opposite to enlightened reason. In this way, the society was purged of irrationality. By silencing the mad, rationality was normalised (ibid 319-320).

According to Fillingham, power relations in society are formed through the study of abnormality. By defining a certain normality, the abnormal is left out of the sphere of "normal" by definition, and the normal will have power over the abnormal by driving them out (Fillingham 18).

The delinquents during Voldemort's reign are those who are against the discourse. Not only the muggle-blood witches and wizards, but also the half and pure-bloods that are against the pure-blood supremacy stand in opposition to the system that Voldemort is trying to establish. Their fight for equality between and within species is irrational in the discriminatory regime; thus, they are "mad", and their "un-normalised" delinquent existence and behaviour means that they either have to yield to the power discourse or be expelled from the magical society because they do not conform to what the discourse imposes.

2.2.4 Discipline

According to Foucault, individuals are disciplined to be normal in a series of ways, the first of which is spatialisation; that is, assigning individuals with certain places. Each person will know who s/he is and where her/his place is. People are classified according to skill and competence, which are observed and assessed frequently. Classification brings with it ranking amongst people. Classification (or division of labour) prevents confusion and facilitates supervision. The second way of disciplining is control of activity. Institutions require a certain way and order in

which processes are carried out. Timetables and rhythmic activities (such as those in military) define each movement, which lead to "time [penetrating] the body and with it all the controls of power". Timetables are originally designed to avert idleness, which is a form of productivity wasted. Discipline, on the other hand, maintains positive productivity. Even if it is a soldier marching in a given momentum, energy is directed towards a more useful direction. Another way is what Foucault defines as "the organization of geneses". He defines this as an apprenticeship in institutions, where the new generation follows the steps of the older one(s). Here, the bodies and activities of individuals are controlled so as to maximize the profit of time. Foucault calls these organisations machinery for adding up and capitalizing time". For example, when each segment of training is separated from the other, which also causes the separation of people in different classes. Each segment of training has an allocated time, with start and end times predetermined. Individuals are recruited at an early age and shaped according to the institutions' interests. They are examined by authorities before they can pass on to the next level. This linear system of instruction such as that taken up at the military was later used in pedagogical institutions. The final way of disciplining is through ensuring the productivity of the smaller components of the sum effectively. Discipline becomes an act of "composing forces in order to obtain a working machine". With a precise system of command where each partner understands the signs of each other regarding what is expected of them, people are disciplined into homogenous bodies of populations. In short, discipline controls bodies "by the play of spatial distribution", "by the coding of activities", "by the accumulation of time", and "by the composition of forces". It "draws up tables", "prescribes movements", "imposes exercises" and "arranges tactics" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 135-167).

Discipline and standard training creates actions, habits and skills for people with the intention "to derive maximum advantages and to neutralize inconveniences (thefts, interruptions of work, disturbances and 'cabals')" (ibid 142). Enclosed areas such as factories, prisons and schools serve as places that

establish presences and absences, … know where and how to locate individuals, … set up useful communications, … interrupt others, … be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, … assess it, … judge it, … calculate its qualities or merits. It was a procedure, therefore, aimed at knowing, mastering, and using (ibid 143).

For discipline to be successful and to be fully ingrained in society, as implied above, certain techniques of surveillance by authorities is requisite to know, master and make use of potentials. This modern system of surveillance, a system depending on the truth of individuals and the knowledge of their actions is explained by Foucault as "hierarchized, continuous and functional" system that is integrated in everyday lives of people. Organized as an autonomous power, it depends on individuals within a complex network. The power that comes with surveillance cannot be transferred, but a system of supervision and a head of the pyramid that control everything do exist. In addition, it is omnipresent and constantly supervised by those entitled to supervise while at the same time, discreet due to its silent functioning (ibid 176-177).

While the functioning of disciplinary power is discreet, however, the individuals that depend on it can never be so. They are continuously documented, calculated, registered and examined (ibid 190); slowly turning into a society of "generalizable mechanism of "panopticism"" (ibid 211).

Foucault likens societies living under constant surveillance to Jeremy Bentham's model of Panopticon, which is an architectural design for prisons. It is a circular building with a watchtower in the centre that can observe each cell. It is designed in such a way that full visibility of each cell is provided. Inmates cannot have contact with other inmates for they do not see anyone else. They are fully visible but cannot see anything other than the tower. Whether there actually is a person in the watchtower or not, inmates have to act accordingly. In this way, order is restored and maintained. Power acts automatically in such a setting of constant surveillance (ibid 200-201).

Individuals in a society under constant surveillance, therefore, is similar to the inmates under the surveillance of the Panopticon tower in a prison. Whether there is a concrete authority that supervises their actions or not, individuals will conform to the general functioning of the society. Normalised through the discourse based on the knowledge from pedagogical institutions, medical institutions and the like, the individual becomes an inmate in a cell, to supervise whose behaviour no outside visible authority is necessarily requisite. In order not to be marginalized, s/he will join the mainstream discourse.

Truths extracted from individuals constitute the basis of the knowledge to be set that will be a part of the discourse that is made by and is also a constituent and determinant of disciplines and disciplinary operations. The discourse serves certain bodies that aim at maintaining order and maximizing productivity. The docile human bodies that are constantly under surveillance have to be disciplined through a variety of mechanisms in order not to be marginalized in the discourse that they exist in. They have to be educated and trained to act within normal limits set by the mainstream discourse of power, turning them into fabricated representations of "ideologies" exerted on them. Such mechanisms of discipline include educational, medical and military institutions; and forms of recording such as observation, investigation and registration systems. Disciplined in more or less the same way, individuals are normalized into similar obedient beings that are grinded in the gears of the system that they both contribute to and suffer from.

Power is a coordinating entity that orchestrates all of the above. It depends on the discourse to exist, and in turn, creates the discourse that it can survive in. Although it cannot be possessed by one single person or group, the exertion of it can be regulated and managed by some for their own interests. That is, one cannot be the owner of power, but s/he can be in a governing position that makes use of power to cater for their needs and fulfil their desires.

The *Harry Potter Series* can be analysed in Foucauldian terms because the methods of the formation of power discourse is in close alignment with what Foucault's work has been suggesting. On the surface, a homogenous society of pure-

bloods is aimed at by estranging non-human species and non-pureblood humans by means of manipulation of truths, discipline and constant control over populations. The magical society is also governed through Foucauldian methods. The method of spatialisation is implemented, as every creature knows his or her group and place in society, which are strictly divided. For example, goblins are specialised in metalsmithing and running Gringotts; jobs that other creatures cannot do. The methods of control of activity and organisation of genesis are also implemented in the magical world. For instance, young witches and wizards are accepted to Hogwarts at a certain age, go through a 7-year education and are examined by experts at such levels as the O.W.L.s (Ordinary Wizarding Level tests, taken at the end of the fifth year at school in order to determine whether or not a student can take certain lessons during the last two years of their studies) and N.E.W.T.s (Nastily Exhausting Wizarding Test, a voluntary taken at the final year of school in order to be accepted to certain jobs). Such tests aim at sustaining "the stability in the wizarding community" (Cantrell 196). The final method of making each component of the society a small piece of the grand sum is also embodied in the wizarding society. Without one piece of the community, the other can hardly work. For example, without house-elves, many families would have great difficulties in daily life; or without goblins, quality metalwork cannot be done (as they do not share their secrets with others, as well).

Yet another way the magical society is in alignment with Foucauldian understanding of how the discourse of power can work is the existence of a Panopticon-like surveillance system. Magical beasts, beings and spirits are registered. Their actions are ceaselessly monitored by authorities. Those who enter the muggle world are inhibited from performing magic; and when they do so, they are punished by the Ministry of Magic. In addition, the more powerful Voldemort and the Death Eaters get, the more severe the controlling mechanisms become.

However, as will be discussed in the next two chapters, the real aim is to maintain (if present) and create privileges for those who are on the side of Voldemort. Two kinds of discrimination, namely, speciesism and discrimination

based on blood status is encouraged by Voldemort's and the Death Eaters' discourse of power so as to keep different groups of beings separate from each other, which makes the controlling of them much easier through a number of mechanisms of control. On the other hand, although the power discourse seems to suggest a clear superiority of humans over other species and pure-blood humans over other humans, this understanding is also rather discursive, for there are non-human species and non-pure-blood humans supporting Voldemort's cause; while there are pure-blood humans opposing it. Keeping in mind that even Voldemort is half-blood himself, it is overt that the "truths" about species and blood purity are manipulated as well. The power discourse does not discriminate between pure-blood humans and other groups. It actually discriminates between those who are for the privileging of Voldemort and his followers, and those who are for a more equal magical society.

CHAPTER 3

SPECIESIST DISCRIMINATION

3.1 Definitions and the Psychology of Discrimination

In order to understand how the discriminatory discourse of power helps certain characters in the book, it is necessary to understand discrimination, and the concepts of speciesism and discrimination through blood as subtopics of it.

Anderson defines discrimination as "the phenomenon of treating a person differently from other persons based on group membership and an individual's possession of certain characteristics such as age, class, gender, race, religion, and sexuality" in *The Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (Anderson 253). With a similar definition, G. W. Allport differentiates the general understanding of discrimination, which he believes to be "[coming] about only when we deny to individuals or groups of people equality of treatment which they may wish" (Allport 51), from social discrimination, which he defines as "any conduct based on a distinction made on grounds of natural or social categories, which have no relation either to individual capacities or merits, or to the concrete behaviour of the individual person" (ibid 52).

The definitions of discrimination suggest an unfair treatment. Distinct features amongst human beings do not justify discrimination of any group toward another. A number of theories on human psychology can explain the reason behind why people would exert discriminative behaviour on others despite its harm. In a general look, the starting point is the sense of group identity, through which a person might tend to feel a groundless superiority over members of other groups, leading to harmful consequences ranging from stereotyping (Anderson 253) to terrorist attacks (Saavedra 394).

29

Mummendey & Otten refer to Social Identity Theory and Self-categorisation Theory to explain discrimination:

> Favouritism of own group and discrimination against the outgroup is conceived as the result of individuals' striving for positive social distinctiveness, in which they engage when they identify as members of a group in a context where the categorization into ingroup and outgroup is made salient (Mummendey & Otten 111).

Social Identity Theory examines group membership and group behaviour towards other groups. According to the theory, people have a personal identity, with which they define themselves regardless of a group; but they also identify, define and evaluate themselves as members of a certain group; which can be vital clues for understanding such behaviours as prejudice and discrimination (Hogg 901).

Social categorization; that is, mentally categorizing oneself and others based on certain stereotypical characteristics is linked to overvaluing in-group members and devaluing out-group members. With a correspondence between the behaviour of one's self and the behaviour of one's group, an individual is likely to perform ethnocentric behaviour (ibid 902). That is, people tend to evaluate the beliefs, values and behaviour of others by taking those of their own culture as the main reference. Social identity theory states that people feel closer to those similar to themselves externally or/and internally (Eisenberg 386); which is to say that we favour those akin to ourselves over those who are not.

When one values his/her own group over the other(s) only in judgement, it is prejudice; yet once it exceeds judgment and turns into behaviour, it becomes discrimination. Discriminating against others through favouring in-group members may have a number of reasons. Firstly, studies show that people may favour their groups for the rewards that they receive. These rewards could include economic merits or social status. However, when further studies showed that people may demonstrate discriminative behaviour toward other groups despite a return of little value, they concluded that there may be further reasons than mere self-interest in in-

group favouritism. Through in-group favouritism, self-esteem and social identity can be enhanced; thus, the emotional and symbolic benefits could also be the underlying reasons of in-group favouritism and out-group derogation (Spears 483-485). As stated above, Mummendey and Otten linked in-group favouritism to positive social distinctiveness. As the definitions of discrimination suggest, therefore, with a given group identity, people are likely to treat other people differently and unfairly based on their age, gender, ethnicity and other features in the expectation of the material, emotional or symbolic advantages they will receive.

3.2 Speicisism

Defined as "assignment of different inherent and moral status based solely on an individual's species membership" by Caviola, Everett & Faber (1); "the unjustified disadvantageous consideration or treatment of those who are not classified as belonging to one or more species" by Horta (247), and "the belief in human superiority, and the redundant establishment of supremacy" by Celestino (46), speciesism can be defined as the unfair treatment of non-human species by humans.

Being a sub-topic of discrimination together with racism and sexism, speciesism is regarded equal to them in terms of its immorality and the fact that it is solely based on whether one possesses characteristics of a certain group or not (Caviola, Everett & Faber 1; Dhont, Hodson & Leite 508; Horta 246; Oberg 43; Singer, "Why is Speciesism Wrong?" 31 and "Animal Liberation Movement" 3).

Speciesism is based on the belief that humans are superior to members of other species (Caviola, Everett & Faber 1), and is anthropocentric in that "the satisfaction of human interests is central" to it (Horta 258). In this sense, it parallels racism:

> Racists violate the principle of equality by giving greater weight to the interests of members of their own race, when there is a clash between their interests and the interests of those of another race. Similarly speciesists allow the interests of their own species to override the greater interests of members of other species (Singer, "Animal Liberation Movement" 4).

31

Although a limit to which species are being treated unfairly is untold in scholarly works, most focus on animals. The discrimination between human species and animal species is based on three important criteria: (1) faculty of reason, (2) faculty of morality and (3) capability of pain and suffering (Caviola, Everett & Faber 2). Singer regards these criteria the question of "equal consideration of interests" (Singer, "Animal Liberation Movement" 4).

Caviola, Everett & Faber discuss that the devaluation of animals based on the idea that they have less mental capabilities than humans seems inconsistent on human's side. First of all, this idea fails to explain why some members of human species are still considered better than others despite clear evidence that they may not be as competent in cognitive abilities as certain animals. For example, some members of animal species such as chimpanzees, may perform better than some members of human species such as babies or those with mental disorders when it comes to activities that require cognitive competence. Secondly, despite scientific evidence proving certain animals have higher mental capabilities than others, humans still tend to place them in a hierarchical order regardless of their capabilities. To exemplify, although humans may behave in a speciesist way putting forward that mental capabilities are an important criteria in ordering species, they may still place dogs higher than pigs, which are proven to be more intelligent (Caviola, Everett & Faber 2). In addition, within the same species, humans may assume a contradictious order, placing pet animals of the same species above wild ones. For example, while pet fish are to be fed and admired, other fish can be consumed as food. In parallel with Caviola, Everett & Faber, despite his disagreement with most anti-speciesists that speciesism is analogous with racism and sexism, Oberg suggests that mental capacities and abstract thinking abilities create no ground for unequal treatment of animals, giving similar examples (Oberg 44-45).

The second criterion is the differences of moral abilities between species. Humans consider animals' lacking moral agency a justification for speciesisim; disregarding that certain humans may not have ethical or moral capabilities as well.

Yet, a given human is still set above a given animal in the hierarchy (Caviola, Everett & Faber 2).

Singer merges mental capabilities with the third criteria: capability of pain. He states that the anticipation of pain is another source of pain, which could be achieved only with a certain level of cognitive capabilities. Regardless, "pain is pain", and causing suffering to any being should be equally wrong although we would still intrinsically opt for experimenting on animals than humans regardless of mental capabilities (Singer, "Animal Liberation Movement" 4-6). Caviola, Everett & Faber also believe that pain could be related to mental capabilities, but humans tend to *dementalise* animal agents so as to validate the pain we cause them. Similar to how racists and sexists *dehumanize* their victims by calling them "apes" (used for black people), "rats" (used for Jews) or "bitches" (used for women), which would render them unworthy of fair human treatment, speciesists *dementalise* animals, which could suggest that they have no capacity for pain, either; rationalizing their suffering (Caviola, Everett & Faber 3). The same goes for the animals that humans consider food. Although the notion of which animals are food and which ones are not is virtually culture-bound, the common point here is the dementalisation of the animals considered food; and despite being in the same species, not dementalising those who are not food, but are, for example, pets (ibid 4).

On the other hand, Shelly Kagan asserts that people called "speciesists" by anti-specisists are actually *personists*, which he defines as a person who attaches more importance to a *person* rather than a *Homo sapiens*. That is, they defend the interests of a person, a being "that is rational and self-conscious, aware of itself as one being among others, extended through time" (Kagan 9), rather than *human beings* only. Kagan suggests that even Peter Singer, an anti-speciciesist scholar, agrees with him at certain points, referring to Singer's accounts where he suggests that in a case of a dilemma as to whose life must be saved, we will save the human being's (Singer, "Animal Liberation Movement" 6; Singer, *Animal Liberation* 20-21; Kagan 10).

However, Singer's full account is

> The evil of pain is, in itself, unaffected by the other characteristics of the being that feels the pain; the value of life is affected by these other characteristics.
> Normally this will mean that if we have to choose between the life of a human being and the life of another animal we should choose to save the life of the human being; but there may be special cases in which the reverse holds true, because the human being in question does not have the capacities of a normal human being. So this view is not speciesist, although it may appear to be at first glance (Singer, "Animal Liberation Movement" 6).

Singer suggests here that interests of animal species must be taken as seriously as interests of human species (ibid 6). He calls equality "a moral ideal, not a simple assertion of fact" (ibid 3); thus, he is not for the suffering of animals. If humans consider themselves more morally capable than animals, they must also fight for their rights.

Horta gives account of classifications of speciesists made by others, a classification that he does not believe exists. People may support speciesist exercises with numerous justifications ranging from the question of whether a species does or does not possess traits that are confirmable such as intelligence or moral agency; whether a species does or does not possess traits whose existence can be confirmed such as power relations or emotions; to the ontological questions such as whether one's species is "the chosen one" (Horta 253). Horta believes that speciesist positions may exist, all of which account for an anthropocentric disposition. Humans' putting their own interests and satisfaction before those of other animals is an anthropocentric approach. In fact, the definitions are similar as well: "Anthropocentrism is the disadvantageous treatment or consideration of those who are not members (or who are not considered members) of the human species" (ibid 258); therefore, he concludes that anthropocentricism is "an instance of speciesism" and is unjustifiable (ibid 264).

In conclusion, as Singer states in his response to Kagan's work:

> If a being suffers there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration. No matter what the

nature of the being, the principle of equality requires that its suffering be counted equally with the like suffering — insofar as rough comparisons can be made — of any other being. If a being is not capable of suffering, there is nothing to be taken into account. So the limit of sentience (using the term as a convenient if not strictly accurate shorthand for the capacity to suffer and/or experience enjoyment) is the only defensible boundary of concern for the interests of others. To mark this boundary by some other characteristic like intelligence or rationality would be to mark it in an arbitrary manner. Why not choose some other characteristic, like skin color? (Singer, "Why Speciesism is Wrong" 32).

3.3 Species and Speciesist Attitudes in *Harry Potter Series*

Categorization and discrimination in the magical world are fundamentally based on qualities such as state of living and level of intelligence in separating magical creatures. Magicals are classified into three main groups as spirits, beings and beasts. Then, this main categorization is fragmented into smaller categories in each group. The categorization is made by magical humans; however, which could explain why each category is defined based on their proximity to *human beings* in terms of physical proximity and also cognitive and moral proximity; which is similar to the definition of speciesism in the reader's world. Speciesism in the book, therefore, translates into the discrimination inflicted by human magicals on non-human magicals in the novel series.

The main categorization of magical folk is done according to their status of living. While beasts and beings are alive, spirits have passed away.

The Ministry of Magic includes the Department for the Regulation and Control of Magical Creatures, which has three divisions for each group, dealing with the duties and problems of the groups their name indicate.

3.3.1 Spirits

In an attempt to actually distinguish beings from beasts, the third category, spirits, have appeared. According to Newt Scamander, during a meeting to fulfil the necessity, ghosts have attended in hope of being classified as "being". However, due

to their non-living status, they were rather classified as "has-been"'s and the Spirit Division that appears today under the Department for the Regulation and Control of Magical Creatures had been created by the Minister of Magic, Grogan Stump (xii).

3.3.1.1 Ghost

Among the many mysterious creatures, ghosts exist in Harry's school, Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry. As mentioned above, ghosts are among spirits. About twenty of them live in Hogwarts (*Philosopher* 86) and each of the four Hogwarts houses has a ghost for them. House Slytherin has the Bloody Baron, House Ravenclaw has the Grey Lady, House Hufflepuff has the Fat Friar, and House Gryffindor has Nearly Headless Nick, or so Nicholas. There is also Moaning Myrtle lurking inside a girls' toilet (Rowling "Hogwarts Ghosts" on Pottermore).

3.3.1.2 Boggart

Other than ghosts; boggarts, "shape-shifting creature[s] that will assume the form of whatever most frightens the person who encounters [them]", are considered spirits (Rowling, "Boggarts" on Pottermore). During their third year Defence of Dark Arts lessons with Professor Lupin, Harry and his friends learn to tackle them should they come across one. When asked what a boggart is, Hermione replies "[i]t's a shape-shifter… It can take the shape of whatever it thinks will frighten us most" (*Prisoner* 101). Professor Lupin tells the class that they live in dark places; and do not have a fixed shape but turn into what the person they face fears most (*Prisoner* 101).During the rest of the lesson, each student gets a chance to experience what their boggart looks like, and they try to revert it. Ron's boggart is a giant spider while Harry's is a dementor.

3.3.1.3 Banshee

Another spirit, banshee, is a siren-like creature whose shrieks can be fatal. They are first mentioned in the same lesson when Seamus Finnigan's boggart turns into one:

Seamus darted past Parvati.

Crack! Where the mummy had been was a woman with floor-length black hair and a skeletal, green-tinged face – a banshee. She opened her mouth wide, and an unearthly sound filled the room, a long, wailing shriek which made the hair on Harry's head stand on end –

'Riddikulus!' shouted Seamus.

The banshee made a rasping noise and clutched her throat; her voice was gone (*Prisoner* 104).

3.3.1.4 Dementor

Dementors are one of the most dangerous spirits. They are wraith-like creatures who are primarily responsible for guarding the magical prison *Azkaban* with hoods gliding in the air. Most students in the books face a dementor for the first time in their lives while approaching Hogwarts during Harry's third year in the train, Hogwarts Express. When Harry falls off his broom during a Quidditch match in the same year due to a dementor, Professor Lupin comforts him by defining dementors as:

… among the foulest creatures that walk this earth. They infest the darkest, filthiest places, they glory in decay and despair, they drain peace, hope and happiness out of the air around them. Even Muggles feel their presence, though they can't see them. Get too near a Dementor and every good feeling, every happy memory, will be sucked out of you. If it can, the Dementor will feed on you long enough to reduce you to something like itself – soulless and evil. You'll be left with nothing but the worst experiences of your life (*Prisoner* 140).

Hagrid also has memories with dementors from his time at Azkaban, when he continuously remembered bad memories (*Prisoner* 163-164). Dementors are well known for causing their victims to lose their will to live and go insane:

Yeh can' really remember who yeh are after a while. An' yeh can' see the point o' livin' at all. I used ter hope I'd jus' die in me sleep ... when they let me out, it was like bein' born again, ev'ry- thin' came floodin' back, it was the bes' feelin' in the world. Mind, the Dementors weren't keen on lettin' me go (*Prisoner* 164).

3.3.1.5 Poltergeist

Poltergeists are yet another sort of spirit. A poltergeist, according to the author herself, is " an invisible entity that moves objects, slams doors and creates other audible, kinetic disturbances" (Rowling "Peeves" on Pottermore). The poltergeist of Hogwarts, Peeves, has a somewhat annoying character, playing tricks on students and staff. He introduces himself to the new students at their arrival at Hogwarts:

> A bundle of walking sticks was floating in mid-air […].
> There was a *pop* and a little man with wicked dark eyes and a wide mouth appeared, floating cross-legged in the air, clutching the walking sticks.
> 'Oooooooh!' he said, with an evil cackle. 'Ickle firsties! What fun!'
> He swooped suddenly at them. They all ducked (*Philosopher* 96).

