

Harry Potter ist vermutlich nicht das erste literarische Werk, welches mit der Thematik Überwachung, oder auch Herrschaft und Macht in Verbindung gebracht wird. Jene Themen, vor allem basierend auf Michel Foucaults Abhandlung *Überwachen und Strafen: Die Geburt des Gefängnisses*, verknüpft mit den Ausführungen über den Herrschaftsbegriff Richard Sennetts, der Idee der totalen Institution seitens Erving Goffman und der Fragen zu Macht sowie den drei Idealtypen der legitimen Herrschaft von Max Weber, sollen Bestandteil und Grundlage dieser Bachelorarbeit sein. Hogwarts wird von seitens Harrys bereits sehr früh als neue Heimat, ein Ort an dem er sich, trotz seines Ruhmes, akzeptiert fühlt, angesehen. Hogwarts sei sicher, auch wenn es im Verlauf der Reihe zu vermehrten Übergriffen auf Schüler kommt. Die Analyse der gegebenen Systeme, welche in sich gesehen als effektive Anwendung der Theorie des Panoptikum bestimmt werden können, sowie deren Verknüpfung mit den obengenannten Theorieansätzen, zeigte jedoch, dass weder die magische Welt noch Hogwarts als sicher zu determinieren sind. Dies ist sowohl auf die jeweiligen Repräsentationsfiguren, deren Qualifikationen und praktizierte Methoden, sowohl als auch auf die systemimmanenten Elemente zurück zu führen. Ein Ziel der Arbeit ist, abgesehen von der Darstellung und Examinierung des Ministeriums, Voldemorts, Dumbledores und im weiteren Sinne Harrys anhand spezifischer Fragestellungen, das Zeigen des Faktes, dass obwohl Überwachung, vor allem jene zur Erlangung von jedweder Sicherheit, nicht nur eng mit der Frage nach Macht verknüpft ist, sondern immer mit dem wesentlichen Verlust von Freiheit einhergeht. Die Dichotomie von Freiheit und dem Verlangen nach Sicherheit trägt dabei zur Fügsamkeit der sowohl magischen als auch der nichtmagischen Massen bei.

List of Abbreviations

BBC	British Broadcasting Cooperation
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
cf	compare
D.A.	Dumbledore's Army
etc	et cetera
ff	following
GPS	Global Positioning System
MoM	Ministry of Magic
NSA	National Security Agency of the United States of America
par	paragraph
qtd	quoted
sec	section
UK	United Kingdom

Abstract	II
List of Abbreviations	III
1 Introduction	5
2 Power, Authority and Surveillance	8
2.1 Power and Authority	8
2.1.1 Power	8
2.1.2 Authority	10
2.2 Surveillance	13
2.2.1 The Panopticon	16
3 Power, Authority and Surveillance in the Wizarding World	19
3.1 I will have order! – The Ministry of Magic	22
3.1.1 I The Ministry – Power and Authority through Law	23
3.1.2 Prominent and Problematic – Cornelius Fudge and Dolores Umbridge	26
3.1.3 Instruments of Surveillance	30
3.2 He-Who-Must-No-Be-Named returns! Voldemort and the Death Eaters	33
3.2.1 Voldemort – Power and Authority through Fear	33
3.2.2 Instruments of surveillance	38
3.3 I'll have a look inside your mind/ And tell where you belong! – Hogwarts	40
3.3.1 Hogwarts – Heterotopia and Total Institution	40
3.3.2 Dumbledore and Hogwarts – Power and Authority	45
3.3.3 Instruments of Surveillance in Hogwarts	47
3.4 Harry the secret guardian?	53
4 Conclusion	59
Bibliography	V
Statement of authorship	XI
Notes	XII