Spirits are often ignored in the daily lives of the magical folk unless they are dangerous as dementors. Against most, there is a spell or charm that could keep them away or leave them harmless. Although they may live with humans, their un-living status causes them to usually be exempt from discussions of discrimination. Nor do they seem to be paying great importance to the issue.

Discrimination comes into question between and amongst the two living groups, namely the beasts and the beings. They have been in a running battle for superiority or equality. Despite the fact that they may not share the same habitat with humans, as some beasts prefer to live in the wild, they are persistent about certain rights being given to them. The question of speciesism comes in especially regarding the relationship between beasts, beings and humans (a sub-category of beings).

3.3.2 Beasts

According to Newt Scamander, the definition of a beast and its distinction from a being has long been discussed, and the most complex issue was classifying the following three groups:

1. Werewolves, for they are mostly human, yet turn into a violent beast once a month.

2. Centaurs, for they are half human and half horse in appearance and have a level of intelligence close to humans.

3. Trolls, for they are very human-like in appearance yet very far form humans in intelligence (Scamander x).

From the fourteenth century on, the magical community has worked on the definition of beasts and beings. The fourteenth century Chief of the Wizards' Council, Burdock Muldoon, declared all members of the magical community that walked on two legs beings and others beasts, and summoned the two-leggeds to a meeting to discuss magical laws. However, when each and every two-legged magical creature, regardless of intelligence, attended the meeting, chaos occurred and the meeting was cancelled (Bagshot qtd. in Scamander xi).

The event was an indicator that physical appearance itself was not sufficient in determining who belongs to which group.

The ability of speech was the second criteria deemed to distinguish beasts from beings. Muldoon's successor, Elfrida Clagg announced any species who could produce human language and could make themselves understandable to the Council to be a being, which, however, ended up with another meeting at which trolls, who could be taught simple words, but had no further intelligence came seeking for the status. What is more, ghosts, who had not been granted the status for they glided rather than stand on two feet during Muldoon's administration, attended the meeting in search for a "being" status, yet left on the grounds that the council attended more to the living than to the dead.

On the other hand, although they were proclaimed beings, centaurs protested the meeting and refused to attend it, for merpeople, who *do* speak language, but were unintelligible to non-merpeople once out of water were casted as beasts when subjected to the "intelligible language" rule (ibid xi-xii).

In 1811, the question was finalized:

Grogan Stump, the newly appointed Minister for Magic, decreed that a 'being' was 'any creature that has sufficient intelligence to understand the laws of the magical community and to bear part of the responsibility of shaping those laws'. Troll representatives were questioned in the absence of goblins[4] and judged not to understand anything that was being said to them; they were therefore classified as 'beasts' despite their two-legged gait; merpeople were invited through translators to become 'beings' for the first time; fairies, pixies and gnomes, despite their humanoid appearance, were placed firmly in the 'beast' category (ibid xii).

Other creatures were classified according to other criteria. Centaurs, despite being qualified for the status, refused it and remained beasts (followed by merpeople the next year). Werewolves[5] had both statuses: there is a Werewolf Support Services under the Being Division; but a Werewolf Registry and Werewolf Capture Unit under the Beast Division of the Ministry.

Some other creatures, although intelligent, were given the beast status due to their violent nature: Acromantulas[6] and Manticores[7] were under this categorization; and the Sphinx[8], although understandable, speaking only in riddles and turning

---

[4]Goblins kept bringing trolls with them, and caused chaos during meetings.

[5]Werewolves are actually otherwise-harmless humans who turn into murderous beasts once a month, during full-moon phase. Their most preferred prey is humans. The transformed version is among the most deadly beasts, receiving XXXXX (known wizard killer/ impossible to train or domesticate) status on the Ministry of Magic Classification (Scamander 41-42).

[6] Acromantulas are "monstrous eight-eyed spider[s] capable of human speech". They are rather intelligent, yet are carnivorous; and thus pose a danger to humans. It is among the most deadly beasts, receiving XXXXX (known wizard killer/ impossible to train or domesticate) status on the Ministry of Magic Classification (Scamander 1-2).

[7] Manticores are beasts with heads of a human, bodies of a lion and tails of a scorpion. Their sting results in instant death. They are among the most deadly beasts, receiving XXXXX (known wizard killer/ impossible to train or domesticate) status on the Ministry of Magic Classification (Scamander 28).

[8] A guardian beast, the Sphinx has a human's head and a lion's body. It may become violent when there is a threat to what it is guarding. It is among the highly dangerous beasts, receiving

violent unless its recipient comes up with the correct answer, was also classified as beast.

At the same meeting, a discussion that is still extant to date took place. Extremist witches and wizards, such as Araminta Meliflua, the cousin of Sirius Black's mother, who "tried to force through a Ministry Bill to make Muggle-hunting legal" (*Order* 105), campaigned for classifying Muggles as beasts (ibid xiii), which could eventually allow for the possibility of hunting them like animals.

According to the last meeting on the issue on this classification, therefore, beasts are those creatures that lack the capacity to make and understand the laws for the magical community. All can perform magic of some sort without equipment. None has the license to carry a wand; partly because they do not need it, and partly because they are deficient of the responsibility for carrying a wand and performing magic with it and bearing its consequences.

The assumption of not having enough mental, moral and sentience capabilities justifies the discrimination against non-humans for some in real life. In the magical world, wizards first took capabilities of walking and speech into consideration; then, they finally decided on intelligence and the degree of violent nature as the boundary between beings and beasts. Intelligence and morality is the common point in both. It is noteworthy that wizards expect beings to be intelligent enough to understand and take the responsibility of magical laws.

3.3.3 Beings

A being is defined by the Minister of Magic of 1811 as "any creature that has sufficient intelligence to understand the laws of the magical community and to bear part of the responsibility of shaping those laws" (ibid xii). In accordance with their intelligence, beings are considered as accountable for their actions, which justifies their being employed at certain institutions, carrying a wand, and being convicted

---

XXXX (dangerous/requires specialist knowledge/ skilled wizard may handle) status on the Ministry of Magic Classification (Scamander 39).

provided they commit a crime. They are also expected not to have a distinctly violent nature.

Among these liabilities and responsibilities, wand carrying has become a matter of debate among the sub-categories of beings. Denial of the right has caused several disputes among witches and wizards, who enjoy the right (thus, also called "wand-carriers") and goblins, who are denied it.

According to the Harry Potter Fandom, seven to ten sub-categories exist in the being category. Centaurs and merpeople are considered beings; however, as mentioned above, they refused the status. Werewolves are considered beings when in their harmless human form, but beasts in their transformed form, which still causes confusion as to what their true category is (Harry Potter Wikia "Being").

Veelas, hags, vampires, giants, goblins, house-elves and humans are fully and unexceptionally considered beings.

3.3.3.1 Veela

Veelas are described in the book as very beautiful women with moon-bright skin and white-gold hair (*Goblet* 93). Their aggressive forms, however, are in sharp contrast to their astonishing beauty. During the World Quidditch Cup match before Harry's fourth year at school, Ireland and Bulgaria have a match, each having brought their national mascots. During the match, Veelas lose temper over leprechauns, at whom they threw fire; "[t]heir faces were elongating into sharp, cruel-beaked bird heads, and long, scaly wings were bursting from their shoulders" (*Goblet* 101).

The veela can produce their own magic; however, crossbreeds with humans use wands, such as Fleur Delacour, a quarter-veela, who attends the Triwizard Championship in the same year:

> Fleur Delacour swept over to Mr Ollivander, and handed him her wand.
> 'Hmmm ...' he said.

42

He twirled the wand between his long fingers like a baton and it emitted a number of pink and gold sparks. Then he held it close to his eyes and examined it carefully.

'Yes,' he said quietly, 'nine and a half inches ... inflexible ... rosewood ... and containing ... dear me ...'

'An 'air from ze 'ead of a Veela,' said Fleur. 'One of my grandmuzzer's.'

So Fleur *was* part Veela, thought Harry… (*Goblet* 270).

Fleur later marries Ron's brother, William Arthur "Billy" Weasley, which confirms crossbreed species.

3.3.3.2 Hag

As opposed to veelas, hags are ugly, but similar to veelas they can be dangerous. Hags attended the first meeting for the classification of magical community, where they "glided about the place in search of children to eat" (Scamander xi). They are also mentioned in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* when Harry meets his Defence Against Dark Arts teacher, Professor Quirrell, about whom Hagrid says to Harry that his trembling was a consequence of "a nasty bit o' trouble with a hag" (*Philosopher* 55). Thus, hags are known generally as women to be avoided.

3.3.3.3 Vampire

Vampires, on the other hand, have been another trouble to Professor Quirrell. His encounter with them in the Black Forest and the hags changed him forever (*Philosopher* 55). Like hags, vampires are not described in detail in the books, yet there is a vampire Harry meets during his sixth year at Hogwarts when he attends the Christmas Party of the Slug Club, a party attended by only an exclusive group of students of Professor Slughorn, the Potions teacher (*Half-Blood* 295).

3.3.3.4 Giant

Giants are another group of beings. Generally habiting in mountains away from humans, they can also mingle with human beings, especially when they are

crossbreeds, like Rubeus Hagrid, the gamekeeper of Hogwarts, and Madame Maxime, the headmistress of another European school of witchcraft and wizardry, Beauxbatons Academy of Magic. Cohabiting with full-bred humans, they are one of the species that are exposed to speciesist behaviour by humans.

On Pottermore, giants are described as "colossal creatures which can be extremely dangerous". The use of "which" rather than "who" is an important indicator of a non-humanly build, as they are human-like in appearance, but not so in intelligence and behaviour. They also have a violent nature, which makes them difficult to group as beings.

Even being a half-giant himself, Hagrid is open to the threats of other giants. He has been attacked by giants dwelling at mountains when he went to meet them to persuade them to fight against Voldemort in the war to come (*Order* 374-375).

Despite its illegality, Hagrid also brings his half-brother back with him to Hogwarts since he is being bullied by other giants for his relatively small statue, which indicates the brutal and violent nature of giants. However, he is faced with awe by Harry and his friends, who besides the fear of the act being illegal, worry about the dangers the giant poses:

> 'Oh, Hagrid, why on earth didn't you let him [stay in the mountains]!' said Hermione, flopping down on to a ripped up tree and burying her face in her hands. 'What do you think you're going to do with a violent giant who doesn't even want to be here!' (*Order* 610).

Apparently, giants can be rather dangerous when they are unattended or approached to in their own habitat. On the other hand, humans are not entirely welcoming to giants, either. Due to humans' speciesist attitude toward crossbreeds; including human-giant breeds; such half-giants as Hagrid and Madame Maxime avoid talking about their backgrounds. They may feel uncomfortable or even insulted by such an inference:

'Another half-giant, o' course!' said Hagrid.
''Ow dare you!' shrieked Madame Maxime. Her voice exploded through the peaceful night air like a foghorn; behind him, Harry heard Fleur and Roger fall out of their rose bush. 'I 'ave nevair been more insulted in my life! 'Alf-giant? Moi? I 'ave – I 'ave big bones!'
She stormed away; great multi-coloured swarms of fairies rose into the air as she passed, angrily pushing aside bushes (*Goblet* 373).

The response of Madame Maxime stems from her well-known knowledge on how giants are perceived by humans. Despite their "being" status, giants are not approached with hospitality or respect.

The readers are mostly given accounts of friendly giants in the book. Apart from the wild giants who attack Hagrid and those who have joined Voldemort (*Deathly* 562, 567, 587, 591), the reader does not encounter an unfriendly giant in person. In contrast, Hagrid becomes Harry's first guide to the magical world, one of the most important companions of the trio, and is a member of the Order of the Phoenix, which suggests that a giant breed can be as an important part of the society as a witch or wizard and commit good deeds. Similarly, Madam Maxime has risen to the level of headmistress in her career, which shows that far from being dangerous, as most witches and wizards would believe, giant-breeds could actually be beneficial to the society. This, however, does not prevent humans from stigmatizing giant-breeds. It is due to this stigma that half-breeds have to either hide their background, like Madam Maxime; or suffer consequences of its being known, like Hagrid, who receives hate mail, some bidding him to kill himself, after he is acknowledged on newspaper as a half-giant by Rita Skeeter:

…, the Daily Prophet *has now unearthed evidence that Hagrid is not – as he has always pretended – a pure-blood wizard. He is not, in fact, even pure human. His mother, we can exclusively reveal, is none other than the giantess Fridwulfa, whosewhereabouts are currently unknown.*
Bloodthirsty and brutal, the giants brought themselves to the point of extinction by warring among themselves during the last

century. The handful that remained joined the ranks of He Who
Must Not Be Named, and were responsible for some of the worst
mass Muggle-killings of his reign of terror (*Goblet* 381-382).

Rita Skeeter's account of giants as being bloodthirsty and brutal is an attempt to rally parents of Hogwarts students against Hagrid, but is also an indicator of the speciesist discourse of the magical society. Many parents will not be happy when they learn that a giant-breed is teaching their children. Moreover, her implication that Hagrid is among the "controversial staff appointments" by "eccentric" (*Goblet* 380) Dumbledore due to his "part-human" nature and due to his expulsion from school as a student, are aimed at populist reader responses. However, this is also an indication of how humans view giant breeds. It is populist because Skeeter knows that people will not welcome the idea of a giant as a teacher even though they do not know Hagrid, and thus the kind of person he is.

When the readers reflect on what Hagrid's fault is in easily being framed for murder and being told to kill himself, they realize that it is only about who he is; not about what he has done. This is a case of speciesism. Hagrid is taunted only for being a half-giant, which has nothing to do with his level of intelligence or morality[9]; or his competence as a teacher.

The reader sympathizes with Hagrid in that he has to bear certain difficulties solely due to his background, a feature of himself that he has not chosen and cannot change. Rowling seems to have created her speciesist world to let her audience reflect on how speciesism would influence beings on the individual level. A societal mentality could easily destroy a good person's life for nothing.

Full breed giants may be dangerous, but half-breeds seem to bear the relatively civilized human side more than their precarious giant side, which witches and wizards seem to ignore. On the other hand, since most beings prefer being left alone at their

---

[9]As discussed above, even if he did show signs of low levels of inelligence or morality, it still would not pose a rationale for being discriminated against.

own accord in their own habitat, they do not cause much problem for or have much trouble with humans.

The last three groups, namely goblins, house-elves and humans, co-exist, and thus have a more intricate and delicate relationship; therefore, they are the more important ones for the scope of this thesis.

3.3.3.5 Goblin

Goblins are described on Pottermore as cunning and clever metalsmiths with short height, long noses, and long and thin fingers (Rowling on Pottermore "Goblins"). They can perform their own magic without the necessity of a wand.

Goblins are most known for running the wizarding bank, Gringotts. Harry first meets them right before he starts school when he is taken to Diagon Alley, the cobblestoned shopping area for the wizarding world, where Hogwarts students can purchase necessary supplies (Rowling on Pottermore "Diagon Alley").

According to Maza, goblins "do not accept or internalize inferiority, and this provides them with the "right" to act in their own interest and survival, independently of wizard well-being" (Maza 430), which is depicted clearly in the seventh book of the series, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, when Griphook, one of the goblins working at Gringotts, betrays Harry and his coterie before they can betray him.

Unlike giants, goblins are intelligent; making them more akin to humans. Yet this closeness brings about competition as well. This competition causes more friction between the two species. Such stereotyped characteristics of goblins as self-centred, opportunistic and manipulative beings have made them ill-perceived in the eyes of the wizarding community, and goblins regard humans hardly differently. Thus, a bilateral distrust exists between the two communities since the understanding of most concepts for both races may contradict, as can be understood from Fleur's attitude toward Griphook, when she refuses to address him via his name, but as "Ze goblin"[10] (*Deathly* 413). Both species consider themselves to be superior and the

---

[10] Fleur is originally French, thus the accented speech. She means "The goblin".

other a distrustful lower species. Both sides put the interests of their own species first, and do not care much for whether the other species could be harmed. They can easily abuse the other's temporary trust for their own benefit. Thus, neither side is more trustworthy in the face of the other.

Goblins have a different idea of belonging when it comes to possessions. Bill Weasley, Ron's older brother warns Harry against Griphook when they make the abovementioned deal that goblins' idea of concepts as payment and ownership are not the same as humans' (*Deathly* 417). In goblins' point of view, the rightful owner of an item is its maker. Purchasing the items would only be perceived as renting; thus, most metalwork, especially the treasures, actually ultimately belong to goblins (*Deathly* 418). This understanding has lead to disputes between the two species, contributing to the existing distrust. Harry recognizes the resentment on Griphook's face when he takes Godric Gryffindor's sword from his side (*Deathly* 396), and Griphook implies his belief in goblins being the true possessor of the tiara Fleur is gifted at her wedding day, which Fleur's husband, Bill snaps back at by saying "paid by wizards" (*Deathly* 418).

Harry, Hermione and Ron are in mild hesitation dealing with Griphook and they cannot put complete trust in him, and try to trick him into believing in them until they have fulfilled their work with him. Griphook asks for Gryffindor's sword in exchange of the help he will offer for Harry and his friends to get into the vaults of the Wizarding Bank of Gringotts. However, both sides plan frauds for each other. Harry tells his friends that they can promise Gryffindor's sword; yet they will not tell him *whenexactly* he can put his hands on it (*Deathly* 410). On the other hand, while in the vaults, Griphook prevents Harry from taking the sword (which Harry also needs) and shouts out "Thieves!", almost getting Harry and his friends caught.

The scenes work as a small model of what has happened through centuries between humans and goblins. Due to their different perspectives, they have never been able to completely understand each other, and have always put themselves first, leading to their scarce collaboration. The mutual distrust, therefore, is not groundless. It seems to stem from mutual intolerance and chicanery.

48

The characters discuss this amongst themselves as well, with Herimione concluding that the wizards' records of history are not very reliable, for they tend to brush over the facts for the interest of themselves:

> 'It is true?' Harry asked Hermione. 'Was the sword stolen by Gryffindor?'
> 'I don't know,' she said hopelessly. 'Wizarding history often skates over what the wizards have done to other magical races, but there's no account that I know of that says Gryffindor stole the sword.'
> 'It'll be one of those goblin stories,' said Ron, 'about how the wizards are always trying to get one over on them. I suppose we should think ourselves lucky he hasn't asked for one of our wands.'
> 'Goblins have got good reason to dislike wizards, Ron,' said Hermione. 'They've been treated brutally in the past.'
> 'Goblins aren't exactly fluffy little bunnies, though, are they?' said Ron. 'They've killed plenty of us. They've fought dirty too.'
> 'But arguing with Griphook about whose race is most underhand and violent isn't going to make him more likely to help us, is it?' (*Deathly* 409).

Similarly, Bill Weasley comments on wizard-goblin wars as "[t]here's been fault on both sides, I would never claim that wizards have been innocent" (*Deathly* 417).

As the excerpts above imply, each group has been mistreated at the hands of the other. Due to their in-group favouritisim and out-group prejudice, both the humans and goblins have made their contribution to the mutual enmity that persists to date.

Another reason of discordance between the two groups is wand ownership. Griphook calls witches and wizards "wand-carriers" (*Deathly* 394), which implies that goblins are not granted the right of carrying wands, like other non-human species:

> 'Wand-carriers,' repeated Harry: the phrase fell oddly upon his ears […]

> 'The right to carry a wand,' said the goblin quietly, 'has long been contested between wizards and goblins.'
> 'Well, goblins can do magic without wands,' said Ron.
> 'That is immaterial! Wizards refuse to share the secrets of wandlore with other magical beings, they deny us the possibility of extending our powers!'
> 'Well, goblins won't share any of their magic, either,' said Ron. 'You won't tell us how to make swords and armour the way you do. Goblins know how to work metal in a way wizards have never –' (*Deathly* 394-395).

Both sides denying the secrets they excel in to the other have long caused dispute. Neither side yielding to the other in terms of sharing their craft stems from neither of them accepting the equality of the other species to theirs. While each considers themselves to bear a hierarchically higher status; neither accepts the opposing idea, for it would mean the inferiority of themselves. Thus, both sides keep their secrets to themselves, which keep the upper hand to their owner against the rival. Lipińska notes that although coexistence is possible, it is not on equal terms between wizards and goblins since there is a disagreement between the two groups as to who is superior/inferior to whom (Lipińska 123).

Hope for harmony does exist, however. Through mutual understanding and tolerance, scars of past generations could be mended between the two species. When Griphook sees Harry bury the house elf, Dobby, he displays his bewilderment. He calls Harry "unusual" for digging the grave himself for the elf. He also calls him "odd" for saving himself, a goblin, from death in the earlier chapter. He had probably never seen wizards demonstrating such respect for another being. When Harry breaks his plans of entering Gringotts, for which he needs Griphook's help, he states that it is not for personal gain, which Griphook replies as:

> 'If there was a wizard of whom I would believe that they did not seek personal gain,' said Griphook finally, 'it would be you, Harry Potter. Goblins and elves are not used to the protection, or the respect, that you have shown this night. Not from wand-carriers' (*Deathly* 394).

Resentment mixed with awe is what softens Griphook's attitude toward wizards, which means that a reciprocal sense of protection and respect could be the way to create a peaceful atmosphere in the magical community. This scene is especially powerful in giving a message of tolerance to the readers: No matter how deep in history enmities are buried, they can be overcome with small easy steps of mutual understanding and a two-sided sense of tolerance. Although the following chapters show both sides in attempts of manipulating each other, a glimpse of hope occurs. If goblins (, house-elves) and humans can find a common ground in the magical community and can cooperate, so can any group of the same species, humans, in real life.

3.3.3.6 House-elf

House-elves are domestic workers generally in houses of wealthier families in the wizarding community. They are described as "[l]oyal magical creatures bound to their owners as servants for life" (Rowling "House-elves" on Pottermore). They can, however, be freed provided their owner presents them with a piece of clothing, which is perceived as derogatory by most elves as serving their masters and their families is their sole duty, and receiving a piece of clothing represents their failure in work (Kellner 368).

Kellner compares Tolkien's elves to Rowling's elves and finds a sharp contrast in that while Tolkien's elves are beautiful and masterful, Rowling's elves are small, amusing and harmless (ibid 368). They are extremely loyal to their masters, and seem to have no freewill for their own. They usually wear dirty clothes and speak in faulty language.

Lipińska claims house elves to be treated by most wizards much severely than humans regardless of the human's social standing. They bear almost no rights, receive no education and are bound to slavery with all their predecessors and descendants to the same family for generations on end.

Similar to goblins, house-elves are denied the right to carry wands, yet they do have the ability to perform magic despite the absence of equipment. They can also

"apparite and disapparite"[11] without training; which is a skill witches and wizards can use only after they pass their Apparition Test upon the age of 17.

Different from goblins, who do not accept any masters, however, most house-elves are unquestioning slaves to their masters. They are responsible not only for the chores in the house or demands of their masters, but they are also expected to keep house-hold secrets to themselves. They are not supposed to speak about what happens in the house.

Although house-elves name their condition "enslavement" as well, there is no negative connotation in the statement for them. It is a normal part of their life bringing them certain responsibilities as well. "Tis part of the house-elf's enslavement, sir. We keeps their secrets and our silence, sir, we upholds the family's honour, and we never speaks ill of them" (*Goblet* 331) says Dobby when he explains to Harry the expectations from a house-elf. Upon this sentence, Dobby does speak ill of his *former* masters, for which he immediately punishes himself by banging his head on a nearby table (*Goblet* 332).

The level of loyalty house-elves show is not retaliated at the same level by wizards, however. The treatment of wand-carriers toward house-elves is no better than it is toward goblins. On the contrary, it is much worse since they "are believed to be inferior to wizards since they lack intelligence, like to serve humans and are seemingly incapable of living on their own" (Rana 53), which distinguishes them from the more independent and autonomous goblins.

This seems to suggest that although clashes have happened between goblins and humans, when the bilateral relationship each has with humans are considered, goblins are still regarded with more respect than house-elves. Although they are not considered equals, their autonomous and confident character helps goblins to be considered the species that is closest to equal a human.

Considering house-elves inferior due to an assumption of lack of intelligence is similar to the speciesist attitude humans exert on animals in real life for the same

---

[11] The ability to appear and disappear at will.

reason. However, as discussed above, lack of intelligence could only be an assumption; and even if true, it is no justification for ill treatment of members of species.

Harry's friend Hermione seems to be the only witch in the book who actively supports elf rights. Most witches and wizards either ignore the house-elves or treat them with sympathy. No one, however, treats them as anything near equals.

When Hermione finds out that chores at Hogwarts, from preparing fireplaces to cleaning, are fulfilled by the hundreds of house-elves in the castle, she refuses to eat dinner, claiming it is "slave labour" (*Goblet* 162). She does research on house-elves, about whom she could not find references in *Hogwarts: A History*, which she thinks should have been named ""A *Revised* History of Hogwarts" or "A Highly Biased and *Selective* History of Hogwarts, Which Glosses Over the Nastier Aspects of the School" (*Goblet* 209-210), as she states "*House-elves! …* Not once, in over a thousand pages, does *Hogwarts: A History* mention that we are all colluding in the oppression of a hundred slaves!" (*Goblet* 210).

Similar to the records of goblins, house-elves cannot find their voice in human books of history, neither are they represented officially at any platform. Hermione, thus, founds the Society for the Promotion of Elfish Welfare (S.P.E.W.) in order to better legal rights of house-elves. She has also done research at the library of the school, where she found out that slavery of elves "goes back centuries". She is shocked that nobody has ever done anything for the elves so far (*Goblet* 198):

> 'Our short-term aims,' said Hermione, …'are to secure house-elves fair wages and working conditions. Our long-term aims include changing the law about non-wand-use, and trying to get an elf into the Department for the Regulation and Control of Magical Creatures, because they're shockingly underrepresented' (*Goblet* 198).

The single point of view, the viewpoint of humans, brings with it a single story in which the voice of the oppressed is silenced (Attebery 9). The narrative in the history books in the wizarding world leaves no space for the voice of the Other. This

is similar to Foucault's assertation about knowledges and scientific disciplines; that they present a single discourse revolving around a chosen set of knowledges. In ignoring house-elves and mentioning goblins only as enemies to humans throughout centuries, humans are setting an anthropocentric discourse, a discourse that puts humans in the centre, and perceives the world only through their senses, either excluding or denigrating non-human species.

The attitude of most other beings toward house-elves is rather contemptuous. Humans take for granted the work that house-elves fulfil for them. They believe the house elves to actually enjoy their duties:

> George […] leant towards Hermione.
> 'Listen, have you ever been down in the kitchens, Hermione?'
> 'No, of course not,' said Hermione curtly, 'I hardly think students are supposed to –'
> 'Well, we have,' said George, indicating Fred, 'loads of times, to nick food. And we've met them, and they're *happy*. They think they've got the best job in the world –' (*Goblet* 210-211).

They also believe that house elves would not want to be freed, which is a representative attitude of an institutionalized speciesism in the magical community. This term is also in alignment with Foucault's claims because for him, institutions are the product of but also the makers of discourse; thus the speciesist discourse of power is a form of institutionalized speciesism. Witches and wizards are brought up in a discourse believing that house-elves are happy the way they are without having asked one house-elf what their ideas or feelings on the subject are:

> 'You're leaving out hats for the house-elves?' said Ron slowly.
> 'And you're covering them up with rubbish first?'
> 'Yes,' said Hermione defiantly, swinging her bag on to her back.
> 'That's not on,' said Ron angrily. 'You're trying to trick them into picking up the hats. You're setting them free when they might not want to be free' (*Order* 112).

Humans may also have the perception that house elves are responsible for the work they are doing anyway, whether they enjoy it or not, as if it were their destiny and that they do not have anything better to do. This oppressive attitude resembles that of people like Aristotle, Linneaus or Morton, who believe certain races are *born* to serve and are to remain so (Özbek 22, 41; "Racial Hierarchy" 2: 461):

> 'You know, house-elves get a *very* raw deal!' said Hermione indignantly. 'It's slavery, that's what it is! That Mr Crouch made her go up to the top of the stadium, and she was terrified, and he's got her bewitched so she can't even run when they start trampling tents! Why doesn't anyone *do* something about it?'
> 'Well, the elves are happy, aren't they?' Ron said. 'You heard old Winky back at the match ... "House-elves is not supposed to have fun" ... that's what she likes, being bossed around ...' (*Goblet* 112).

Ron's attitude in this conversation is very much like the one of those who claimed African-American slaves to *like* serving, and that it is their duty with which they are content. Ron echoes Winky, the house-elf's words as a justification for his ignorance of the slavery of house-elves in general. In terms of house-elves' rights, Hermione seems to be the speaker of justice and truth while Ron (and the Weasley boys in general) stands for long-held traditions. In other words, Ron speaks the discourse, while Hermione tries to stay out of it.

This makes Hermione a rebel as she is against the established mainstream discourse, which causes her being made fun of or ignored when the issue comes up. In parallel with Foucault's theory, by opting out of the discourse, Hermione actually objects to being normalized and risks being marginalized.

In a cyclical manner, it is the discourse of power that takes this "truth" out of the house-elves: They are to serve humans and they like to do so (we do not have a certain idea whether they serve other species). From this point, the produced truth in society is set: House-elves are servants from birth because they are house-elves, who like serving human beings. This is the idea that sets the discourse of speciesism: House-elves are servants (inferior) to the (superior) humans, whose standards they

have to live up to and rules they have to follow. They cannot and do not work against the interests of their "masters" (another word implying superiority over a species) or former masters. When one does so, such as in the example of Dobby, who defies his masters and is happy being free, s/he is behaving differently from the expectations of the discourse, which is abominable. Thus, he is condemned by other house-elves.

However revolutionary she might seem, on the other hand, Hermione does not ask house-elves' opinion, either. She simply presupposes that they want freedom. She calls them "uneducated and brainwashed" (*Goblet* 211), and is angry for they "never stick up for themselves" like goblins (*Goblet* 390). Even Hermione, who seems to stand up for the rights of house-elves, actually belittles them. She *dementalizes* them, not considering them intelligent enough to choose for themselves, which is why she tricks them into getting themselves freed, rather than putting time and effort into educating house-elves. Without asking what their opinions are, Hermione has already decided what is better for the house-elves, believing that they could not know what they want. Like everybody else in the magical community, she does not listen to the house-elves; she mutes them. Only the fact that she tries to become their voice distinguishes Hermione from others. Besides that, she is similar in mentality with others in that she disregards house-elves' opinions, and with that, their existence. Hermione's way of oppressing house-elves is only different than others in that it is out of goodwill instead of indifference or hostility. Thus, her attitude is similar in the attitude of speciesists, believing that the other species lack intelligence, they are not qualified for their own opinions, so somebody else, a human, has to think and act for them.

Other creatures are not more respectful towards house elves, as well. House elves have generally been disregarded, neglected and discriminated against by the magical community at a large scale, which points at the widespread speciesist discourse in the magical society. If there were a caste system in the magical world, house-elves would definitely be in the lowest rank. Not only are they undervalued by humans, they are also undervalued by spirits, goblins and other magical creatures. The Gryffindor ghost, Nearly Headless Nick speaks of house-elves in a Ron-like

manner when he tells Hermione that there are about 100 house-elves who work at Hogwarts:

> 'But they get *paid?'* she said. 'They get *holidays,* don't they? And – and sick leave, and pensions and everything?'
> […]
> 'Sick leave and pensions?' he said, pushing his head back onto his shoulders and securing it once more with his ruff. 'House-elves don't want sick leave and pensions!' (*Goblet* 161).

Humans and other creatures alike take it as a joke when someone (Hermione) stands up for house-elf rights. They have never regarded house-elves more than a property of the house/institution; let alone a separate being with emotions, needs and rights; which is very similar to the speciesist attitude. Thus, questioning the welfare of house-elves and fighting for their rights do not seemas a serious issue. This, however, is the consequence of a long-held tradition that even house-elves have internalized.

House-elves receive this treatment solely due to their species. That is, if they were born into human species rather than house-elves, but have had the same characters, they would still be treated better regardless of the kind of human they would be. Surprisingly, house-elves also believe that their masters' interests come before theirs. They seem to have complied with the viewpoint that humans have for them. Although they are different species and not different races of the same species, their attitude still has parallelisms to the characteristics of a person who has internalized racism: (1) they believe in their inferiority, (2) they assert aggressive or violent behaviour toward their own group (those who do not comply with the discourse), (3) they have low self-esteem, (4) they put higher value on group members who resemble the superior group and (5) they put higher value on group members who adapt values of the superior group ("Internalised Racism" 2: 187).

Winky, the house-elf of Crouch family is a representative of house-elves in this sense. She is ready to take on any duty given to her without questioning. She takes pride in serving her family as her predecessors did (*Goblet* 332). She puts her masters

first, and is very defiant of house elves' gaining freedom; which fulfils the first and second trait of a person who has internalized racism toward themselves. She is unhappy for Dobby for he is free now because "[f]reedom is going to [Dobby's] head" for he asks for payment, which is a shame for house-elves according to Winky:

> 'House-elves is not paid, sir!' she said in a muffled squeak.
> […]
> 'House-elves is not supposed to have fun, Harry Potter,' said Winky firmly, from behind her hands. 'House-elves does what they is told. I is not liking heights at all, Harry Potter –' she glanced towards the edge of the box and gulped, '– but my master sends me to the Top Box and I comes, sir.'
> […]
> 'Winky is wishing she is back in master's tent, Harry Potter, but Winky does what she is told, Winky is a good house-elf' (*Goblet* 89-90).

House-elves working at Hogwarts have a similar manner, too though they do not work for a family or a master. They are visibly happy when Ron comments "Good service!" to them in Hogwarts kitchens (*Goblet* 329). They are also visibly annoyed at Dobby when he tells his story of not being able to find a job because he wants payment now (*Goblet* 330), which Professor Dumbledore, the headmaster, agreed upon. Accordingly, Dobby compromises a much lower payment and refuses days-off for "Dobby likes freedom, …, but he isn't wanting too much, …, he likes work better" (*Goblet* 331). When Winky, who has also found a job at Hogwarts with Dobby, is asked about her payment, she shows that her mind has not changed; she still considers freedom a disgrace and payment a much more horrible shame, for although "Winky is a disgraced elf" she still is "not yet getting paid!" because "Winky is not sunk so low as that! Winky is properly ashamed of being freed!" (*Goblet* 331)

It still is surprising for the reader that anyone can refuse freedom or more seriously, find it disgraceful. Even when they do achieve freedom (or fall into it), they have a restrained attitude towards it. However, this is the continuum of an established speciesist mentality in the magical world. Raised inside the same

discourse for centuries, not only humans but also the oppressed house-elves themselves have come to accept it as a fact.

Despite the remedial actions taken up by Hermione, and although some characters come to accept house-elves more as equals than inferiors throughout the series, the speciesist discourse seems to prevail.

Kreacher, the house elf of the famously pure-blood Black Family has a life-ambition "to have his head cut off and stuck up on a plaque just like his mother" (*Order* 72). He has "adapted the values of the superior group". Like the Black family, he detests any person who does not carry pure magical blood. He insults muggle-borns as "mudbloods"[12] and those who are in favour of them as "blood traitors"[13], just like his masters (used to) do. In this way, he puts himself in a higher status, and finds a justification for belittling witches and wizards.

The importance of set discourse is shown here as well. Having taken his values from his masters and growing up in a discriminative discourse, Kreacher has grown into a discriminator himself as well despite the fact that he is not considered equal by his masters, either. Still, Kreacher can easily call Fred, one of the Weasley twins a "nasty little brat of a blood traitor" (*Order* 101) and Hermione, a "Mudblood", whom he does not find fit to address himself:

> '... and there's the Mudblood, standing there bold as brass, oh, if my mistress knew, oh, how she'd cry, and there's a new boy, Kreacher doesn't know his name. What is he doing here? Kreacher doesn't know ...'
> 'This is Harry, Kreacher,' said Hermione tentatively. 'Harry Potter.'
> Kreacher's pale eyes widened and he muttered faster and more furiously than ever.
> 'The Mudblood is talking to Kreacher as though she is my friend, if Kreacher's mistress saw him in such company, oh, what would she say –' (*Order* 101).

---

[12]A rather pejorative term used for witches and wizards with non-magical parents.

[13]Another pejorative term used for half-blood or pure-blood families who are in favour of equality with muggle-borns.

He also considers the son of his masters, Sirius a blood-traitor for having half-blood and muggle-born friends, calling him a "nasty ungrateful swine who broke his mother's heart" (*Order* 102):

> Master is not fit to wipe slime from his mother's boots, oh, my poor mistress, what would she say if she saw Kreacher serving him, how she hated him, what a disappointment he was –
> [...]
> Kreacher would never move anything from its proper place in Master's house,' said the elf, then muttered very fast, 'Mistress would never forgive Kreacher if the tapestry was thrown out, seven centuries it's been in the family, Kreacher must save it, Kreacher will not let Master and the blood traitors and the brats destroy it –
> [...]
> – comes back from Azkaban ordering Kreacher around, oh, my poor mistress, what would she say if she saw the house now, scum living in it, her treasures thrown out, she swore he was no son of hers and he's back, they say he's a murderer too – (*Order* 102).

Goblins take being likened to house-elves as an insult and may use the phrase "I'm not a house-elf" to show their independent, self-sufficient and dauntless character as opposed to the downtrodden elves. Similar to how humans consider other beings lower than themselves, goblins undervalue house-elves or humans. They proudly reject any master, especially any witch or wizard:

> 'How come you're in hiding, then?'
> 'I deemed it prudent,' said the deeper-voiced goblin. 'Having refused what I considered an impertinent request, I could see that my personal safety was in jeopardy.'
> 'What did they ask you to do?' asked Ted.
> 'Duties ill-befitting the dignity of my race,' replied the goblin, his voice rougher and less human as he said it. 'I am not a house-elf' (*Deathly* 243-244).

Thus, although given a being status, which is still higher than the other two ranks (spirits and beasts), house-elves are considered the lowest of beings, receiving

60

little to no respect from other beings. Except for Hermione, who works hard to maintain house-elf rights, Dumbledore, who grants Dobby with the merits he asks for after being freed, Harry, who shows evident respect for him by burying him and making him a grave after he is killed by Death Eaters, and Ron, despite his prejudice at first worries about saving the house-elves in Hogwarts before the War of Hogwarts in his seventh year (*Deathly* 502); house-elves and their struggles are mainly ignored or disparaged, even by themselves.

Rowling's house elves are undervalued not because of a faulty action, but simply because who they are. Similar to giants or goblins, they are customarily and unquestionably stigmatized by humans who may or may not be primarily defined as speciesists. They receive little or no respect from humans because of who they are. They are enslaved and held captive until either they die or their master lets them go, which only rarely happens.

3.4 Speciesism in *Harry Potter Series*

The speciesist discourse of power in the magical world is not a new phenomenon. Most characters are born to parents who raised them accordingly with the discourse. Some others have entered the magical world, and met the speciesist atmosphere. In order to be relevant in which, however, they have to comply with the social norms themselves.

The magical world of humans requires its members to acknowledge the superiority of human species over others. Although no written instructions are communicated, the magical community seems to be almost in unison at keeping every other being below them, whether it is by exploiting them through slavery, by not granting them the right to possess wands, or simply by ignoring their presence. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the access to economic, emotional or social benefits explain this type of an in-group behaviour and discrimination of the out-group members. Regardless of their attitude toward the discrimination that happens within their group (the discrimination based on blood status of humans), human species in the novels discriminates against other species. What they receive in return is a sense

of superiority that caters for their emotional needs, along with more material gains, such as jobs (the magical society is predominantly employed by humans).

Such a prevalent discrimination could not occur, however, unless a discourse fed on it. As mentioned in the previous chapter, discourses are a type of control mechanism, which shape humans into "normalised" beings; most think and act in similar ways. Discourses do not allow humans to think outside given limits, if one attempts to do so, they are institutionalized. Adamancy in one's "delinquent" thinking causes marginalization from society. Thus, it is understandable that while none of the characters in the novels are responsible for creating the discourse, only few of them are working to eliminate it. Most characters are not even aware of the fact that they live in a seriously speciesist world let alone that they contribute to the preservation of it. They may consider house-elf slavery a part of the normal functioning of the magical society without questioning the wrongs of it; or be prejudiced against goblins without having met many of them to have an objective point of view.

It is hardly surprising that the first character to question the speciesism in the society in the series is one coming from another world. Despite being a part of the wizarding community now, Hermione still has the ability to view the wizarding world from outside. She has a different upbringing than many other wizards, allowing her to weigh multiple sides of the narrative to come to her own conclusions and think as a member of the out-group. Hermione is certainly not the only character from a muggle upbringing, yet it is understood that she has not fully yielded to the power discourse in the magical world once she steps in it. Characters like Harry, Bellatrix or Narcissa (both of whom are Death Eaters) are mentioned to be nice to house-elves, while Sirius is blatantly cruel to Kreacher. However, due to lack of information, how compliant Narcissa and Bellatrix are to the speciesist discourse regarding house-elves in general is unclear. In addition, whether any of the characters would be any nicer or worse to a house-elf that they do not know or care for personally is also unknown. On the other hand, Fleur and Bill display aggressive behaviour towards Griphook and many characters seem to distrust goblins although they fight against Voldemort,

which would automatically group them as "good characters" from whom such behaviour would not be expected.

Therefore, it seems that behaviour towards other species is more of a discursive attitude rather than one that assigns good-bad roles to characters. The general magical discourse of power is based on speciesist discrimination, grouping each species in their own sphere of beings and guiding most characters toward that direction.

The discourse that fixes the idea that humans are superior to the other species in terms of intelligence and morality seems to fail at certain parts, however. First of all, as numerous instances show in the novels, intelligence is unrelated to species. Certain human characters, such as Goyle and Crabbe, fall far behind goblins in intelligence. In fact, goblins are competent in intelligence with humans in general, so speciesism based on intelligence seems to have a fallacy. Secondly, house-elves generally display more moral responsibility than humans. Self-harm can never be defended, yet house-elves' self-inflicted harm is a display of their remorse for their unethical actions despite the fact that their errors could go unnoticed. While some humans and goblins can willingly harm others for their interests, house-elves are generally too kind to do so, which shows that they can be morally superior to the former. This also shows the fallacy of speciesism in the magical society.

Each species has its own in-group values. With minor exceptions, the human species in the book seem to conform to the speciesist discourse against all other species. Goblins seem to have a similar understanding, giving themselves priority over other species. House-elves expect members of their group to be obedient to their masters; hence the marginalization of Dobby. Centaurs do not bend to human masters and interact with them unless vital; hence Firenze's ejection from his herd for accepting a teaching position in Hogwarts (*Order* 615). This in-group favouritism is a golden opportunity for Lord Voldemort to use so as to control the power relations in the magical world.

3.5 Speciesism as a Means to the Discourse of Power in *Harry Potter Series*

The existing speciesist discourse helps Voldemort's men attain the governing position in the wizarding community. Intriguingly, the speciesist discourse feeds power, and power feeds the speciesist discourse in return in order to maintain its existence.

In-group bias within species causes them to discriminate against out-groups, which creates a polarized society. From each group's point of view, there are themselves and the others. For Voldemort, building on this prejudice and the discrimination that the prejudice brings is essential. Voldemort's means to power through discrimination has two dimensions. As a human-being himself, Voldemort works on the existing anthropocentric discourse to keep humans close to him. Amongst humans, however, he works on the ethnocentric discrimination based on blood to keep the pure-blood family members close to him, which is the topic of the next chapter.

As explained in the previous chapter, spatialisation, control of activities, organisation of genesis (a system of apprenticeship) and each part being an indispensable piece of the sum are important methods in setting the discourse of power for Foucault. Moreover, a system of surveillance is crucial in governing and controlling whether people are normalised according to the conditions of the discourse of power. Similar to Foucault's world, the magical world has certain ways of keeping the society within the limits of the discourse.

3.5.1 Institutions

3.5.1.1 Families and Hogwarts

For Foucault, institutions are the creator and carrier of the discourse of power in that they interpret "truth"s in ways that serve power, and convey them to the recipient people with the expectation of their obedience and contribution to it. In the same manner, magical institutions; family, school or governing bodies, are very effective in disposing the speciesist discourse of power. Children of magical families grow up knowing that even if they do not, some other families have house-elves in

their houses, serving the "human masters". It is natural that they do not regard them as equals because they grow up seeing that their parents do not regard them as equals. Similarly, it is implied in the series that children do not see many goblins around their families, either. Given the mutual dislike between the two species, it is understandable; however, this separatism serves the discourse of power, where mutual understanding becomes almost impossible. The household that the reader interacts with most in the series is the Weasleys, and even in the Weasley family, who welcome anyone regardless of their background and/or species, the reader does not come across a goblin friend, except for Griphook, whom they have as a guest seemingly unwillingly.

Hogwarts, on the other hand, is a boarding school, away from both the muggle and magical societies. It is a Foucauldian "other space" that has its own separate and distinct existence (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 24). Hogwarts, too, is a Foucauldian institution of discipline in that it "is a site where adults successfully train students to conform to the practices and expectations of the wizarding world" (Cantrell 196).

Hogwarts is where students can see a variety of beasts and beings, not only as topics of lessons but also as fellow students or/and teaching staff. Most teachers are humans, yet teachers of different backgrounds in terms of their species work in Hogwarts. Professor Flitwick is of a goblin background; Firenze is a centaur; Professor Lupin turns into a werewolf once a month; and the half-giant Hagrid teaches for a short time in Hogwarts. However welcoming Hogwarts may be in this, parents may be very unwelcoming to non-human teachers. For example, Professor Lupin has to conceal his identity so as not to have to leave Hogwarts, knowing the possible reaction of parents; and Hagrid is made to leave his position because of certain parents.

Taking into account the diversity in the backgrounds of teachers, one might take Hogwarts as an anti-speciesist school. However, as far as the content of lessons is concerned, it could be the opposite. Cantrell believes "Hogwarts's curriculum promotes compliance rather than critical thinking" (ibid 196) with strict rules of discipline that students have to obey so as not to face serious consequences including

expulsion from the school. With this in mind, students also have to succumb to the teachings of the school curriculum, which can be rather speciesist, as well. The clearest example of the speciesist attitude in Hogwarts is the content of the History of Magic lessons. As Hermione points out, history books written by human species often brush over what had really happened to other species in history. As the reader makes out from the History lessons, the curriculum concentrates on human-goblin wars. If an event happened in history, it is natural that they appear in history books; however, written by humans, history books do not allow the point of view and the knowledge of the Other mingle with theirs. The knowledge from other points of view is subjugated by the mainstream knowledge produced by humans. That is, the mentality in the books, and thus the lesson is an anthropocentric one. In addition, so much focus on wars between two specific species indoctrinates enmity between humans and goblins. In this sense, speciesist generations are trained in Hogwarts.

Another point in showing Hogwarts' speciesist stance is the house-elves working in the school. They do almost all the chores in the school invisibly. Although neither teachers nor most headmasters on duty in the series show blatant anti-house-elf behaviour; the fact that the school makes use of the service of house-elves is still a contribution to the discourse of power. The school administration does not show a clear stance against the servitude of house-elves, which is another manifestation of humans' power over other species. Unless the discourse let it, this might not happen. Still, as long as house-elves work in Hogwarts, Hogwarts may never be a completely anti-speciesist school; and will be serving the discourse of power that discriminates between species.

3.5.1.2 The Ministry of Magic and Fountain(s)/Statue(s) of Magical Brethren

Whether they have apodictic discriminative approaches or not, witches and wizards seem to have always considered themselves superior to the other creatures in the magical world, may they be beings, beasts or spirits. The wizarding culture has cultivated the idea into the conscious of the new generations, which has become the general norm shaping the attitude of witches and wizards towards others.

66

The very famous fountain with statues at the Ministry of Magic, The Fountain of Magic Brethren, is an important figure of indoctrination for the wizarding world. The mentality the authorities wish to incept, or the discourse of power they would like to set, in the consciousness of the society is embodied in the very statue. When Harry enters the Ministry for the first time during his 5th year, he sees the statue:

> Halfway down the hall was a fountain. A group of golden statues, larger than life-size, stood in the middle of a circular pool. Tallest of them all was a noble-looking wizard with his wand pointing straight up in the air. Grouped around him were a beautiful witch, a centaur, a goblin and a house-elf. The last three were all looking adoringly up at the witch and wizard. Glittering jets of water were flying from the ends of their wands, the point of the centaur's arrow, the tip of the goblin's hat and each of the house-elf's ears ... (*Order* 117).

The Ministry of Magic puts the statue up in the middle of the entrance, meaning anyone who enters the building will have to witness the wand-carrier male figure surrounded by the wand-carrier female figure, and the centaur, goblin and elf looking at them. Not only is the given message sexist, for even the two genders of wand-carriers are not of the same level, but it is also speciesist, for the centaur, goblin and house-elf look "adoringly" up the witch and wizard. If it is the wand they adore, their right to carry it is denied by the very wizards. If it is the power of magic they adore, there is no proof that a wizard's self-made magic is of higher value than the others', besides, they are a part of the magical world as well; thus, there should be no reason for them to "adore" the wand-carriers. Apparently, in the eyes of the humans who have made the fountain and the statue, other species adore them, which is anthropocentric.

Fields regards social institutions as entities that "shape our lives and give our existence meaning" (Fields 172), similar to Foucault's understanding of the role of institutions in creating and maintaining discourse. With the lack of a government or ruling royal family, the Ministry is the highest authority and the governing body of

the magical community. It is the architect of common mentality, and thus of the speciesist discourse.

The statue is the epitome of the speciesist discourse in the magical world. It is a powerful tool in conveying the mentality of the community. Speciesism in the magical world is symbolized in the statue, yet realized in daily life. To name a few examples, humans consider beings such as centaurs and merpeople wild and goblins untrustworthy (despite their successful running of Gringotts for centuries). House-elves are used by humans, and are mistreated most of the time. Therefore, humans consider themselves the only reigning beings of the community, and the statue is a solidified proof of the thinking.

While the situation is such even during a freer atmosphere, it becomes even worse for the non-humans under Voldemort's reign during Harry's seventh year. Harry visits the Ministry once again and sees the statue changed for the worse:

> The great Atrium seemed darker than Harry remembered it. Previously, a golden fountain had filled the centre of the hall, casting shimmering spots of light over the polished wooden floor and walls. Now a gigantic statue of black stone dominated the scene. It was rather frightening, this vast sculpture of a witch and a wizard sitting on ornately carved thrones, looking down at the Ministry workers toppling out of fireplaces below them. Engraved in foot-high letters at the base of the statue were the words: MAGIC IS MIGHT (*Deathly* 198).

The change in the fountain's statue is an important indicator of the mentality of the new regime. In this regime, non-human species are completely eliminated from the magical social life. The oppressive regime has shown itself through the complete eradication of non-humans. While the regime before had at least included the races that co-existed in the same statue although it was not totally egalitarian, the new one has no place for co-existence. The discourse that undervalued other species has led to a new one that totally ignores their existence; and it could be possible only through an anthropocentric discourse effective for centuries that makes humans ignore other species.

68

3.5.1.3 The Ministry of Magic's Interference at Hogwarts

From the third book of the series on, Professor Dumbledore has warned the Ministry about the true danger of Voldemort's return. There have been incidents that prove him right; nevertheless, his warnings go unheard. Due to his vocality, Dumbledore is silenced and is pressured to resign from his office and other duties because the truth in Dumbledore's claims would make the Ministry seem insufficient in doing their job. In addition, the Minister (wrongly) suspects that Dumbledore is trying to overthrow him. Thus, instead of investigating into the claims, the Ministry demonises Dumbledore, and uses this situation as a way to interfere in Hogwarts.

The fear of losing his job and his personal hatred of Dumbledore causes the Minister of Magic, Cornelius Fudge, to try to refute any claim Dumbledore makes, and thus discredit him, which only serves for Voldemort because he gains time thanks to the denial of the Ministry.

At this point, the Ministry representative appointed to Hogwarts is worthy of mention: Dolores Jane Umbridge. The reader first reads about her in the fifth book of the series as an interrogator of Harry's trial for producing a Patronus charm in a muggle area when met with dementors. She then becomes a teacher in the school and is known for her cruel ways during detention and resistance at teaching pupils practical defence against dark arts.

Professor Dolores Umbridge, the former senior Undersecretary of the Ministry of Magic and later, Professor of Defence against Dark Arts, and finally, Headmaster of Hogwarts is an important figure in understanding the magical community. Although not a Death Eater, thus not a professed follower of Voldemort, she still contributes to his cause in numerous ways.

Umbridge is one of the most flagrantly speciesist characters in the series. During her work in the Ministry Office, she drafts an anti-werewolf legislation, which bans werewolves from obtaining jobs (*Order* 271). According to Sirius's account, "she loathes part-humans; she campaigned to have merpeople rounded up and tagged" (*Order* 271). He also jokingly asks Harry whether she trains them to kill half-breeds during lessons (*Order* 271). Her attitude toward the beasts in the Forbidden

Forest also shows her arrogance. She tells them that they inhabit the forest only thanks to the Ministry's permission. When they do not comply with her, she calls them "filthy half-breeds", "beasts" (in a derogatory manner) and "uncontrolled animals" (*Order* 665).

Umbridge also uses derogatory terms for Hagrid several times, emphasizing his half-breed background (*Order* 219, 655, 662), which is approved by some students in the school. Acting as a representative of the Ministry, Umbridge is also a representative of speciesism of the institution. They do not send her there to set or maintain a specific speciesist discourse, yet giving such a person such important duties and approving of her behaviour, and finally letting her teach these to the younger generation show at least the indifference of the Ministry towards other species. Although she is not sent there to specifically indoctrinate speciesism, she is there to interfere at Hogwarts and make sure that it is in parallelism with the Ministry's wishes (*Order* 192-93).

3.5.2 Control of Bio-power through Discouragement of Cross-breeding

The attitude toward half-breeds in the magical world is in alignment with Foucault's understanding of bio-power; the use of biological potential for political ends. Half-breeds are the result of a fairly *laissez-faire* perspective towards cross-breeding. In the eyes of the supremacists, humans should only bear pure human (and preferably, pure-blood human) offspring.

The animosity toward half-breeds stems from the animosity toward non-human breeds. In fact, in a society in which other species than humans are not considered equals, the offspring of non-humans is also to be faced with a speciesist attitude. Humans are set firmly above non-humans in the magical society; thus the half-breeds do not contribute to the pure-blood supremacist agenda. They are a mixture of two different main classes (humans and non-humans), making them worse than the mixture of two sub-classes of humans (pure-blood and non-pure-blood humans). The discourse of power feeds on diverse groupings and tries to refrain from the formation

70

of a heterogeneous society by keeping each group homogenous in itself, separate from the others.

This existing aversion towards half-breeds in the society benefits Voldemort's cause. The Foucauldian bio-power asserts the control of biological processes including birth. By religiously adhering to their in-group values and attitudes, and thus approaching cross-breeds negatively, the magical society knowingly or unknowingly contributes to the discourse of power. New generations are discouraged from cross-breeding, and they become products of the discourse, which they will probably support and pass on to the next generations.The oppressive attitude toward half-breeds is an extension of this discourse, which despises species other than humans and aims at keeping each group separate. This works for Voldemort and his followers because with each group strictly separate and disliking others, they become easier to govern.

3.5.3 Wand-ownership

Privileging one group with a right and denying the same right from another is a practice of discrimination in both the primary and secondary worlds. In a discriminative manner, humans have denied the right to carry wands to non-human species. The reader can liken this act to black people having been denied the right to own arms and ammunition by Virginia ("Slave Codes" 3: 42-44). Similar to a weapon, a wand can harm someone, but more importantly, it can save the owner's life in certain circumstances. Hence, as harmful as it can be in the wrong hands, it could also be pivotal in self-defence. Goblins and house-elves stand little chance against humans in terms of defending themselves in case of danger. Even the vanishing power of house-elves may not save them from immediate danger, as Bellatrix can kill Dobby with a knife as he prepares to disapparate (*Deathly* 384-385).

Wands can also prize their owner with a certain kind of power that they cannot otherwise own. With the "Accio" charm, for example, one can summon items from where they are; with the "Lumos" charm, one can use their wand as a light source in dark places or with the "Alohomora" charm, one can open locked doors. It may seem

trivial at first sight, but by denying such a power that is hardly possible otherwise to goblins and house-elves, humans have monopolized power in the wizarding world. The only reason for the denial of the right is the speceies' not being human; which is a trait of their identity that they cannot choose, such as their heritage. Thus, humans are acting in a supremacist manner in terms of wand possession, and it *is* speciesist to deny such a right to a group of beings solely because they are born the way they are.

Lord Voldemort and his followers, the Death Eaters, benefit from this speciesist discourse in the magical society. Under circumstances where species other than humans are not respected or do not have access to certain rights, humans will automatically feel superior, which, as mentioned above, caters for their emotional needs of self-esteem and identity. Whether they support him or not, with humans on his side in terms of speciesism, Voldemort can take over institutions of the magical world more easily. Gringotts, the wizarding bank, has been under control of goblins until Voldemort is powerful enough to throw them aside (*Deathly* 244). Similar to the treatment animals receive in real life, Griphook knows that a given goblin or house-elf will still be less worthy than a given human being in the eyes of the human species, and is offended over humans' indifference regarding the issue: "[a]s the Dark Lord becomes ever more powerful, your race is set still more firmly above mine! Gringotts falls under wizarding rule, house-elves are slaughtered, and who amongst the wand-carriers protests?" (*Deathly* 395)

Horne sees this as Griphook's voicing "the institutional and cultural oppression inherent in not only Voldemort's rule, but within normal, everyday wizarding culture itself" (Horne 93). Despite Hermione's disagreement with Griphook's statement, stating that *they* care, Griphook's point that the human species in general is indifferent to the unfair treatment of other species is not absolutely wrong. Since humans consider other species below themselves by discourse, they do tend to turn a blind eye on the mistreatment of them, which makes it easier for Voldemort to govern the magical society.

Voldemort returns to an existing discourse of speciesism. He and his followers do not have to work to create a discriminating atmosphere against non-human species; on the contrary, maintaining the situation as is is sufficient to meet their interests. Many followers of Voldemort are already speciesist; but more importantly, the wizarding society in general is speciesist. The speciesist discourse, to which each member contributes but which also determines the limits of thought and action in the society; therefore which makes people contribute to itself, maintains its existence in this vicious cycle. People are speciesist because of the discourse, and the discourse is a speciesist discourse due to the people.

Most non-human species are being treated with indifference if not hostility in the magical world of the series. Similar to how animals are being abused and mistreated to "serve" certain purposes of the humankind in various ways which could include but is not limited to serving in laboratories despite showing clear signs of pain (Singer, *Animal Liberation* 15), house elves are treated as slaves, and goblins are not given the right to possess a wand, making them inferior to humans in terms of magical ability. In addition, many other species are either totally ignored or refrained from. Despite the fact that this situation has become a part of the established wizarding culture for centuries, Voldemort and his followers are ostensibly exerting discriminatory exercises for their own interests.

From a Foucauldian point of view, the discourse of power in the fictional magical world parallels the real one. Truths are taken and produced from the magical individuals. The produced truths about species point out the differences in each group of individuals, proposing a division, which causes each group to retreat to itself and despise the out-group members and behaviour.

Humans expect their members to exert superiority over others. The "normal" behaviour within this discourse of power is the belief and according behaviour of human supremacy. Magical institutions help the creation of and contribute to the discourse (, which also creates them in turn) with their teachings aimed at the conscious and unconscious minds of those they seek to govern. The inspection of

whether and to what extent the wizarding community adheres to the expectations of the discourse is maintained through certain disciplinary control mechanisms.

The way the discourse helps Voldemort is through the polarisation it presents. The polarisation gives humans an inherent sense of security, which is exploited by Voldemort. With exceptions, the wizarding society in general disregards other species, leaving them very little space in daily life for self-assertion. Without the help of the privileged on their side, the non-human species have little chance to proclaim themselves, and will be suppressed much more easily. Total control of the society can only be achieved through this "divide and rule" methodology. The division isolates each group and makes them concentrate within themselves. Given the speciesist discourse, each group is so focused on their own group that they do not bother themselves with the troubles of the other, which ends up in more isolation because each group undertakes their troubles on their own. Speciesism is so intrinsic at this point that eliminating it completely seems impossible. While a pan-speciesist approach would preclude Voldemort from gaining control over the magical society, this division and polarisation assists him in his cause.

The polarisation, however, is more complicated than a seemingly clear human versus non-human difference. It is seen that Voldemort's followers include non-human species such as dementors (*Half-Blood* 20), werevolves (*Half-Blood* 313) and giants (*Deathly* 520). On the other hand, those who fight for equal rights for non-humans include humans such as Hermione. Thus, the difference is between those who yield to Voldemort's fascist regime and those who stand for equality. Namely, there is a power play between the two poles consisting of those who try to set, enhance and profit from a discriminative discourse of power and those who resist it; rather than a strictly divided human versus non-human fight borne from pure hatred of one another.

The presence of such a speciesist discourse of power is the first step to gaining total control over the magical society. From discrimination between species, supported by most humans, Voldemort has a higher chance to be successful in

moving to the discrimination between humans, which is the key to total hegemony and domination of the magical society in the final analysis.

CHAPTER 4

DISCRIMINATION BASED ON BLOOD STATUS

As discussed in the previous chapter, in-group and out-group bias may easily turn into discrimination especially when the partners are in expectation of material or emotional gain. They may be rewarded with jobs, or they may simply feel self-esteemed with the group they are a part of and by discriminating against a group or groups they consider inferior.

In the wizarding society, once humans have determined that they are of human species, they go deep down into the ratio of magical blood purity to further categorise themselves. Similar to how humans have been categorized due to their race in the empirical world, the fictional magicals are categorized based on the rate of the blood purity and whether or not they can naturally produce magic. Being a member of one specific group may lead to discrimination towards others in both worlds. While the speciesist discourse in the magical community stems mostly from an anthropocentric point of view (for humans), the discrimination based on blood status is ethnocentric; believing that one's culture is superior to another's (Hebl and Madera 314-15). Speciesism has its roots in ethnocentrism as well, given that each species consider their own culture superior to the others. Yet, it is not possible to seek the motive of intra-human discrimination in anthropocentricism, unlike speciesism, since all partners are human in this context, making a "human-centred discrimination" impossible.

Throughout history, humans in the empirical world have made use of certain categories to define themselves and others. According to the Social Identity Theory, people conceptualise prototypical people or behaviour for many categories of humans. In this way, they double-check how similar they are to the prototype of their group and how different they are from other groups. However, it is crucial to

76

remember that prototypes of in-group and out-group behaviour are contextual and thus, discourse-bound.

Categorization causes the conception of humans as a part of a group rather than individual beings separate from their group. They are evaluated according to how prototypical they are both by in-group members and by out-group members. To be precise, in-group members expect one another to be in uniform; thus, members who defy certain rules; or in Foucauldian terms, "are not normalised"; are likely to be marginalized, and out-group members are defined by their unlikeliness to the group. This mindset suggests ethnocentrism in that every group considers their group superior to all other possible groups.

One underlying rationale of creating such an identity is the self-esteem that the group gives the individual. Another could be the reduction of uncertainty toward life, for the group pre-defines behaviour for the individual, providing the individual with self-definition and reducing her/his uncertainty towards life (Hogg 901-903). In a similar manner, Mummendey and Otten state that people strive for positive distinctiveness, which they attain by a group categorization (Mummendey & Otten 111) Additionally, Spears suggests that economic benefits could be another reason for abiding by the prototyping of a group (Spears 483).

In the *Harry Potter Series*, some characters are in favour of the categorisation and the exploitation of this categorisation for the same psychological reasons. Some families are in expectation of past glory their pure-blood used to grant them, some characters are in expectation of the "rewards" that they will receive; and in general, Voldemort and his followers seem to create a world where they can continue their existence in a privileged status. This expectation leads them to follow a discriminative and oppressive agenda of power.

4.1 The Human Species in the *Harry Potter Series*

Compared to other species in the series, humans are the most speciesist. With minor exceptions, they unanimously seem to assert their superiority over other species. Denying their right to wand possession, driving them away from social

institutions and marginalizing them are only a few examples of the discrimination against non-human species. However, humans' unification in speciesism does not mean that all witches and wizards are still considered equals by one another. The wizarding community is also categorized amongst itself, yet, this time, mainly based on blood status.

The wizarding world consists of three groups in terms of blood purity, and an extra group referring to those who have magical blood but cannot perform it: (1) muggle-born, (2) half-blood, (3) pure-blood and (4) squib.

4.1.1 Muggle-born

The group with least magical blood are the muggle-borns; that is, those who do possess magical ability, yet lack magical parentage. Muggle-borns, as the name suggests, are born to muggles; *non-magical* parents. Like every other witch or wizard, they perform magical ability by the age of 11, when they are accepted to Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry. The school is informed about the "unusual" event and send an invitation to the child when the time comes.

Magical ability has no direct ties to having magical parents. In fact, muggle-borns are at least as talented in magic as are half or pure-bloods. The way to determine whether a child is magical or not is the same for every child, regardless of their parentage.

During a Bloomsbury Publishing House Webchat in 2007, when Rowling is asked about how muggle-borns receive magical ability, she answers as "Muggleborns will have a witch or wizard somewhere on their family tree, in some cases many, many generations back. The gene re-surfaces in some unexpected places", which suggests that a witch or wizard cannot have purely non-magical blood.

Many muggle-born people have proved very successful in the magical community. Harry's mother, Lily Potter (neé Evans) is muggle-born. She proved magical while her sister, Petunia (in whose family Harry grows up), did not. She is described as "one of the brightest" students in the school to the surprise of her teacher, Professor Slughorn, who apparently presumed Lily to perform less successfully due

to her blood status (*Half-Blood* 70). One of Harry's best friends, Hermione Granger is one of the cleverest of her time in Hogwarts. The famous wand-maker Garrick Ollivander, the owner of *Ollivanders*, the wand shop, had a muggle-born mother.

Edward Tonks, father of Nymphadora Tonks, a member of Order of the Phoenix and the mother of Harry's godson, Edward Lupin, was also muggle-born. His marriage with Andromeda Tonks (neé Black) caused Andromeda to be disowned by her pure-blood family. He is murdered by Death Eaters while he is on the run during Voldemort's fascist regime.

While some families in magical community would not mind blood purity, some obsessively do, causing such events as disowning and excommunication with members. Muggle-borns are considered untrustworthy by these families. This understanding stems from the early history of Hogwarts, if not even before that. When the four founders of Hogwarts, whose surnames are given to the four houses of the school as well, Godric Gryffindor, Helga Hufflepuff, Rowena Ravenclaw and Salazar Slytherin, built the school, they decided on accepting children with magical abilities in order to educate and train them. Slytherin, however believed that they have to be more selective about the students, claiming that muggle-borns are unreliable and only those who have complete magical ancestry must be accepted to the school, which caused a disagreement between him and the other four founders, leading him to leave the school.

After a millennium, some families still insist on the same idea. They refuse to intermarry and regard non pure-bloods, but especially muggle-borns, as equals. Some even asked for a legal warrant to hunt them down (Scamander xiii). Muggle-borns may be addressed to with slurs, the most popular of which could be "scum" and "mudblood". The term "mudblood" is especially important in the plot, for the reader hears it first with Harry and Hermione, and it is the first instant of blatant discrimination based on blood status in the book. When Harry first hears it from Draco Malfoy, directed at Hermione, he does not understand the true meaning; yet, he does infer that it is a slur from the reactions of his fellow Gryffindors:

Harry knew at once that Malfoy had said something really bad because there was an instant uproar at his words. Flint had to dive in front of Malfoy to stop Fred and George jumping on him, Alicia shrieked, *'How dare you!'* and Ron plunged his hand into his robes, pulled out his wand, yelling, 'You'll pay for that one, Malfoy!' and pointed it furiously under Flint's arm at Malfoy's face (*Chamber* 86-87).

Harry's coterie visits Hagrid upon an accident due to an unlucky attempt of cursing Malfoy, where they discuss the meaning of the word and its connotations:

'It's about the most insulting thing he could think of,' gasped Ron, coming back up. 'Mudblood's a really foul name for someone who was Muggle-born – you know, non-magic parents. There are some wizards – like Malfoy's family – who think they're better than everyone else because they're what people call pure-blood.' … 'I mean, the rest of us know it doesn't make any difference at all. Look at Neville Longbottom – he's pure-blood and he can hardly stand a cauldron the right way up.'
[…]
'It's a disgusting thing to call someone,' said Ron, wiping his sweaty brow with a shaking hand. 'Dirty blood, see. Common blood. It's mad. Most wizards these days are half-blood anyway. If we hadn't married Muggles we'd've died out' (*Chamber* 89).

4.1.2 Half-blood

As Ron states, most wizards are half-blood in the modern magical society, for their ancestors had given birth to offspring to muggle-borns sometime in history. Muggle-borns are, in a way, the saviour of the wizarding community in terms of population as magic generally passes on to the child; and pure-blood inbreeding would have generated very unhealthy generations for witches and wizards. Thus, it is the muggle-borns who prevented the wipe-out of wizards.

Half-bloods are the most crowded group. Any person with a non-wizard in their ancestry is half-blood; which, as Ron says, makes most magical families comprise of half-blood witches and wizards.

Although the name suggests one magical and one non-magical parent, a half-blood is actually one that is neither muggle-born nor pure-blood. The way half-bloods are defined is very similar to the "Limpieza de Sangre" laws and "one-drop" blood policies[14]; that is, as long as one has a non-pure ancestor, they are half-blood; and once they are deemed half-blood, they cannot bear non-half-blood offspring.

The strict lines between families in terms of blood status have brought with them the discussion of superior and inferior statuses. For pure-blood families, who are primarily interested and involved in this classification; muggle-borns are the worst, yet half-bloods are not very praiseworthy, either. When Harry confronts Death Eaters at the Ministry of Magic in the fifth book, Bellatrix Lestrange scolds him for pronouncing Voldemort's full name, underlining his blood status:

> 'How come Voldemort wants it?'
> Several of the Death Eaters let out low hisses. 'You dare speak his name?' whispered Bellatrix.
> […]
> 'Shut your mouth!' Bellatrix shrieked. 'You dare speak his name with your unworthy lips, you dare besmirch it with your half-blood's tongue, you dare – (*Order* 691).

The use of such strong words as "besmirch" shows the level of contempt pure-blood obsessive Bellatrix has for non-pure-bloods, including half-bloods. However, half-bloods are still in a better place than muggle-borns during Voldemort's reign; especially when muggle-borns are interrogated and tortured in the Ministry of Magic for stealing their wands and thus the ability to perform magic from those who righteously enjoy it:

> … abruptly and shockingly amid the frozen silence, one of the dungeon doors on the left of the corridor was flung open and screams echoed out of it.

---

[14] The "Limpieza de Sangre" laws and "one-drop" blood policies are policies regarding blood quantum, and are to be explained later in this chapter.

'No, no, I'm half-blood, I'm half-blood, I tell you! My father was a wizard, he was, look him up, Arkie Alderton, he's a well-known broomstick designer, look him up, I tell you – get your hands off me, get your hands off –' (*Deathly* 212).

Having a wizard in one's ancestry; and so being half-blood, is an alibi for not being tortured by Voldemort's men, though it is not a warranty against it. It still is despicable to Voldemort's men since the blood is not pure.

Pure-blood people, on the other hand, are very hard to run into since during centuries of wizarding community, intermarriage has and will continue to happen, multiplying numbers of half-bloods; and with every pure-blood parenting a child with a non-pure blood, decreasing the number of pure-bloods by generations.

4.1.3 Pure-blood

According to Rowling, during the 1930s, a book on pure-blood families was published, acknowledging the "Sacred Twenty-Eight"; families who were still pure at the time. The "Sacred Twenty-Eight" included such families as Ron's family, the Weasleys; Neville's family, the Longbottoms; the Minister Barty Crouch's family, the Malfoys and the Blacks. By the time Harry started school, some families had either been wiped out or lost their blood purity (Rowling on Pottermore "Sacred Twenty-Eight). The Gaunts, for example, had no heirs through their sons, yet had Tom Marvolo Riddle; i.e. Lord Voldemort, through their daughter, whom they disinherited due to her muggle husband.

Disinheritance and disownment is a way of keeping lineages pure. The Black family, for example, disowned Andromeda for marrying a muggle-born man. They burned her face off the family tree tapestry on their mansion wall, unlike her sisters, who are still on it. Similarly, they burned off the face of Sirius, Harry's godfather for befriending muggle-borns and half-bloods. For them, such behaviour is outrageous, and "blood traitors" deserve no place on family trees:

> '… Andromeda was my favourite cousin,' said Sirius, examining the tapestry carefully. 'No, Andromeda's not on here either[15], look –'
> He pointed to another small round burn mark between two names, Bellatrix and Narcissa.
> 'Andromeda's sisters are still here because they made lovely, respectable pure-blood marriages, but Andromeda married a Muggle-born, Ted Tonks, so –' (*Order* 105).

Sirius later explains to Harry about the marriages between pure-blood families (and the absence of some families from the tapestry) when Harry is rather surprised to see so many people related to each other:

> 'The pure-blood families are all interrelated,' said Sirius. 'If you're only going to let your sons and daughters marry pure-bloods your choice is very limited; there are hardly any of us left. Molly and I are cousins by marriage and Arthur's something like my second cousin once removed. But there's no point looking for them on here – if ever a family was a bunch of blood traitors it's the Weasleys' (*Order* 105).

However, such abstinence form intermarriage causes some illnesses as well. The Gaunts' last two children had physical disorders; both had eyes directed at opposite directions (*Half-Blood* 198). The son, Morfin, also seemed to have mental disabilities and sadistic tendencies. The daughter, Merope, on the other hand, could not perform proper magic with her wand.

The abusive language and attitude of the father, Marvolo, could have had a reverse effect on Merope's magical abilities. In a very short instance Harry watches the family through the Pensieve, the father strangles the daughter to show the family heirloom locket on her neck to the Ministry official (*Half-Blood* 196).

He also likens the daughter to a "filthy little muggle" for preferring to scrub the floor manually rather than with help of her wand, a "useless sack of lump" and a

---

[15] Referring to his abscence from the tapestry as well for befriending muggle-borns; thus, for being a "blood-traitor".

83

"pointless lump" for not being able to repair the broken pot. He calls her a "dirty Squib" for her failed attempt of magic (*Half-Blood* 194-195) and a "disgusting little Squib" and "blood traitor" for falling for a muggle man (*Half-Blood* 199), all of which could have accumulated and added to her stress, which can cause loss of magical ability.

Not all pure-blood families are pure-blood supremacists, however. The Weasleys and Longbottoms, for example, find the discrimination based on blood status pointless, for the content of blood indicates neither character nor skill. In addition, members of pure-blood supremacists may also change their minds, as Draco became less of an advocate of the discrimination after the war.

Furthermore, people who discriminate others due to their blood status may not be pure-blood themselves. The most outstanding example of these people is Lord Voldemort himself. Ironically, he comes from Salazar Slytherin's bloodline but born to a witch and a muggle father, Lord Voldemort is half-blood, and neither can any off his future offspring be pure-blood.

4.1.4 Squib

A squib is a person who cannot perform magic although s/he comes from a magical family. They are people who are "born into a wizarding family but [haven't] got any magic powers. Kind of the opposite of Muggle-born wizards, but Squibs are quite unusual" (*Chamber* 110-111), as Ron explains to Harry. Unusual as they can be, as understood from Marvolo Gaunt's words, squibs are not well-respected in wizarding community despite their wizarding heritage. Not being able to perform magic is a very stressful situation, both on squibs themselves and on their family, for producing squibs is considered a disgrace. Dumbledore's sister, Ariana, was rumoured to be a squib, about which Aunt Muriel says their mother was devastated, for she was "proud and very domineering, the sort of witch who would have been mortified to produce a Squib" (*Deathly* 129).

The squib category is based less on blood purity and more on magical skills. Regardless, squibs can go through cruel treatment, like muggle-borns or half-bloods.

They would be locked up in St. Mungo's Hospital, or in their own houses. In Dumbledore's youth, for example, "[s]quibs were usually shipped off to Muggle schools and encouraged to integrate into the Muggle community ... much kinder than trying to find them a place in the wizarding world, where they must always be second class" (*Deathly* 130).

Being a disgrace to the wizarding community, squibs are considered even below muggle-borns, for they possess no magical ability at all. They can be referred to as "the squib" rather than by their name (*Chamber* 229; *Half-Blood* 381); or the word "squib" could be used as a slur.

According to a wizard obsessed with blood purity, the hierarchy of witches and wizards would place the pure-bloods on top, followed by half-bloods and then muggle-borns, with squibs at the bottom of the pyramid. Yet, considering the four groups of the wizarding community, it can be said that magical ability has nothing to do with heritage. One may lack the ability despite magical parents, or possess it despite muggle parents. Thus, claiming the superiority of one group over the other based solely on blood is unfounded, making such a hierarchy paradoxical. If the worth of a wand carrier is to be decided by their blood; then squibs should have a higher status; yet since they do not possess magical ability, they are not. On the other hand, if magical ability is the base of the worth of a wand-carrier, then blood has nothing to do with it.

4.2 The Discourse of Discrimination Based on Blood Status in *Harry Potter Series*

Discrimination based on blood is exerted mainly on those who are not pure-blood, but especially on muggle-borns. The wizarding community has a long history of discriminatory attitudes expressed in their actions and/or discriminatory slurs.

4.2.1 The M Word: "Mudblood"

The word "mudblood" is a derogatory word, meant to hurt the receiver. It appears several times in *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, where it is first heard. The Chamber of Secrets is a hidden chamber in the school, accommodating a

Basilisk charged with killing muggle-borns, and so cleansing the school of them. Some families support the purification of Hogwarts, and thus the wizarding society from muggle-borns. When Draco talks about the Chamber of Secrets, he tells his friends how his father "says the school needs ridding of all the Mudblood filth" (*Chamber* 167), that Mudbloods will be the next to be murdered by the "Air of Slytherin" (*Chamber* 106), and that he is surprised the Mudbloods do not pack their luggage and leave the school (*Chamber* 198). The person responsible for opening the chamber and releasing the snake, Tom Riddle (Voldemort's young self), also addresses muggle-borns as "mudbloods" (*Chamber* 229).

During the fourth year, in the book *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*, followers of Voldemort, the Death Eaters, cause a scene during the Quidditch World cup, where they ridicule muggles. Draco uses the slur against Hermione:

> 'Granger, they're after *Muggles,*' said Malfoy. 'D'you want to be showing off your knickers in mid-air? Because if you do, hang around ... they're moving this way, and it would give us all a laugh.'
> 'Hermione's a witch,' Harry snarled.
> 'Have it your own way, Potter,' said Malfoy, grinning maliciously. 'If you think they can't spot a Mudblood, stay where you are (*Goblet* 110).

Draco also calls the headmaster a "Mudblood-lover" merely for accepting muggle-borns in the school, unlike some other schools that are more selective about their students (*Goblet* 147), and that he needs to be sacked for accepting "slimes" to Hogwarts (*Chamber* 166). He also calls Harry a "saint" mockingly for befriending Hermione (*Chamber* 166). In a similar manner, Voldemort calls Dumbledore the "champion of commoners, of Mudbloods and Muggles" (*Goblet*562). For blood supremacists, supporting and caring for muggle-borns is nearly as bad as being one. Draco puts the understanding in words as: "Too late now, Potter! They'll be the first to go, now the Dark Lord's back! Mudbloods and Muggle-lovers first!" (*Goblet* 632).

In the fifth book, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, the reader sees young Snape calling Harry's mother, Lily Evans "mudblood" (*Order* 571), not to forget Mrs. Black's portrait yelling "Mudbloods", "scum" and "blood traitors" to the Order of the Phoenix members in same book of the series. Hermione is referred to as "Mudblood" by Draco in the next book as well, before he is responded with "I don't think there's any need for language like that!" (*Half-Blood* 110) by Madam Malkin, the clothing shop owner and "Please do not use that offensive word in front of me" by Dumbledore (*Half-Blood* 551); clearly displaying the atrociousness of the word.

The last book, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, is full of the word "Mudblood", for it is when Voldemort has taken full control of the Ministry, and the word has become less of a slur, but more of a denominator for muggle-borns. Pamphlets named "*Mudbloods and the Dangers They Pose to a Peaceful Pure-Blood Society*" have been published and disseminated.

Thus, the word "Mudblood" has a significant meaning in the plot. The use and abuse of it signifies important messages about the people who react to it indifferent ways. The timeline evolves from a time when it is shameful to use such a word to when it is necessary to address some as such. The evolution of the exertion of the word in different contexts also shows the evolution of the wizarding society in seven short years. From a relatively egalitarian society (excluding other beings), the magical society becomes a more obviously fascist society that values blood purity over content of character.

The new totalitarian regime excludes any non-pure blood, unless they abide by the new rule. Beings other than humans are not even mentioned, and they are erased from narratives. Among humans, muggle-borns are alienated and drawn away by ill treatment. Being half-blood or pure-blood is also not a warranty against Voldemort for once one is stigmatized as a "blood traitor", s/he could be treated as badly as a muggle-born would. Arthur Weasley is being tracked by the Ministry for his interest in muggles and close ties to Harry Potter despite his pure-blood status (*Deathly* 207). The new social order brings a new definition of blood status: only those who truly

submit to the Death Eaters are "pure-blooded" and relatively safe, which means that no matter how clearly-defined the term may seem, "pure-blood" is a discursive terminology in the wizarding community. Those who possess pure blood may suffer in Voldemort's regime for supporting non-pure-bloods, and those who do not may be favoured by Voldemort for supporting him, not to mention that Voldemort himself is half-blood.

4.2.2 Laws Regarding Blood Quantum

The empirical world and the magical one in the series are similar in their formation of discriminative discourses. In the empirical world, discriminative policies existed in history as early as the Roman Empire. The main discriminative policy at the time was Anti-Judaism; Jews "were refused citizenship rights" and were demonized by the society (Law 4-5). Similarly, fifteenth century Spain regarded members of certain groups inferior to theirs. They passed laws that imposed religious discriminating against non-Christians living in Spain. The famous "Limpieza de Sangre" laws of the 1430s were made to "ban all children and grandchildren of converted Jews and Muslims from climbing into royal offices and high-up church hierarchies" (Groebner 226).Fifteenth and sixteenth century Spanish authors are reported to have commented "the new Christians – as opposed to natural Christians – and their children could, among other things, be detected by their outward appearance, dark complexion and curly hair" (qtd. in ibid 226). The laws that alleged "Jewish and Muslim blood was inferior to Christian; the possession of any amount of such blood made one liable to heresy and moral corruption" (ibid 242) led to the Toledan Revolt of 1449. Converts were accused of abusing their social and political posts, lusting for nuns and killing men to obtain their wives and thus corrupt the Spanish blood with, for example the "perverse lineage of Jews" (ibid 254).

Along the same line, blood quantum was a determiner of whether or not one could enjoy certain legal rights in the United States of America. Intermarriage was illegal by law during the seventeenth century so that an "abominable mixture and spurious issue, which hereafter may increase in this dominion, as well by negroes,

mulattoes and Indians intermarrying with English, or other white women, as by their unlawful accompanying with each other" could be prevented and the purity of blood could be protected (qtd. in "Black-White Intermarriage" 1: 212). According to the same law, in order to be considered white, both parents had to be white; one black parent would make the offspring black according to law (ibid 212). The Virginia Law of 1787 was in the same line with the laws preceding it; any person having ¼ black blood (any black grandparent) was deemed black. Similar to the "Limpieza de Sangria", a white person was defined as anyone with no other blood than Caucasian and a black person was defined as anyone with one drop of black blood. The legal right to intermarry was obtained in 1967, upon the Loving vs. Virginia case (ibid 212). Virginia's early laws also prohibited "negroes" from owning arms and ammunition ("Slave Codes" 3: 42-44). Moreover, according to Goldberg, the "one drop of negro blood" was still a determiner in the legacy of slavery until the 1970s (Goldberg 87).

Similar to half-blood witches and wizards, being a full blood black was always more disadvantageous than being mixed blood. Mixed bloods, by virtue of their white ancestry, were deemed more competent and thus had fewer legal and social restrictions ("Blood Quantum" 1: 223). Native Americans, on the other hand, could be considered neither black, yet nor white; and could obtain US citizenship only after they were confirmed to be "white enough" (ibid 223) as whiteness was a sine qua non for citizenship (ibid 317).

The strict lines in blood status resemble the laws of the past in non-fictional human history. The definition of "half-bloods", especially, reminds the reader of the "Limpieza de Sangre" laws or the "one drop blood" rule. Similar to the laws and the rule, once a person is half-blood, her/his future lineage can never be pure-blood. In other words, provided that a witch or wizard has a muggle-born in their heritage, they and their future generations will ever be deemed "half-blood", contrary to the expected "one muggle parent" criterion. Moreover, in Voldemort's reign, being pure-blood is ideal, still being half-blood is still relatively better than being a muggle-born;

not to forget that Death Eaters included half-bloods; and Voldemort himself was one, as well; proving the discursiveness, rather than the empirical roots of the terminology.

As discussed above, in the novels, the elimination of muggle-borns from the society could be either by drawing them away or by killing them, both of which are methods used by Voldemort. Voldemort makes fun of the Malfoys, who are related to Nymphadora Tonks, whose mother, Andromeda was erased form the Black family tree for marrying a muggle. Nymphadora marries a werewolf, which becomes a matter of laugh for the Death Eaters, but a matter of disgrace for the other Black daughters, Bellatrix Lestrange and Draco's mother, Narcissa Malfoy. Voldemort refers to Nymphadora's children as "cubs" and asks Draco if he would babysit them, arousing laughter among the other gathered Death Eaters (*Deathly* 16). By dehumanising muggle-lineages, Voldemort makes the removal of them from the pure-blood families, and thus, the "human society of witches and wizards" justifiable:

> 'Many of our oldest family trees become a little diseased over time,' he said, as Bellatrix gazed at him, breathless and imploring. 'You must prune yours, must you not, to keep it healthy? Cut away those parts that threaten the health of the rest.'
> […]
> 'And in your family, so in the world ... we shall cut away the canker that infects us until only those of the true blood remain ...'
> (*Deathly* 16-17).

As the Spanish tried not to mingle with non-Spanish/Christian blood in the history, pure-bloods try not to mingle with muggle blood. In addition, the "Limpieza de Sangre" laws also take away the opportunities of certain jobs from stigmatized groups. A wand-carrier should be pure-blooded, and muggle-borns and half-breeds are not supposed to use wands, according to magical extremists; which means they can barely find jobs in the magical sphere; thus, they are exiled from their "homes" such as the Jews and Muslims in fifteenth-century Spain.

The total exclusion of non-pure-bloods from the society is the ultimate aim of Voldemort. From the discriminative discourse, which separates each group from the

others, the complete elimination of some will be made easier; and in return, true governance of the magical society is made more possible and easier.

4.2.3 Blood Traitors

Although it seems that discrimination in the wizarding world is based on blood status, it hardly is. Discrimination based on blood status is a discursive phenomenon for neither can it be said that all pure-blood families support the pro-pure-blood discourse; nor is each Death Eater (or Voldemort himself) pure-blood. The concept of pure-blood actually translates as those who support the discrimination against non-conformists. That is, the privileged in the Voldemort regime are those who favour the discriminatory system rather than only and all pure-blood family members.

For those who are against the discriminatory discourse, they are demonised whether or not they belong to pure-blood families. Families such as the Weasleys and the Longbottoms come from pure-blood lineages. Due to the fact that pure-blood families are interrelated to each other, for they do not have many choices of partners, Weasleys and Longbottoms are also relatives to some families that have Death Eater members. Still, because they do not adhere to the discriminatory discourse, they are demonised by the Death Eaters as "blood traitors". The in-group behaviour of pure-bloods require those in the same group to support the same discriminative discourse as they do; therefore, those who do not are marginalised. The blood status cannot be pre-determined; however, the attitudes of people towards each other can be; which explains why, despite their pure-blood status, members of some families are labelled "blood traitors" by some others. That is, they betray their blood by opting for an egalitarian system as opposed to a discriminative one that would deem them privileged.

Members of the Weasley family are referred to as blood traitors multiple times for being part of the Order of the Phoenix, an anti-Voldemort team, despite their pure-blood lineage (*Order* 74, 96, 100, 101, 102, 105, 109, 420; *Half-Blood* 144, 227, 277; *Deathly* 157, 363, 390). For Death Eaters, "the blood traitors are as bad as the Mudbloods" (*Deathly* 204), and they are next to each other *in their books* (*Deathly*

375). In a similar manner, when Fenrir Greyback, a werewolf Death Eater famous for targeting children especially, comes across Ron, although Ron does not give his real name, he states his surname as "Weasley"; for which Greyback comments "[s]o you're related to blood traitors even if you're not a Mudblood" (*Deathly* 363).

These comments prove that discrimination in the magical world is more of a discursive matter and less of a truth based on facts. While it seems as if blood is the primary denominator of status in the wizarding world; it actually is not of primary importance. The disparity between the words and actions stem from the discourse. The discourse does not force people to draw clear lines between the pure-bloods and non-pure-bloods, it rather asks them to forge a polarity between those who support the maintenance of the discriminatory system and those who works for egalitarianism.

4.3 Discrimination Based on Blood Status as a Means to Power

Discrimination based on blood status has been a problem that dates back to centuries ago in the wizarding world. It can be understood that discrimination is a general discourse in the magical society that can be manipulated easily. Given that witches and wizards have been brought up believing that they are superior to other species; and depending on their blood status, better than other witches and wizards for generations, one needs not form a discriminatory discourse from scratch to meet personal interests.

Power is gained in the magical world through the existing discriminatory discourse and discriminatory practices, which means it is born from it. It also maintains the existence of discrimination so as to secure its own existence, creating a vicious circle of a "power through discrimination through power" relation. In the same way speciesism is used, discrimination based on blood among humans is used to divide the human population, which makes them easier to control. With each group withdrawing into itself, a collective resistance becomes almost impossible.

The polarisation of humans and non-humans becomes more layered and becomes a "pure-bloods versus non-pure-bloods" distinction when humans are

92

analysed. While most humans are congruent in speciesism and are on the discriminating side regardless of the content of their blood; when it comes to the intra-human discrimination due to blood status, some take the role of discriminator and some discriminated. Virtually, a hierarchical pyramid would set pure-bloods on the top, under whom there are other magical humans, with other species at the bottom.

However, the real opposing poles would be those who are for some witches and wizards being privileged and those who are not because although blood status seems to stand for a standard, it barely is. The distinction is between those who abide by Voldemort's discourse, the discriminatory one that divides the population in smaller groups, and those who oppose to it.

With a more liberal and egalitarian atmosphere in the magical world, pure blood families were losing the glory and eminence they used to have only due to their blood status. As time passed, circumstances have changed, and many pure-blood families have lost their status due to intermarriage, others lost their influence in social and political life, and some lost their financial power. The lineage of families such as the Gaunts had started to decay, while the remaining pure-blood families such as the Malfoys started losing their influence. Therefore, stirring the feelings of past glory among the pure-blood families is where Voldemort starts. This provokes most pure-blood families and causes them to blame the non-pure-bloods for the state they are in.

Group psychology benefits Voldemort in this sense. The speciesist discourse creates a human versus non-human dichotomy. Both groups attach more importance to their own group in general. The discrimination based on blood purity, on the other hand, creates a pure-blood versus non-pure-blood dichotomy. Although it seems that Voldemort depends on the pure-bloods, he actually depends on the in-group favouritism of both groups. It is this mutual favouritism of one's own group that polarises the society. Voldemort's discourse is not a newly created discourse; however, it was relatively suppressed until his return. With the invigoration of the discourse, the dichotomy is revived, and a division among humans is created once

again. The wizarding world under Voldemort becomes a divided body, easily checked and controlled through certain control and surveillance mechanisms.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Foucault believes that power cannot be obtained; it is an entity of its own, yet people can control and govern other people through numerous control mechanisms. In short, they extract truths from people, turn them into manipulated and doctored knowledge and make it the discourse. The discourse establishes limits for people and shapes them. People are normalized by these limits. They are under constant surveillance to check whether they abide by the discourse. The formation of discourse and the surveillance is maintained through certain apparatuses. In the same manner, individuals in the magical world are expected to conform to the normalisation process imposed by Voldemort and his followers; and conformity of magical humans to the discourse of power is maintained and controlled through certain control mechanisms.

4.3.1 Law and Order

Voldemort and his supporters use fairly legal ways to fulfil their purposes. In fact, their "coup has been smooth and virtually silent" (*Deathly* 171) due to their virtual lawfulness. They make use of law for their own interests. New laws and decrees are made by the Ministry the moment it is taken over. Similarly, Dolores Umbridge tries to bring the Ministry order in Hogwarts by use of the several Educational Decrees implemented. The puppet minister, Pius Thicknesse, is put under the Imperius Curse, and seems to be the legal representative of Voldemort in the Ministry. Since Voldemort does not personally manage the Ministry, the situation does not seem alarming to many (*Deathly* 171-172). As law is manipulated, no action exceeds the boundaries of lawfulness.

This lawfulness also brings a new kind of control and surveillance over the society. Openly and lawlessly attacking people simply for their blood status would probably be faced with more resistance against visible opponents. However, the changes in the society are done so silently and undercover that people fear to confide in each other; for they can never know who is a real supporter of Voldemort and who

is not. They never know whether they can be reported or not; and if so, to whom they will be reported exactly.

A system of perennial control by legal authorities already exists in the magical world. The magical society is constantly under surveillance. The Ministry is notified of any magic performed by students outside school premises, causing them punishment. The Ministry also knows when magic is performed in the Muggle world. It perpetually tracks activities of witches and wizards. Such a system opens way for more severe control by malevolent authorities. Under Voldemort's regime, witches and wizards' communication and transportation networks are brought under surveillance as well.

Voldemort does not create a society of the Panopticon anew, but he extends the limits of control over people, making use of the existing situation. He becomes the unseen ever-watching eye of the Panopticon. He is never present in person until the very end. He is behind curtains, but somehow people know that it is him who is fundamentally behind everything:

> Naturally many people have deduced what has happened: there has been such a dramatic change in Ministry policy in the last few days, and many are whispering that Voldemort must be behind it. However, that is the point: they whisper. They daren't confide in each other, not knowing whom to trust; they are scared to speak out, in case their suspicions are true and their families are targeted. Yes, Voldemort is playing a very clever game. Declaring himself might have provoked open rebellion: remaining masked has created confusion, uncertainty and fear (*Deathly* 172).

The fear of the Panopticon; that is, the anticipation of being watched ceaselessly creates an atmosphere of anxiety and distrust; which constitutes the backbone of Voldemort's divisive agenda. In this way, people will be easily manipulated by authorities because they do not trust anyone.

A similar atmosphere is set in Hogwarts as well. With the removal of Dumbledore from his office, Hogwarts students are confused and are made more

confused by the educational decrees that are published almost every day by Dolores Umbridge.

Before the school year ends, Professor Umbridge pledges several Educational Decrees in the school banning such activities as student clubs (*Order* 313), Quidditch games (*Order* 369), teachers' talking to students on matters other than school subjects (*Order* 486) and owning the alternative media source, *The Quibbler* (*Order* 512) after becoming the "appointed first ever high inquisitor" of Hogwarts[16]. In a *Daily Prophet* article, the event is explained as the Ministry's preventive measure against the wrong direction the school is heading at:

> This is not the first time in recent weeks that the Minister, Cornelius Fudge, has used new laws to effect improvements at the wizarding school. As recently as 30th August, Educational Decree Number Twenty-two was passed, to ensure that, in the event of the current Headmaster being unable to provide a candidate for a teaching post, the Ministry should select an appropriate person.
> "That's how Dolores Umbridge came to be appointed to the teaching staff at Hogwarts," said Weasley last night. "Dumbledore couldn't find anyone so the Minister put in Umbridge, and of course, she's been an immediate success –"
> […]
> "– an immediate success, totally revolutionising the teaching of Defence Against the Dark Arts and providing the Minister with on-the-ground feedback about what's really happening at Hogwarts."
> It is this last function that the Ministry has now formalised with the passing of Educational Decree Number Twenty-three, which creates the new position of Hogwarts High Inquisitor.
> "This is an exciting new phase in the Minister's plan to get to grips with what some are calling the falling standards at Hogwarts," said Weasley. "The Inquisitor will have powers to inspect her fellow educators and make sure that they are coming up to scratch. Professor Umbridge has been offered this position in addition to her own teaching post and we are delighted to say that she has accepted" (*Order* 274-275).

---

[16] With the last Educational Degree, she becomes the headmistress (*Order* 550).

The interference of the Ministry in Hogwarts is made completely legal, feasible and also public with the article. The selection of "an appropriate person" by the Ministry is an exertion of power over Hogwarts, its students and staff. It is also important that the "appropriate person" is tasked with dealing with "the falling standards at Hogwarts" by "providing the Minister with on-the-ground feedback" and "inspect her fellow educators". In other and more precise words, s/he is expected to spy on the school in order to ensure that Hogwarts is up to the standards of the Ministry; and indirectly, to the standards of Voldemort and his team. That is, Umbridge is the eye of the constantly watching Panopticon in Hogwarts.

Umbridge also forms a group of students as an Inquisitorial Squad, "[a] select group of students who are supportive of the Ministry of Magic, hand-picked by Professor Umbridge" (*Order* 551). They become her small army, who can act as they wish under the purpose of bringing order to the school. They are also the intelligence bureau for Professor Umbridge, acting as her SS[17] forces.

The Muggle Studies lesson is of great importance to Voldemort and his Death Eaters. Their attitude towards Muggle Studies is a representation of their stance toward muggles in general. During the seventh year of Harry's education, they first hear of Charity Burbage, the Muggle Studies teacher, has resigned (which is untrue; she is kidnapped by Death Eaters and is later killed by Voldemort). Then, they hear two very famous Death Eaters start teaching at Hogwarts. Alecto Carrow teaches Muggle Studies, which has become compulsory so that each student has to hear muggles being referred to as "animals, stupid and dirty" (*Deathly* 462). Alecto also tells students that the natural order is being re-established by the new regime (*Deathly* 462), referring to a superior status of pure-blood witches and wizards over others.

With the new laws and according implementations, non-pure-bloods in the magical society, but especially muggle-borns, lose the protection of law, which would make each citizen equal in front of law. The new laws, on the other hand, create a system that values and favours one group over others.

---

[17] Hitler's Secret Police Force

Thus, the legal ways of establishing control is an important method used by Voldemort and his followers. They seemingly do not commit crime and do everything according to rules; however, *they* make the rules. With legal authority behind them, Voldemort and his followers form a society of constant surveillance in order to assert total control over the magical society; which will lead to (1) a distinction of those who abide by the new rules and those who do not, and (2) an atmosphere of fear and confusion that deters people from reacting.

The system of surveillance contributes to Voldemort's discourse of power. People are trained to obey the discourse and are checked in terms of how obedient they are to it. When the discriminative side of the discourse is also taken into account, people are divided and suppressed; and therefore governed by Voldemort.

4.3.2 Registration Bureaus

In another attempt to exert control over populations, the puppet Ministry of Voldemort establishes a Muggle-born Registration Comission, as Hermione and Ron find out from the newspaper, *The Daily Prophet*:

> "Muggle-born Register …The Ministry of Magic is undertaking a survey of so-called 'Muggle-borns', the better to understand how they came to possess magical secrets.
> "Recent research undertaken by the Department of Mysteries reveals that magic can only be passed from person to person when wizards reproduce. Where no proven wizarding ancestry exists, there- fore, the so-called Muggle-born is likely to have obtained magical power by theft or force.
> "The Ministry is determined to root out such usurpers of magical power, and to this end has issued an invitation to every so-called Muggle-born to present themselves for interview by the newly appointed Muggle-born Registration Commission" (*Deathly* 172).

The above-mentioned interrogations are conducted by the members of this commission, which aims at seizing the wands of witches and wizards rather than merely "rooting out" "usurpers" by interviewing them as the news states.

The news item uses the word "invite" for the muggle-borns, while they are actually forced to be interrogated, which is why most decide to return to the muggle world or live as fugitives until the situation turns better. In other cases, Death Eaters and outlaws round up and bring to the Ministry muggle-borns in exchange for money (*Deathly* 368).

The registration of a stigmatized group of people both in real world and in a fictional one only works for their profiling, which could end up with their persecution. Barratt states that as hurtful as name-calling is, it is not nearly as dangerous as such a state-induced institutionalized discrimination, which leads to the visibility and verification of a hierarchy based on blood status, and legislation that would target defined categories of people (Barratt 74).

The registration of each person conduces to Voldemort's discourse of power because each and every individual can be closely inspected about whether they observe the discriminative discourse or not after being registered. If they do not, they are dismissed from the magical society, cleansing the society from the "delinquents" who sow discord; and if they do, they are devoured by the discourse of power, by which they are produced and to which they contribute. In both ways, individuals become easier to manage, and the magical society becomes a product of the discourse of power, governed by Voldemort and his followers.

4.3.3 The Control of Bio-power Through Discouragement of Intermarriage

As mentioned above, most pure-blood families are against the idea of intermarriage. Although no law is passed during the short reign of Voldemort banning intermarriage, the sufficient support behind the idea makes it likely if Voldemort persisted to reign.

Death Eaters despise marriages with half-bloods and muggle-borns forin their opinion, the quality of their blood decreases. Several instances of disowning members from families and encouraging the "pruning" of such branches in family trees appear in the series as practices of pure-blood preservation. For example, the wand of Mrs. Cattermole, whose husband works at the Ministry is seized upon the accusation of

muggle-bornness. When a Death Eater, Yaxley, sees Mr. Cattermole on his way to interrogate his wife, he makes rather unsettling remarks about the marriage, stating that he would never marry "such filth" himself, and that Mr. Cattermole would be wise to "marry a pure-blood next time" (*Deathly* 200).

For the mentality supporting Voldemort, mixing bloods is a despicable act that leads to the weakening of wizarding blood, and thus, wizarding power. The very slur "Mudblood" is an indication of blood of dirt; dirty blood; the kind of blood that pure-blood witches and wizards do not want to mingle with.However, as Ron suggests, intermarriage is what has saved the magical community from extinction, and it is requisite to secure the future of the magical community.

On the other hand, the discriminative discourse is a requisite for Voldemort's reign. The indoctrination that muggle blood is dirty and thus needs to be cleansed from the society in order to secure the future generations from rotting, and that muggle-borns cannot originally produce magic, so they must have stolen it from wizards is similar to Foucault's understanding of such science disciplines as medicine.

He states that what we believe to be science can be manipulated and manipulative as well; for knowledge can be bent and shaped according to what the discourse requires. In addition, knowledge is such a flexible entity that at different times in history, it may be interpreted differently, or it may refute itself completely. (Foucault, *Archaeology* 5, 83-84, 116, 197-198) In alignment with his statement, Voldemort tries to achieve means of power by manipulation of knowledge. The institutionalised magical knowledge indoctrinates people untrue facts. As discussed above, neither character nor magical skills is related to blood status. In addition, keeping in mind Rowling's own words that muggle-borns most probably have a magical ancestor somewhere in their lineal past; there actually is no usurper of magical power. Rowling's statement also suggests that there is no child who has absolutely no magical blood, either.

Even the discussions of a possible ban on intermarriage would normalise the idea, eventually leading to a distance to intermarriage in the society and a more polarised, segregated community.

Another point that needs to be addressed at this point is Foucault's bio-power. For Foucault, the discourse of power discourages any activity that leads to no production. In other words, unless an activity caters for the interests of some people, it needs not encouraged. Bio-power is an example for this. The biological power of people is extracted by them, according to Foucault, to the point of exploitation when it can be used by the discourse of power.

The control over bio-power is an important issue in the magical world as well. Pure-blood can only be produced by two pure-blood partners. According to a blood supremacist, any sexual activity that would lead to a non-pure-blood offspring should be illegal. The only acceptable coupling can be between two pure-blood partners, which is the only option to give birth to new pure-blood generations. Therefore, a coupling between a pure-blood and non-pure-blood witch and wizard is inadmissible.

A possible ban over intermarriage would be a very strong kind of administrative control over humans. The exertion of power in such a way would lead to more serious divisions between humans. In such a case, non-pure-bloods would be marginalised more. In the current situation, those who are in favour of a heterogeneous society are labelled as "blood traitors". If intermarriage were to be banned, those who marry non-pure-bloods would probably be expelled from the society altogether. The prospects of such a situation would draw thicker lines between different groups of humans, contributing to the divisive discourse of power Voldemort benefits from.

4.3.4 Media Control

It is a well-known fact that media is a prominent apparatus of the creation and/or maintenance of discourse. It can be used as a tool to shape crowds in a desired way. Many political administrations, such as the Nazis (Simpson 34), aimed at total media control. Media control is a means to power rather than an end.

In the book series, one of the first works that the Death Eaters implemented was also a ban and censorship over media in the wizarding world. Wizarding newspapers are the leading sources of information for the community, and the newspaper *Daily Prophet* becomes almost the single media and the daily brochure of Death-Eater mentality, rising its dangerous tone gradually since Harry's fourth year at school.

As mentioned above, dissemination of booklets such as *Mudbloods and the Dangers They Pose to a Peaceful Pure-Blood Society* written by Ministry officials are maintained.

Radio is also under Ministry control with broadcasts supporting the capture of Harry and his friends. "Harry's all over the *Prophet,* all over the radio, they're looking for you everywhere, all these rumours and mental stories …" says Ron when he returns from the wizarding world to his friends in hiding after a quarrel (*Deathly* 310).

With most media channeling Voldemort, there are only few that fearlessly broadcast against him:

> *Potterwatch,* didn't I tell you that's what it was called? The programme I keep trying to get on the radio, the only one that tells the truth about what's going on! Nearly all the programmes are following You-Know-Who's line, all except *Potterwatch.* I really want you to hear it, but it's tricky tuning in ... (*Deathly* 355).

Potterwatch is an underground radio programme hosted by Harry's school friend, Lee Jordan, from different locations each time so as not to be found. They report news that is not given by the other Voldemort-controlled media, where the people murdered by Death Eaters are not mentioned (*Deathly* 356-357).

Alternative media such as Xenophilius Lovegood's *The Quibbler* also aims at giving a more correct account of events, yet are discredited and silenced due to their stance, and writing stories opposite those that appear on *Daily Prophet*. Due to his anti-Voldemort articles, Xenophilius' daughter, Luna, is abducted by Death Eaters.

If they cannot persuade people to be on their side, Death Eaters will use force to either silence or destroy them:

> 'Harry, look at this.'
> He strode over to her as quickly as he could through all the clutter.
> The front of *The Quibbler* carried his own picture, emblazoned with the words *Undesirable Number One,* and captioned with the reward money.
> *'The Quibbler's* going for a new angle, then?' Harry asked coldly
> […]
> Xenophilius licked his lips.
> 'They took my Luna,' he whispered. 'Because of what I've been writing. They took my Luna and I don't know where she is, what they've done to her. But they might give her back to me if I – if I –' (*Deathly* 340).

Knowing that media is one of the most effective ways of reaching masses and creating a single perspective via a "mainstream media" flow, most oppressive regimes silence the other sources that could show a different view. Alternative voices could easily damage the image created by the regime, and thus they are handled most tyrannically. Voldemort controls the media in an attempt to get the public opinion on his side by completely monopolizing ideas, and thus gain from the polarization in the society.

Media is an important means of setting discourse. The existing yet subdued discriminative discourse can be used and spread through media. However, a total control of it is necessary to meet the interests of some. That is, power is exerted on magical humans through the control of media, in a way. On the other hand, as Foucault states, "[w]here there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault, *Sexuality* 95). In a society that becomes as polarized as this, witches and wizards have to choose a side. They are either on the side that unfairly exerts power over others through discrimination; or they are on the side for egalitarianism despite the discourse they are fed. They either agree to or refuse to feed the discriminative discourse for a possible personal return for themselves.

The alternative media sources such as *The Quibbler* and *Potterwatch* are extensions of this choice, and therefore the resistance to the mainstream media, which fuels and is fuelled by discrimination. For Foucault, paradoxically, resistance in an indispensable part of power relations as well. Like power, they need to derive from a single source or follow a leading person (ibid 92). Power, as an all-inclusive entity, includes the resistances against it. In a way, this friction is what ensures its existence.

The existences of alternative media and mainstream media depend on each other. Without the mainstream media, there is no alternative media, and vice versa. In a more general scope, without Voldemort's efforts towards discrimination, the resisting force of the group that supports egalitarianism would not exist; they feed and feed on each other.

Voldemort's and his followers' aim is to gain the most of this bipartite situation. By keeping the disparity alive thanks to the discriminative discourse, they intend to make personal gain.Voldemort's followers, Death Eaters, werevolves and dementors expect certain privileges. Crabbe tells Harry, they will be rewarded (*Deathly* 505); Lupin tells Harry and his friends that the famous werewolf Fenrir Greyback is promised preys "in return for his services" (*Half-Blood* 314). Many individuals from various species and blood statuses follow Voldemort; and become members of his group for financial or emotional gain, as explained in the previous chapter.

4.3.5 Control over Possession of Wand

Because wands choose their owners (*Philosopher*63) and they are unique to the witch or wizard that are the true owner of them, similar to a national identification card or a passport, a wand is a witch or wizard's identification in the magical world, which means that the loss of it could mean a social exclusion form the wizarding community. During Voldemort's regime, muggle-borns are questioned at the Ministry of Magic and their wands are taken from them based on the claim that they stole the wands from those who deserve it. Muggle-borns are accused of stealing magical ability, for they would not be able to possess it otherwise. A witch or wizard

would have to give up their wand if they are deemed unworthy of it after an inquisition:

> 'A wand was taken from you upon your arrival at the Ministry today, Mrs Cattermole,' Umbridge was saying. 'Eight and three-quarter inches, cherry, unicorn hair core. Do you recognise that description?'
> Mrs Cattermole nodded, mopping her eyes on her sleeve.
> 'Could you please tell us from which witch or wizard you took that wand?'
> 'T – took?' sobbed Mrs Cattermole. 'I didn't t – take it from anybody. I b – bought it when I was eleven years old. It – it – it – *chose* me.'
> She cried harder than ever.
> […]
> Umbridge and Yaxley, still intent upon their prey, were deaf to everything else. 'No,' said Umbridge, 'no, I don't think so, Mrs Cattermole. Wands only choose witches or wizards (*Deathly* 214-215).

Upon a pre-conjecture that one is not a witch or wizard, the right of wand of an individual; that is, their existence in the magical world would be stripped off them. Barratt sees this as the loss of a chance to defend oneself. For her, Umbridge's reasoning is twisted and deterministic. Her groundless claims, however, cost wand-bearers their security; for without a wand, one loses the opportunity to perform magic, which puts him/her at serious risk, especially at such a dangerous time for an uncommitted crime (Barratt 76).

Loss of wizards' wands not only costs them their security, but it also costs them their quality of life. This is exactly why a wand is likened to a passport. It bears a wizard's identity, and makes them one in the first place. The importance of owning a wand is also an issue for the difference between humans and other beings. Goblins and house-elves alike are not granted the right to use wands, which clearly excludes them from the wizarding community. The underlying meaning of being able to carry a wand, therefore, is "I am a witch/wizard"; thus, it is a symbol of citizenship for the magical humans.

While Harry, Hermione, Ron and Griphook take a walk in the Diagon Alley disguised as other people, they see wandless beggars on the streets, those whose wands are taken and now do not have any job in the wizarding world:

> A number of ragged people sat huddled in doorways. He heard them moaning to the few passers-by, pleading for gold, insisting that they were really wizards. One man had a bloody bandage over his eye.
> As they set off along the street, the beggars glimpsed Hermione. They seemed to melt away before her, drawing hoods over their faces and fleeing as fast as they could (*Deathly* 424).

When the characters come across a Death Eater, who thinks they are also Death Eaters thanks to their disguised looks, the man comments on the people on the streets, referring to them as the "wandless":

> Some of these Wandless can be troublesome,' said Travers. 'While they do nothing but beg I have no objection, but one of them actually asked me to plead her case at the Ministry last week. *"I'm a witch, sir, I'm a witch, let me prove it to you!"'* he said, in a squeaky impersonation. As if I was going to give her my wand (*Deathly* 425-426).

By taking away the wands of witches and wizards, the Voldemort rule aims at three ends: (1) humans are dehumanised for non-humans cannot carry wands, so it becomes legitimate to treat them as non-human species; (2) the surveillance of these humans are made easier if they remain in the wizarding world. Since they lack the means to produce magic, they can barely move and escape Death Eaters; and (3) by putting witches and wizards in such a pathetic position, Voldemort's men validate their claims that muggle-borns (and their supporters) do not deserve to exist in the magical sphere. Thus, the discriminatory discourse of power is approved.

4.3.6 Torture and Murder

A Machiavellist governance of fear defines Voldemort's reign. Although short, Voldemort's reign sees numerous cases of torture and murder.

The discourse that Voldemort and Death Eaters try to set is based on a purification of those who do not comply with their rules. The Unforgivable Curses; that is, the killing curse "Avada Kedavra"; the torture curse "Crucio"; and the manipulation curse "Imperio", whose use would end up the user in Azkaban for years, are used often by Death Eaters without any consequence. To exemplify, a Hogwarts student, Cedric Diggory is killed by Voldemort with the killing curse during Harry's fourth year. Amycus Carrow, the newly appointed Defence Against the Dark Arts teacher has students use the torture curse on other students who have earned detentions. Finally, the puppet Minister of Magic is under an Imperio Curse throughout his office.

Due to the atmosphere of fear and terror, people in the magical society are scared to talk, lest their words are heard, misheard and cause them trouble. People are persecuted without reason and without having been given a chance to defend themselves. Fear is used to keep people in control and avoid resistance.

While Foucault believes the invisible type of power exertion, surveillance, is one of the best ways to keep people under control, Voldemort makes use of both invisible and visible exertions of power. He controls the society through a Panopticon-like system that ceaselessly watches over witches and wizards; but he also makes use of more brute forms of force. It seems that Voldemort's Machiavellian reign of fear works for some time.

Voldemort's regime of discrimination sets humans above other species; yet, discrimination among human beings leads to a system where some humans are set above than some others. This forms a society in hierarchical levels, which causes a polarised determination of who is worthy of existing in the magical society and who is not. Homogeneity within each group is encouraged so that out-group members are marginalised. This division in society makes it easier for Voldemort and Death Eaters

to govern populations of people because it is easier to manage smaller groups separately than bigger ones collaboratively.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The *Harry Potter* novels are among the most popular fantasy fiction of the 20th and 21st centuries. First published in 1997, the books and the following films along with other merchandise of the franchise have reached generations of audiences. New books and films as by-products of the original series are still produced; and the author is still expanding the magical universe with her writings in the website, www.pottermore.com.

The seven-book series are on the fight between the good and the evil in the magical world on the surface. However, the literary thread has deeper sociological and political reverberations. The core of the plot is related to power.

This thesis set out with the aim of studying the *Harry Potter Series* through a Foucauldian lens of understanding power relations and discourse of power created and maintained through means of discrimination in the novels. The use of two kinds of discrimination; the one between humans and non-humans (speciesism), and the one amongst humans (discrimination based on blood status) in controlling power relations and the discourse of power is examined by referring to the Foucauldian concepts of truth, knowledge, control, surveillance, discipline and discourse.

The concepts of power in Foucauldian terms is first examined in the thesis. For Foucault, power is an invisible, untouchable entity that cannot be owned by anybody. Contrary to the old understanding of power as a force that a single person or a group of people held, modern power is a more fluid entity. Power is omnipresent; it cannot belong to anyone; however, the discourse that it creates and the effect that is created by the discourse can be exerted on masses of people by those who are seeking governance of them in order to maintain the privileges they have. In short, power cannot be "held" but can be "made use of" for the interests of certain people.

Power exists in a discourse that creates it, but it also affects the discourse in a way that maintains its existence. That is, there is a cyclical relationship between power and discourse; they are both borne by and influence each other.

Discourse governs humans by producing them through the power relations of it. People are produced cognitively, emotionally and physiologically according to how the discourse of power demands them to be. This process requires a system of differences, privileges to be given/maintained by a certain group of people, institutions of indoctrination, rationalisation of the discourse and methods of surveillance in order to survive, according to Foucault.

The system of differences is ensured and emphasized so as to create hierarchized societies in which some are privileged and some are not. For the protection of the privileges, the society needs to be moulded by the discourse of power through indoctrination by institutions, making every member of the society "normal" according to the set norms that serve the discourse of power. Rationalised with the help of scientific disciplines, the discourse caters for the power and power caters for the discourse. The conformity to the discourse is cultivated through systems of surveillance that track and record individuals invisibly.

According to Foucault, by designating different roles to different groups of people, the society is divided into stratums from which different tasks are expected. No one can exceed the limits of their spatial zone and enter that of another. Thus, everyone knows his/her place in the society very firmly. In addition, the activities of each individual is closely controlled and inspected so that every activity serves the system, and futile activities that have no ends are prevented. Furthermore, the tasks in the society are systematised in a level-by-level system that does not allow one to move on to the next level unless they are examined by authorities for their proficiency. Through this organisation, each individual in the society becomes a small part of a bigger apparatus of the discourse of power.

Individuals are constantly checked on whether they are doing what they are expected to do, which is to fulfil the tasks given to them that contribute to the maintenance of the discourse of power and power relations. Foucault likens this

110

system of constant surveillance to Jeremy Bentham's model of prisons; the Panopticon. The Panopticon is an architectural model that designs prisons in a circular shape with a watchtower in the middle. Each cell faces the tower, and is surveyed by it ceaselessly. At this point, whether there actually is someone in the tower or not does not matter because inmates can feel the effect of the watcher on them; and thus act according to the rules. They become "normalised" in Foucauldian terms by the rules imposed on them and the surveillance system that controls how obedient they are to the rules. The discourse of power is exercised on them through rules and the control system. The society is similar in working to the prison. Each individual is an inmate who is expected to abide by the rules of the discourse and is under constant surveillance by invisible eyes so that they can be "normal" and useful for the discourse of power.

In the *Harry Potter Series*, the Dark Lord, Lord Voldemort and his followers, Death Eaters and other beings such as certain werewolves, giants and dementors benefit from the existing discourse of power to create an oppressive regime that serves themselves. The discourse in the magical world is founded on two kinds of discrimination: (1) speciesism and (2) discrimination based on blood. By reinforcing the discrimination, they can easily manipulate, control and govern different groups of beings at the same time.

The plot of the novel can be read in Foucauldian terms because Voldemort and his followers try to mould the magical society into a more subdivided one in order to designate privileges to certain people and keep the rest of the society controlled through a "divide and govern" policy. The people that are cognitively and emotionally shaped by an already existing discriminative discourse can be easily directed towards the discourse of power that serves Voldemort and his followers.

Along the same line with Foucault's understanding, a system of differences is emphasized in the magical society with speciesism and discrimination based on blood. The institutions such as Hogwarts and the Ministry of Magic contribute to the discourse of power with their speciesist and discriminating stances. Speciesism and discrimination based on blood are rationalised by claims such as "muggle-born

111

witches and wizards do not have magical ability, so they usurped magical power from those who actually deserve it".

Systems of surveillance are also implemented in the magical society. For example, witches and wizards are informed about their use of magic to the Ministry, and humans and some other species have registration bureaus in the Ministry. As Voldemort gains power in politics, the transportation and communication means of witches and wizards are controlled. Some members of the magical folk, such as Arthur Weasley, are personally tracked as well.

In alignment with Foucauldian discourse of power, the discourse of power in the magical society also relies on spatialisation. Different species are given certain roles in the society. Goblins run Gringotts and house-elves are responsible for house chores. Every member of the society is expected to know and remain in their place. In addition, as Voldemort gains strength, different groups of humans are also spatialised. The wands of muggle-born witches and wizards are taken from them; thus, they do not belong to the magical society any more. Also, students are exposed to a pedagogical system in which they have to prove their proficiency from time to time with the O.W.L. and N.E.W.T. examinations. Each individual of the society, therefore, becomes a proficient and indispensable part of the society.

The Panopticon also exists in the magical society. The control systems mentioned above are exerted on the society in an invisible way. In Voldemort's regime, his hidden personality becomes the watchtower of the Panopticon. Not personally present as a ruler; Voldemort's effect can still be felt. Somehow, people know that he is watching them and that they have to adhere to his discourse.

The study of this discriminative discourse involves speciesism and discrimination based on blood status. Speciesism can be defined as the believed superiority of humans over other species. Discrimination through blood status, on the other hand, is the believed superiority of pure-blood witches and wizards over those who are non-pure-blood. That is, the former kind of discrimination is between humans and non-humans, while the latter is amongst humans.

Voldemort makes use of the group psychology that makes discrimination possible. At this point, concepts of Social Identity Theory, self-categorisation, in-group and out-group behaviour, anthropocentricism and ethnocentrism are studied. According to Social Identity Theory, people categorise themselves and others according to the behaviour they and others exhibit. Expectations of economic benefits as well as emotional benefits such as social distinctiveness, enhanced self-esteem and diminishing of uncertainty of the future draw people to closed groups, in which they adhere to certain ways of acting and values. Favouritism of one's own group may lead to discrimination against out-group members.

Voldemort abuses the group psychology of people and the economic and emotional human needs by orienting each group towards becoming a more enclosed homogenous one where they feel safer. Each group becomes prejudiced and discriminative against the members of other groups.

By enhancing the already existing speciesism and discrimination through blood status, Voldemort aims at dividing the magical society. In terms of speciesism, the human species is set firmly above others. Species other than humans are already discriminated against by the human species. However, in return, species such as goblins and centaurs have developed their own in-group understanding of superiority, where they do not accept humans as above them. House-elves, on the other hand, have accepted the sub-human status given to them by humans. Regardless of all, humans still consider themselves superior to the others on the grounds of more cognitive ability and better magical ability. This fracture in the magical society inhibits a collaboration through which equality could be achieved.

It must be noted that for Foucault, people are the production of the discourse they exist in. In the same line, magical creatures are the production of the speciesist discourse that *they* live in. That is, although some fight for equality, they may unconsciously have a speciesist attitude towards other beings. Most Weasley children, for example, despite their anti-Voldemort stance, believe house-elves to like the job they are doing or that goblins cannot be trusted despite their struggle against Voldemort due to the discourse of power prevalent in the wizarding world.

The institutions of the wizarding society; families, Hogwarts and the Ministry of Magic contribute to the speciesist understanding as well; therefore, helping Voldemort in his efforts to keep the magical society divided.

Discrimination based on blood status is also highlighted by Voldemort and his followers for it serves the discourse of power. Different groups of humans according to their blood; pure-bloods, half-bloods, muggle-borns already exist in the society. The fourth group of squibs, one that has less to do with content of blood and more with the ability to perform magic also exists. The discourse of power in Voldemort's regime requires a more divided community than a non-human and human division. Humans should also be divided so that they can be easily governed.

Through particular surveillance systems; law, registration bureaus, control over bio-power, media and wand ownership along with torture and murder, Voldemort tries to keep the wizarding community obedient to the discourse of power. In doing so, each member of the society is recorded and tracked; and whether and how much they adhere to the system can be inspected.

One important way of surveillance pointed out in the thesis is the use of the Foucauldian bio-power by Voldemort and his followers. Bio-power is the potential of individuals; yet it has to be under scrutiny so that the biological potential of people is used in a way that serves the discourse of power, and the interests of the privileged in the society. By despising cross-breed and inter-blood marriages, the birth of individuals that make up a heterogeneous society is occluded. Especially, the production of half-blood children is discouraged because with the increasing number of half-blood individuals, the number of pure-blood individuals decrease; and with every generation, the possibility of raising the number of the pure-blood population weakens.

It seems that an ironic equality exists in Voldemort's reign. Any creature other than a pure-blood humans are equally degraded and tyrannized. Goblins, house-elves and non-pure-blood humans share the similar branding of "not being worthy of magic, and respect". Thus, they can righteously be exiled, tortured and even murdered. However, when the members on Voldemort's side and those opposite him

are analysed, it is seen that the classifications are only socially-constructed discursive concepts.

While the discourse suggests the superiority of humans over non-humans and pure-blood humans over other humans; in reality, the situation is far from that. Voldemort is followed by members of non-human species such as werewolves, giants and dementors. In addition, some members of his human followers, including himself, are not pure-blood. On the other hand, there are pure-blood humans opposing him. According to the discourse, the expectation would be pure-blood humans on one side and all other beings on the opposite side. However, categorisation here is based on whether individuals support the discourse of power that will reward its followers with certain privileges they gain over the loss of others; or whether they opt for a more egalitarian society in which every human being and other species can live justly.

From this point of view, although the discourse of power that relies on discrimination is not invented by Voldemort, it is abused by him and his followers in order to achieve certain privileges; i.e. in order to live in a society that privileges them over "others". Neither side is a homogenous group. The power discourse of Voldemort does reiterate inequality; however, rather than a sharp contrast between humans and non-humans and amongst humans due to blood status; his discourse of power expects beings to choose either the side of being privileged over the disadvantaged status of others, or being equally privileged regardless of species and blood status. In alignment with Foucault's thoughts, his discourse, like any other discourse of power, requires constant surveillance of those it seeks to govern.

In conclusion, Foucault's concepts of truth, discipline, discourse and power are applicable to the novels because in the same way Foucault understands the discourse of power, the fight in the magical world is a fight of power. Voldemort and his followers aim at building a society that will serve their interests through a discourse of power that is based on discrimination so that the magical community is perpetually divided, and thus, easier to control and govern. Methods of surveillance that work for the maintenance of power that Foucault suggests are also used in the magical society. A discriminative discourse that already exists and is contributed to by every member

of the society is exploited further by those who seek social and economic status. A society of Panopticon is sought for the system to survive. However, that the discourse of power is actually the determiner of everything is seen in the artificial discursive division of members of the society: differences between species and differences among humans are only encouraged to build a system that serves only a small group of individuals, who themselves may not fit the definition that their discourse of power seemingly imposes on others.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1954.

Anderson, Kristin J. "Discrimination". *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, edited by Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 253.

Attebery, Brian. "The Politics (If Any) of Fantasy". *Modes of the Fantastic: Selected Essays from the Twelfth International Conference on the Fantastic in the Arts*, edited by Robert A. Latham and Robert A. Collins, Greenwood Press, 1995, pp. 2-13.

Barratt, Bethany. *The Politics of Harry Potter*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bernauer, James W., and Mahon, Michael. "Michel Foucault's Ethical Imagination." *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Cutting, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 149-175.

Cantrell, Sarah K. ""I solemnly swear I am up to no good": Foucault's Heterotopias and Deleuze's Any-Spaces-Whatever in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series".*Children's Literature*, vol. 39, 2011, pp. 195-212.

Caviola, Lucius, Jim A. C. Everett and Nadira S. Faber. "The Moral Standing of Animals: Towards a Psychology of Speciesism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 1, March 2018, pp. 1-19.

Celestino, Chryssa. "Shattering Silence: Tracing Speciesism in Philippine Children's Literature." *Kritika Kultura*, vol. 24, 2015, pp. 46-59.

Chappell, Drew. "Sneaking Out After Dark: Resistance, Agency and the Postmodern Child in JK Rowling's Harry Potter Series." *Children's Literature in Education*, no. 39, 2008, pp. 281-293.

Chomsky, Noam, and Michel Foucault. *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate on Human Nature*. The New Press, 2006.

Dhont, Kristof, Gordon Hudson and Ana C. Leite. "Common Ideological Roots of Speciesism and Generalized Ethnic Prejudice: The Social Dominance Human-Animal Relations Model (SD-HARM)." *European Journal of Personality*, vol. 30, 2016, pp. 507-522.

Eco, Umberto. *Travels in Hyper-Reality: Essays.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986.

Eisenberg, Jacob. "Group Cohesiveness." *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, edited by Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 386-387.

Fields, Joyce W. "Harry Potter, Benjamin Bloom, and the Sociological Imagination." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, vol.19, no.2, 2007, pp. 167-177.

Fillingham, Lydia A. *Foucault for Beginners*. Writers and Readers, Inc, 1993.

Foucault, Michel, and Gilles Deleuze. "Intellectuals and Power." *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by D. F. Bouchard, Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 205-217.

Foucault, Michel. *Archeology of Knowledge.* Routledge, 2004.

---. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, 1995.

---. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Pantheon Books, 1978.

---. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* vol. 16, no. 1, 1986, pp. 22-27.

---. "Politics and the Study of Discourse." *Ideology and Consciousness*,vol. 3, 1978, pp. 7–26.

---. "Truth and Power." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books, 1980, pp. 109-133.

---. "Two Lectures." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books, 1980, pp. 78-108.

---. "The Subject and Power". *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 8, No. 4, Summer 1982, pp. 777-795.

Goldberg, David Theo. *Racist culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Blackwell Publishers, 1993.

Groebner, Valentin. "The carnal knowing of a coloured body: sleeping with Arabs and Blacks in the European imagination, 1300–1550". *The Origins of Racism in the West*, edited by Eliav-Feldon, Miriam et.al., Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Harry Potter Wiki. <http://harrypotter.wikia.com/wiki/Main_Page>.

Hebl Michelle R. and Juan M. Madera. "Ethocentricism". *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, edited by Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 314-315.

Hogg, Michael A. "Social Identity Theory." *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, edited by Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 901-903.

Horne, Jackie C. "Harry and the Other: Answering the Race Question in J. K: Rowling's Harry Potter." *The Lion and the Unicorn*, vol.34, no. 1, January 2010, pp. 76-104.

Horta, Oscar. "What is Speciesism?" *J Agric Environ Ethics*, vol. 23, 2010, pp. 243-266.

Howard, Susan. ""Slaves No More": The Harry Potter Series as a Postcolonial Slave Narrative."*Harry Potter's World Wide Influence*, edited by Diana Patterson. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.

Kagan, Shelly. "What's Wrong with Speciesism? (Society of Applied Philosophy annual Lecture 2015)." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 33, no.1, 2016, pp. 1-21.

Kellner, Rivka Temima. "J. K. Rowling's Ambivalence Towards Feminism: House Elves - Women in Disguise - in the "Harry Potter" Books." *The Midwest* Quarterly, vol. 51, no. 4, Summer 2010, pp. 367-385.

Law, Ian. *Racism and Ethnicity: Global Debates, Dilemmas, Directions*. Pearson Education Limited, 2010.

Lipińska, Joanna. "The Xenophobic World of Wizards: Why are they afraid of the "Other"?" *Harry Potter's World Wide Influence*, edited by Diana Patterson. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.

Maza, Luisa Grijalva. "Deconstructing the Grand Narrative in Harry Potter: Inclusion/Exclusion and Discriminatory Policies in Fiction and Practice." *Politics and Policy* 2012: 424-443.

McHoul, Alec, and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. Routledge, 1993.

Moore, John Hartwell, editor. *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism* Vol. 1. Gale Cengage Learning, 2008. 3 vols.

—. *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism*. Vol. 2, Gale Cengage Learning, 2008, 3 vols.

—. *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism*. Vol. 3, Gale Cengage Learning, 2008, 3 vols.

Mummendey, Amélie and Sabine Otten. "Positive-Negative Asymmetry in Social Discrimination." *European Review of Social Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1998, pp. 107-143.

Oberg, Andrew. "All Too Human? Speciesism, Racism and Sexism." *Think*, vol. 15, Summer 2016, pp. 39-50.

Özbek, Sinan. *Irkçılık*. Notos Kitap, 2010.

Rana, Marion. ""The less you lot have ter do with these foreigners, the happier yeh'll be: Cultural and National Otherness in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series." *International Research in Children's Literature*, vol. 4, no. 1, June 2011, pp. 45-58.

Rouse, Joseph. "Power/Knowledge." *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Cutting, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 95-122.

Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004.

---. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2007.

---. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004.

---. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2005.

---. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2003.

---. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone.* Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004.

---. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004.

---. *Pottermore*. 2018. J. K. Rowling. <www.pottermore.com>.

Saavedra, Richard. "Group Identity." *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, edited by Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 393-394.

Sawicki, Jana. "Queering Foucault and the subject of Feminism." *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Cutting, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 379-400.

Scamander, Newt. *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2001.

Simpson, William. *Hitler and Germany*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation.* Avon Books, 1991.

---. "The Animal Liberation Movement." *Old Hammond Press*, 1985.

---. "Why Speciesism is Wrong: A Response to Kagan." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 33, no. 1, February 2016, pp. 31-35.

Spears, Russell. "Ingroup-Outgroup Bias". *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, edited by Roy F. Baumeister and Kathleen D. Vohs, SAGE Publications, 2007, pp. 483-85.

Thompson, William V. "Finding a Place on the Literary Map: Harry Potter, Secondary Worlds, and Post-Potter Fantasy." *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2016, pp. 36-52.

Weedon, Chris. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Wiley, 1987.

Whitebook, Joel. "Against Interiority: Foucault's Struggle with Psychoanalysis". *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Cutting, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 312-347.

Wolosky, Shira. "Foucault at School: Discipline, Education and Agency in Harry Potter." *Children's Literature in Education*, vol. 45, 2014, pp. 285-297.

HARRY POTTER SERİSİ'NDE İKTİDARIN FOUCAULTÇU BİR OKUMASI: TÜRCÜLÜK VE KANA DAYALI AYRIMCILIK

Bu çalışmanın amacı yalnızca saf iyi ve saf kötü arasındaki savaşı konu aldığı düşünülen *Harry Potter* Serisi'nin aslında daha derin bir analizle iktidar ve iktidar söylemiyle alakalı olduğunu göstermek ve bu bağlamda Foucault'nun kavramlandırmalarını felsefi temel olarak alarak detaylı bir incelemede bulunmaktır. Teorik çözümlemelerde bilgi, disiplin ve söylem kavramları ön plana çıkmaktadır.

Kitap serisine bakıldığında ise türcülük ve kana dayalı ayrımcılık söylemleri ile toplumda ayrılıkçı hareketleri canlandıran Voldemort ve takipçilerinin Foucault'nun anlattığına paralel şekilde, kendi çıkarları için iktidar söylemini koruma çabası göze çarpmaktadır. Bir başka deyişle, toplumda hâlihazırda var olan ve herkes tarafından olmasa da kısmen ve genel bağlamda kabul gören türcülük ve kana dayalı ayrımcılıktan yola çıkarak, Voldemort ve adamları iktidar söylemlerini güçlendirmekte ve bu sayede toplumda ayrıcalıklı bir yer ve çıkarlarına hizmet edinmektedirler.

Foucault'ya göre iktidar bir kişi ya da grubun elinde tutabileceği bir nesneden ziyade hayatın her alanında var olan bir olgudur. Söylem tarafından beslenir ve karşılığında kendisi de söylemi besleyerek mutual bir ilişki tipiyle birbirlerinin var olma mücadelesine çeşitli şekillerde katkıda bulunurlar. İktidarını "elinde tutan" değil belki ama onu "yöneten" kişiler de bu sayede menfaatlerini korumuş ve kollamış olurlar (Foucault & Deleuze 215).

Bu var oluş çabasında belli kavramlar öne çıkmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki olan bilgi, Foucault'ya göre söyleme hizmet edecek şekilde manipülasyona uğrar. İnsanlardan edinilen bilgiler bilimlere dönüşerek iktidar söylemini de belirler. İktidar söylemi artık insanların ne düşüneceğini, ne söyleyeceğini ve nasıl yaşayacağını

belirleyen bir mekanizma haline gelirken; söylem içerisinde yaşayan insanları da belirli kalıplar içerisinde normalleştirerek kendi ürünü haline getirir.

Foucault'ya göre insanlar kendilerine aşamayacakları belli alanlar tahsis edilerek, sabit aktiviteler yaptırılarak, zaman çizelgelerine uydurularak ve uzmanlar tarafından kontrol edildikleri belli aşamaları geçerek ortak bir şekle büründürüldükleri disiplin mekanizmalarıyla bu kalıplara sokulurlar ve sistemin ürünü haline gelirler. Bir taraftan da insanların girmeleri gereken kalıplara ne kadar uyumlu oldukları çeşitli izleme yöntemleriyle devamlı olarak kontrol edilir. Foucault bu devamlı izleme sistemini Jeremy Bentham'ın hapishaneler için yarattığı Panopticon sistemine benzetmektedir. Bu sisteme göre yuvarlak şekilde tasarlanan hapishanede hiçbir oda yanındakini görmemektedir fakat hepsi ortadan yükselen izleme kulesine bakmaktadır. İzleme kulesi her odayı görebilir, fakat her zaman içerisinde birisi bulunmak zorunda değildir. Modern toplumlar da kayıt altına alma gibi çeşitli yöntemlerle bireyleri devamlı izlemekte ve kontrol altında tutmaktadır. Öyle ki, normalleşsinler ve iktidar söylemi tarafından belirlenen sınırların dışına çıkamasınlar.

Harry Potter Serisi'ne baktığımızda da benzer bir örgü ortaya çıkmaktadır. İktidar söylemini kendi çıkarlarına uygun hale getiren Voldemort ve takipçileri menfaatlerini korumak ve kendilerince sağladıkları bir sosyal güvence altında yaşamak niyetindedirler.

Büyü toplumunda hâlihazırda var olan fakat kitabın başladığı noktada nispeten bastırılıp kontrol altına alınabilmiş iki ayrılıkçı söylem vardır. Bunlardan ilki insanlar ve insan olmayanlar arasında var olan türcülük, ikincisi ise insanların kendi aralarında var olan kana dayalı ayrımcılıktır. Varlıkların kendilerini daha rahat ve mutlu hissettikleri kendi grup içi davranışlarından faydalanarak, Voldemort ve onu takip edenler bu ayrılıkçı fikirleri tekrar uyandırmaya çabalamış ve böylelikle herkesin kendi grubuna döndüğü ve dış dünyaya ve farklı varlıklara kendini kapattığı bir toplum yaratmaya çalışmışlardır. Bu sayede bir "böl ve yönet" politikası güdebilir ve iktidar söylemini doğru kullanarak amaçlarına ulaşabilirler.

Foucaultcu açıdan baktığımızda ise, Foucault ile paralel çizgide büyü dünyasında da gerçeklerin manipüle edilip iktidar söylemine uygun hale getirildiği görülür. Bu bağlamda insanların bütün canlılara, insanlar içerisinde de safkan büyücü olanların diğerlerine üstün oldukları fikri aşılanmıştır. Türlere ve insan türünün içerisindeki gruplaşmaya dair bilgi tamamen iktidar söylemine uygun hale getirilmiştir.

Ayrımcılık kavramını *The Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (*Sosyal Psikoloji Ansiklopedisi*) kitabında Anderson "grup üyeliğine ve bir şahsın yaş, sınıf, cinsiyet rolü, ırk, din ve cinselliğine dayanarak bir insana diğer insanlardan farklı davranma olgusu" olarak tanımlamıştır (Anderson 253). G. W. Allport ise sosyal ayrımcılığı genel ayrımcılıktan ayırmış ve sosyal ayrımcılığı "şahsi kapasite veya yeterlilik ile ya da kişinin somut bir davranışı ile alakası olmayıp yalnızca doğal ve sosyal kategorilere dayanarak yapılmış herhangi bir uygulama" olarak tanımlamıştır (Allport 52).

Bu tezde buradan yola çıkarak insanların ayrımcılığı neden uyguladığı ele alınmış ve ayrımcılığın psikolojik arka planı Sosyal Kimlik Teorisi ve Benlik Kategorizasyonu Teorisi ile açıklanmıştır. Mummendey and Otten bu teorilere dayanarak, insanların pozitif ayırt edicilikten faydalanmak amacıyla grup içi davranışlara yöneldiği ve grup dışı davranışlardan uzak durduğunu belirtmiştir (Mummendey & Otten 111). Buna göre insanların kendilerine has özelliklerinin yanı sıra üye oldukları grupla kendilerini özdeşleştirdikleri özellikler de vardır. Bu da insanları kendi grupları içerisinde daha tutkun olmaya ve başka gruplara karşı ayrımcı bir tutum sergilemeye itmektedir. Bu durumda grup üyeleri etnosantrik bir bakış açısına sahip olmaktadırlar (Hogg 901-902).

İnsanlar belli başlı birkaç sebepten dolayı ayrımcılığı mantıklı bulup uygularlar. Bu sebepler, insanların ayrımcılık sayesinde elde edecekleri ödüllerle açıklanır. Bu ödüller ekonomik bir kazanç ya da sosyal statü olabilir. Bunun yanı sıra kişinin kendinin de dâhil olduğu grubun üyeleriyle oluşturduğu birliktelik, ona duygusal anlamda da kazanç sağlar (Spears 483-485).

Bu durumda türcülük önemli bir kavram olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Türcülük, kısa tanımıyla bir türün diğer bir türe karşı uyguladığı ayrımcılıktır. Celestino daha spesifik bir tanımla türcülüğü "insan üstünlüğünün kabulü ve bu üstünlük düşüncesinin getirdiği aşırı bir hakimiyet" olarak tanımlar (Celestino 46). Bu açıdan da türcülük insan merkezli, antroposantrik bir kavramdır.

İnsanlar insan olmayan türlere karşı ayrımcılığı üç ana başlıkla meşrulaştırmaktadır. Bunlar, (1) hayvanlardaki akli yetersizlik, (2) hayvanlardaki ahlaki yetersizlik ve (3) hayvanlarda acı hissinin olmamasına dayanmaktadır (Caviola, Everett & Faber 2). Fakat yalnızca bu düşünce tarzından yola çıkıldığında, bazı şempanze türlerinin bazı insanlardan daha zeki olmasına rağmen yine de insanlardan aşağı görülmesi, insanların hayvanların kendi aralarında da kendilerine göre hiyerarşik bir sistem oluşturması (evcil hayvanları "yenecek" hayvanlardan üstün tutması), ya da aynı hayvan türü içerisinde bile yaptığı hiyerarşik konumlandırma (bazı balık türleri evcil hayvanken bazılarının yemek olması) insanların bu düşünce sisteminin tutarsızlıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Dahası, bazı insanların da ahlaki anlamda hayvanların seviyesine ulaşamadığı görülmüştür (Caviola, Everett & Faber 2). Öte yandan, hayvanların acı çekmediği fikrinin de bilimsel bir arka planı yoktur (Singer, "Animal Liberation Movement" 4-6).

Bu açıdan, *Harry Potter Serisi*'ndeki türcülük gerçek dünyadaki türcülüğün bir yansıması olup iktidar söyleminin önemli bir parçasıdır. Kitap serisinde var olan türler "ruhlar", "hayvanvari varlıklar" ve "insanvari varlıklar" olmak üzere üç gruba ayrılmış; bu gruplar da kendi içlerinde alt gruplara ayrılmıştır. İnsanlar bu türleri yukarıdaki gibi, belli özelliklere sahip olmamalarından dolayı kendilerinden farklı gruba sokmuşlardır. Türcülük açısından bu karakterler daha da yakından incelenecek olursa, ruhları kategori-dışı bırakmak gerekir, zira türcülüğün asıl uygulayıcısı olan insanlar bunu hayvanvari varlıklar grubuna uygulamaktadırlar. Bu grup içerisinde özellikle devler, cincüceler ve ev cinleri insan türü tarafından sistematik bir aşağılama ve negatif türcülüğe maruz bırakılmış, asa kullanma yetkileri ellerinden alınmıştır. Bu yetki yalnızca insan türüne mahsustur.

İnsan olmayan türler insanlar tarafından alacakları negatif tepkileri bilmekte ve ona göre davranmaktadırlar. Örnek vermek gerekirse, kendi okullarında öğretmenlik, hatta okul müdürlüğü yapıyor olsalar bile yarı-dev veya kurt adam gibi insan olmayan türler soylarını öğrenci ailelerinden gelecek tepkilere karşı saklama ihtiyacı hissetmektedirler.

Cincücelerle insanlar arasında yüzyıllar boyu süregelen bir düşmanlık söz konusudur. İnsanlar cincücelere asa kullanma yetkisi vermemiş, karşılığında da cincücelerden onların çok yetenekli olduğu kılıç yapımı ve metal şekillendirmesini öğrenememişlerdir. İki taraf da diğerine üstünlüğünü kanıtlamaya çalışmaktadır ve diğerini güvenilir bulmamaktadır. Benzer şekilde, ev cinleri de sistematik bir türcülüğe maruz kalmış, yine asa kullanma yetkisi ellerinden alınıp üstelik bir de insanların evlerinde kölelik yapma sorumluluğu kendilerine yüklenmiştir. Görünüşe göre bu kölelik hali ev cinleri için bir sorun teşkil etmemektedir. Öyle ki bu görevden seve seve ayrılan (kovulan) ve maaş karşılığı Hogwarts'a işe giren Dobby karakterini diğer ev cinleri hoş karşılamamaktadır. Ev cinlerinin grup içi normları bir sahibinin olmamasını ve para kazanmayı "aşağılık bir hareket" olarak görmek üzerinedir.

Dahası, büyücüler de bu ayrılıkçı söylemi oluşturup bundan faydalanmışlardır. Foucault'ya göre kurumlar söylem yaratma ve devam ettirme konusunda çok önemli ve etkilidirler. Ona göre, bir toplumda iktidarı ve onun söylemini oluşturan mekanizmalar şarttır ki iktidar söylemi devam edebilsin (Foucault, "Two Lectures" 93). Büyücülük dünyasındaki bu mekanizmaları oluşturan en önemli kurumlar ise aileler, Sihir Bakanlığı, ve Hogwarts Büyücülük Okulu'dur.

Aileler türcü bakış açılarıyla yetişmiş ve çocuklarını da bu şekilde yetiştirmektedirler. Çoğu aileye göre büyücü insanlar dışındaki varlıklar güvenilmez veya tehlikelidir. Aileler farklı türlerden gelen öğretmenleri ve öğrencileri okulda istemezler ve çocuklarının farklı türlerle evlilik yapmalarına sıcak bakmazlar. Hogwarts ise ilk görünüşte farklı türlerden öğretmenler işe almasıyla ve ev cinlerine okulda nispeten iyi davranılmasıyla gayet eşitlikçi bir okul gibi görünse de müfredatına bakıldığında özellikle anti-cincüceci bir tarih dersi içeriği göze çarpmaktadır. Bu da okuldaki öğrencilerin içinde yetiştirildiği söylemi ve zihniyetin

yansımasıdır. Sihir Bakanlığı ise her bir tür için bir alt komisyona sahip olmakla beraber çalışanları arasında diğer türlerin neredeyse hiç olmaması ve Bakanlık'ın girişindeki "Kardeşlik Havuzu"ndaki heykelle türcü bir anlayışa sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Bakanlığın girişindeki çeşmenin ortasında bir heykel yer almakta ve bu heykelde büyücü bir kadın ve adam asalarını gökyüzüne doğru tutmaktadırlar. Diğer sihirli türler ise bu kadın ve erkeğin altındadır ve onlara/yukarıya doğru "imrenerek" bakmaktadırlar. Bu heykelin Bakanlık'ın girişinde olması Bakanlık'ın her bir ziyaretçisine verdiği türcü bir mesajdır. Öte yandan, Voldemort güçlendiğinde bu heykel değişmiş, diğer türler heykelden çıkarılmış ve altında kafatasları bulunan bir tahta oturan bir büyücü yapılmış, altına da "Sihir Hâkimiyettir" yazısı yazılmıştır. Bu yeni heykel Bakanlık'ın zaten türcü olan söyleminin ne kadar daha kötüye gittiğinin somut bir simgesi olmuştur. Bununla beraber, Bakanlık her fırsatta Hogwarts'a da müdahale etmiş, türcü zihniyete sahip hocalar göndermiş ve okuldaki işleyişe sürekli karışmak suretiyle söylemini okuldaki yeni nesillere de aktarmıştır.

Büyücülük dünyasında iktidar elde etmenin yolu olarak türcülüğün bir başka örneği ise biyoiktidardır. Biyoiktidar Foucault'ya göre insanın biyolojik potansiyelinin iktidar söyleminin ihtiyaç ve isteklerine göre manipüle edilmesidir (Foucault, *History of Sexuality* 140). Bu durumda büyücülerin yarı-insan türlerine karşı olan negatif bakışı bir biyoiktidar baskısı örneğidir. Öyle ki yarı-türler iş edinmede ve sosyal hayata girmede zorluk çekmektedirler. Dolayısıyla da toplum yarı-tür nesiller oluşturma konusunda temkinli hale getirilmiştir.

Tezde büyücülük dünyasındaki iktidar edinmenin yolu olarak türcülüğün son örneği de asa kullanmaya getirilen düzenlemeler üzerinedir. İnsan türü diğer türlerin asa kullanmasını engelleyerek kendi iktidarını oluşturmakta ve sosyal hayatta diğer türlere avantaj bırakmamaktadır.

Büyülü dünyadaki tek ayrılıkçı hareket türcülük değildir. İnsan ırkı da kendi içerisinde gruplara ayrılmıştır ve farklı gruplara karşı farklı davranış tipleri geliştirmişlerdir. İnsan ırkı kanının içeriğine göre üç gruba ayrılır. Bunlar (1) safkan

büyücüler, (2) yarım-kan büyücüler ve (3) mugglelardan[18] doğma büyücülerdir. Bu sınıflandırmanın dışında bir de "squib" adı verilen ve büyücü bir aileden gelmiş olmasına rağmen büyücülük yeteneği olmayan kişilerin dâhil olduğu grup vardır.

Büyücülük dünyası hâlihazırda kendi içinde gruplaşmış ve okuyucunun dünyasında da var olan çeşitli uygulamalar geliştirmiştir. Türkçe'ye "Bulanık" olarak çevrilen "Mudblood" kavramı, anne ve babası büyücü olmayan büyücüler için kullanılan son derece aşağılayıcı bir terimdir. Serinin ikinci kitabından itibaren sıklıkla Voldemort takipçisi karakterler tarafından kullanılıp bu ayrımcı söylemin simgesi olmuştur. Öte yandan, bir kişinin üst soyunda yalnızca bir kişinin bile safkan olmamasından dolayı yarım-kan olması ve gelecek nesillerin bu şekilde devam edecek olması da eski İspanya'daki "Limpieza de Sangre" yasalarına benzemektedir ve Voldemort takipçilerine göre görünüşte bu kişilerin artık büyücülüğün belli faydalarından yararlanma hakkını kaybetmesi gerekmektedir. Fakat Voldemort'un takipçilerine göre bir "bulanık" ya da "yarım-kan" olmak dışlanmanın tek sebepleri değildir. Safkan büyücüler eğer bu iki gruba, insan dışı türlere ya da büyücü olmayanlara empatiyle yaklaşıyorsa, bu durumda saf kanlarına ihanet etmiş olmaktadırlar. Bu kişiler de diğer grupların üyeleri gibi dışlanmaktadırlar.

İnsanların kendi aralarında olan ayrılıkçılık Voldemort'ın "böl ve yönet" politikasını uygulamadaki en uygun ve en önemli alandır. İktidar söylemini ayrımcılık üzerinden oluşturan Voldemort, çeşitli yollarla daha önceden de var bu söylemi devam ettirmeye ve kendi emelleri için kullanmaya çalışmaktadır.

Foucault için "modern iktidar" yöntemi olan ve Jeremy Bentham'ın mimari planı Panopticon'dan faydalanarak teorileştirdiği kontrol mekanizmaları da büyücülük dünyasında kullanılmıştır. Panopticon bir hapishane modelidir ve bu modele göre çember şeklindeki bir binada odalar vardır. Her birinin ön yüzü açıktır ve çemberin tam ortasında bulunan gözlem kulesine bakarlar. Odalar birbirini görmez; yalnızca gözlem kulesini görür. Gözlem kulesinde birisinin var olup olmadığı mühim değildir çünkü mahkûmlar orada birisi varmış gibi davranışlarını

---

[18]Muggle: Büyücü olmayan kişi

kontrol ederek yaşarlar; yani, kendilerini Panopticon'un istediği şekle sokarlar (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 200-201).

Buna benzer olarak da toplumlar da görünmez mekanizmalarla devamlı gözlemlenerek kontrol altına alınır ve söylemin gerektirdiği ürünler haline getirilirler. Bu da modern iktidarın işleyiş şeklidir. Büyücülük dünyasında bu Panopticon sistemi de biyoiktidar sistemi de, Foucault'nun öngördüğü diğer sistemler de bir model olarak bulunmaktadır.

Bu uğurda atılan en önemli adımlardan biri büyücülük yasalarının değiştirilmesidir. Kitaptaki karakterlerin tarifine göre Voldemort'un güce ulaşması sessizce ve derinden olmuş, adım adım geldiği için ses çıkaran insan sayısı da fazla olmamıştır. Bunun sonucunda ise Sihir Bakanlığı'nca yasalar değişmiş, safkan olmayanların ellerinden asalarının alınmasını ve büyücülerin fişlenmesini ve takip edilmesini amaçlayan "kayıt büroları" oluşturulmuş, insanlar sorguya ve işkenceye maruz kalmıştır. Bunların tamamı, Voldemort'un sistemine direnildiği için yapılmıştır. Zira ilginç bir şekilde Voldemort'un takipçilerinin de tamamı safkan değildir. Hatta Voldemort da yarım-kandır. Bu da ayrımcılık söyleminin insanları aslında farklı türler ve insanlar arasında farklı kanlardan ziyade Voldemort'un sistemini destekleyenler ve desteklemeyenler arasında bir çizgi çektiğini göstermektedir.

Biyoiktidar yöntemi burada da kullanılmıştır. Bir kez safkanın dışına çıkıldığında gelecek tüm nesiller yarım-kan olduğu için büyücülük nüfusunda yarım-kan büyücülerin sayısı devamlı artmış, safkanların ise oranı azalmıştır. Bu da bir biyoiktidar gerekliliğini getirmiştir. Büyücülerin büyücü olmayanlarla birlikteliği engellenerek bu sayının; yani Voldemort'un iktidar söylemine her an karşı çıkacak bir grubun oluşması engellenmeye çalışılmıştır. Bunun yasasını çıkaracak fırsat bulunamamış, bu düşünce söylemde kalmıştır; fakat bazı safkan aileler yüzyıllardır saf olan kanlarını çocuklarını başka kana sahip olanlarla evlendirmeyerek, ya da kendilerine bu konuda karşı çıkmış çocukları ailelerinden silerek sağlamışlardır.

Türler arasında yapılan ayrımcılığa benzer olarak, yukarıda da bahsedildiği gibi, asalar kontrol edilmeye çalışılmış, Voldemort'un bu ayrılıkçı söylemine karşı çıkan ya da söylemin dışında kalan büyücülerin asalarına el konulmuştur.

Bununla beraber, devamlı medya kontrol edilmiş ve söylemin gerektirdiği haberler yaptırılmış, alternatif medya kaynakları baskılanmıştır. Voldemort ayrıca Foucault'nun "eski iktidar" olarak adlandırdığı işkence ve katletme yöntemlerini de kullanmıştır.

Voldemort türler ve insanlar arasında var olan ve yukarıda bahsedilen sürtüşme halinden faydalanmış ve her grubun kendi iç-grup dinamiklerini güçlendirerek diğer gruplara karşı ayrılıkçı tavırlar sergilemelerini amaçlamıştır. Burada önemli bir nokta Voldemort'un bu ayrılıkçı söylemi sıfırdan yaratmadığı, fakat hazır olan bir zararlı söylemi ısrarla canlandırmaya çalıştığıdır. Zaten bu sebepten dolayı görünürde Voldemort karşıtları bile bilmeyerek onun iktidar söyleminin devamlılığını sağlayacak nitelikte davranışlar sergilemektedir. Normalde Voldemort'un sistemine, dolayısıyla türcülüğe ve kana dayanan ayrımcılığa karşı görünen Weasley ailesinin üyeleri bile ev cinlerinin haklarını küçümseyebilmekte, cincücelerine karşı anlayışsız tavırlar sergileyebilmektedir.

Voldemort ayrımcı söylemi güçlendirmiş, ayrılıkçı hareketleri canlandırmış ve her bir grubu yalnızca kendi içinde homojenize olmasını sağlamıştır. Bu şekilde, normalde heterojen bir toplum olan büyücü toplumunda herkes kendi kabuğuna çekilip diğer gruplardan uzak kalmayı yeğlemiştir. Dolayısıyla da Voldemort büyücülük toplumunda başarılı bir şekilde "böl ve yönet" politikasını uygulamaya geçirmiştir. Herkesin kendi küçük grubunun içerisinde kalması Voldemort'un daha kolay yöneteceği bir toplum oluşturmuş; yönetilemeyecek olanlar ise adeta toplumdan aforoz edilmiştir.

Bu söylemin ise en tehlikeli tarafı var olan bir söylem üzerine inşa edilmiş olması; dolayısıyla büyücülük dünyasındaki var olan yanlış uygulamaların devam ettirilmesiyle insanların düşüncelerinin manipüle edildiğinin fark edilmemesidir. Bir başka deyişle, büyücülük dünyası hali hazırda türcü ve kendi arasında ayrımcı olduğu için, içinde bulundukları yaşam tarzının aslında dolaylı olarak Voldemort'a hizmet

ettiğini anlamamışlardır. Örnek vermek gerekirse, Weasley ailesi gibi tamamen Voldemort'un karşısında olan bir aile bile türcü davranışlar sergileyebilmekte ve aslında bu ayrımcı iktidar söyleminin parçası olabilmektedirler. Bununla beraber, Voldemort'a destek versin ya da vermesin, cincüceler de dâhil neredeyse herkes ev cinlerinin köleliğini normal karşılamaktadır. Hatta cincüceleri kendilerine yapılan ayrımcılığa karşı çıkmakta, fakat yine de kendilerini ev cinlerinde üstün görmektedirler.

Özetle, büyücülük dünyası Foucault'nun da belirttiği disiplin ve normalleştirme mekanizmalarına halihazırda sahiptir ve bu var olan sistem Voldemort tarafından kullanılmıştır.

Voldemort, psikolojiyi kullanarak kendi yandaşlarına belli vaatlerde bulunmuş, onlara ekonomik, sosyal ve duygusal ödüller kazandırabileceği bir sistem oluşturmaya çalışmıştır. Bu şekilde insanların dikkatini çekip yandaş toplayabilmiştir. Kendi söylemi görünürde antroposentrik bir anti-safkan söylem gibi görünse de kendisi de dahil olmak üzere takipçilerinin tamamı safkan değildir. Dahası, türcü bir söyleme sahip gibi görünmesine rağmen bütün takipçileri insan da değildir. Voldemort'un takipçileri arasında ruh emiciler ya da kurt adamlar da bulunmaktadır. Bu da Voldemort'un iktidar söylemini manipüle ederek aslında kendisini takip eden belli bir zümreye ayrıcalıklar tanıdığı bir sistem yaratmaya çabaladığını göstermektedir.

Foucault'un teorisi ile aynı noktada olmak üzere, büyülü toplum da iktidar söylemini belli mekanizmalar üzerinden var etmekte ve uygulamaktadır. Büyülü toplumun her üyesinin toplumdaki yeri bellidir. Cincüceler büyücülük bankası Gringotts'u işletir ve ev cinleri ev işlerine bakar. Safkancı bir sistem yaratmaya çalışanlara göre büyücü ebeveynlerden doğmamış büyücülerin büyü toplumunda hiç yeri olmadığı gibi onları savunan safkanlar da kanlarına hıyanet etmektedirler. Disiplin yöntemlerinin diğerlerini oluşturan sabit aktiviteler ve zaman çizelgeleri birçok modern toplum gibi büyücü toplumunda da vardır. Öte yandan, tıpkı Foucault'un anlattığı gibi, büyücü dünyasında da uzmanlar tarafından değerlendirilen çeşitli sınavlar ve aşılacak barajlar vardır. Örneğin, Hogwarts öğrencileri O.W.L.

(Sıradan Büyücülük Düzeyi Sınavı) ve N.E.W.T. (Feci Yorucu Büyücülük Sınavı) sınavlarına girip gelecekte seçebilecekleri meslekleri belirlemektedirler. Ayrıca öğrenciler 17 yaşında "cisimlenme ve buharlaşma" sınavına girmektedirler.

Bundan yola çıkarak Voldemort da var olan sistemi kendi amaçlarına hizmet edecek şekilde kullanmaya çalışmıştır. Var olan söylemlerden kendi söylemini oluşturmuş ve Foucault'un iddia ettiği ile aynı doğrultuda, büyülü varlıkların söyleme uygun hareket edip etmediğini Panopticon-vari şekilde mesela Hogwarts'a kendi ile aynı çizgide ve kendisine direkt rapor gönderecek Dolores Umbridge'in atanmasını sağlayarak, safkan olmayanları ayırt etmek amacıyla kayıt büroları kurarak ya da safkan olmayan bazı büyücülerin elinden asalarını alıp onları büyülü dünyada işlevsiz bırakarak izleme ve kontrol mekanizmalarını kullanmıştır.

Söylemin tehlikesi bilmeden ve fark etmeden ona istemsizce katkıda bulunuluyor olmasıdır. Hogwarts'ın müfredatı zaman zaman ciddi anlamda türcü olabilmekte ve dolayısıyla Hogwarts türcü gençler yetiştirebilmektedir (özellikle cincücelere karşı Tarih dersi acımasız olabilmektedir). Aileler fark etmeden türcü ya da kana bağlı ayrımcı olabilmektedirler.

Söylem konusuna biraz daha dikkatle bakıldığında görünen odur ki ne Voldemort'un yanındakiler tamamen safkan insanlardan oluşan bir gruptur, ne de Voldmeort'un karşısındakiler tamamen safkan olmayanlardan oluşmuştur. Voldemort'un kendisi başta olmak üzere birçok yarım-kan büyücü kendisinin yanındadır. Öte yandan, kendisi türcülüğü savunuyor görünse de bazı kurt adamlar, devler ya da ruh emiciler de Voldemort'tan yanadır. Bu durum her ayrılıkçı iktidar söyleminin aslında söylemden ibaret olduğunu ve bilimsel ve felsefi bir arka planının olmadığını kanıtlar nitelikte olup Foucault'un duruşuna benzemektedir.

Kısacası, iktidar söylemini oluşturan ve/veya katkıda bulunan bilgi disiplin mekanizmalarıyla kuvvetlendirilir. Halk bu söyleme uygun hale gelecek şekilde şekillendirilir ve insanların söyleme ne kadar ayak uydurduğu devamlı izlenip değerlendirilir. Bu izleme mekanizmasının açıkça var olmayışı insanların o yokmuş gibi davranmasına sebep olmaz; bu açıdan Panopticon gibi bir zihinsel hapishane söz konusudur. İnsanlar bu şekilde söylemin gerektirdiği ürünler haline gelir. *Harry*

Potter kitaplarında iktidar söylemini kendi çıkarları için kullananlar ayrılıkçılığı destekleyerek "böl ve yönet" politikası gütmekte, bu sayede insanların rahatça kontrolünü sağlamak niyetindedir. Detaylı bir incelemede bu kişilerin kendilerinin de ayrılıkçı kriterlere uymadığı görülmektedir. Bu durumda ancak söylevsel bir ayrımcılığın var olabileceği durumu söz konusudur. Anlaşılan o ki, ayrımcılık bu insanlar için kesinlikle amaç değil, yalnızca menfaatlerine ulaşmalarını ve bunu ellerinde tutmalarını sağlayan bir araçtır.

B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : ....

Adı / Name : ....

Bölümü / Department : ....

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : ....

....

....

....

....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☐ Doktora / PhD ☐

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☐

2. Tez <u>iki yıl</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of <u>two year</u>. * ☐

3. Tez <u>altı ay</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of <u>six months</u>. * ☐

* *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature .... Tarih / Date ....