1984, *V for Vendetta* or *Equilibrium* have applied and shown the results of it, the NSA scandal involving the interception of mobile phones of high ranking officials and politicians has brought it out in the open and demonstrated what the public had pushed into the deepest recess of their minds: “Surveillance is an inescapable part of life” (Bowcott), because “[e]very time we make a telephone call, send an email, browse the internet, or even walk down our local high street, our actions may be monitored and recorded” (House of Lords 5). However, we are not just observed by “Big Brother” via cameras or have our most private conversations intercepted, but rather share private information willingly with our peers and a worldwide community via social media platforms such as Facebook or Twitter. Many scholars, among them David Lyon have stated that “it is commonly held that contemporary capitalist nation-states are ‘surveillance societies’” (Wood 259). Surveillance studies have been dealing with this question and the analysis of contemporary societies since the rise of instruments of public surveillance such as CCTV and the events of September 11, 2001 and July 7, 2005. Authors, such as George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, Alan Moore and David Lloyd, have revisited the same questions even before Surveillance Studies started to gain footing. However, even though those books might deal with power and surveillance in a place detached from our time or the places we inhabit, there are other works of fiction, which address similar issues in an unobtrusive manner.

When in 1997 *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* was published by Bloomsbury neither the publisher, Joanne K. Rowling nor the public could have imagined the huge impact which said book, or the entire series for that matter, would have on an entire generation of children as well as on many adults, who delved into the magical world that Rowling readily provided through her work. Seventeen years, seven books with more than 420 million copies in print worldwide in 60 languages, eight movies and video games and an uncountable number of mesmerized fans, who stuck with the “Boy who lived” later the spell which the series holds over its readership has not ceased to exist. *Harry Potter* has become more than just a few books, it has become an icon in modern pop culture (cf. Heilman 1). The *Harry Potter* brand is now an estimated four billion dollars worth and has been credited for a renaissance in reading for children today (cf. Heilman 1–2). It has grown into the biggest children's publishing and merchandising phenomenon of modern times (cf. Heilman 1). Even in 2014, seven years after the last book and three years after the last film were released the phenomenon continues to penetrate our lives. Whether it is the *Harry Potter* shop and the marking of the Platform 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ at King's Cross that draws in tourists and non-tourists alike, various Twitter accounts relating *Harry Potter* facts, or the release of new, revised book covers and the publishing of complementary books such as *Fantastic Beasts and where to find them* (2011), *The Tales of Beedle the Bard* (2007) or *Quidditch through the Ages* (2001) which ought to deepen the understanding of the magical world the readers have grown so fond of — *Harry Potter* is still trending. However, the biggest contribution to extending

this franchise comes not just from the countless fans working writing fan fiction in order to prolong their Harry Potter experience for a little while longer but from Rowling herself. In 2011 Rowling “launched the website Pottermore to continue the story of the young boy wizard” (Cooke), continuing, explaining and expanding her world. The website is a mixture between an illustrated and interactive version of each Harry Potter book, a walk-through game for every reader and an accumulation of background information which were not included, sometimes not even hinted at, within the books as well as short stories that function as prequels or sequels to the books, giving the audience glimpses of a time before and after the series. Even though some have accused Rowling of “know[ing] how to keep people talking about her creation” (Koski) and trying to squeeze more money out of her readers, her website offers the fans a universe besides the books, giving the entire series more depth and showing that even for an author the end of a series is not necessarily the end.

Being one of the most read books in children literature and one of the most popular major works in fantasy literature, amongst J.R.R. Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*, Carroll Lewis' *The Chronicles of Narnia* or Philipp Pullmann's *His Dark Materials* and various others, the scholarly and academic processing of the series has been largely missing. Up to 2014 there are still comparatively few works that give serious consideration to social, political and cultural issues in Rowling's work. Among them are Neuman and Nexon's *Harry Potter and International Relations*, Bethany Barratt's *The Politics of Harry Potter*, Dedria Bryfonski's collection *Political Issues in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series*, Giselle Anatol's *Reading Harry Potter* and Elizabeth Heilman's *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter* which provide synopses of several political and social themes that appear in the books. Recurring themes in said works are the topics ‘Race’, ‘Power’, ‘Knowledge’, ‘War’, ‘Terror’, ‘Resistance’, ‘Technology’ and ‘Theology’ but also questions of good and evil, morality, identity and Human rights, which widen the scope for further research. The subject of surveillance, unlike questions of power, features mostly on the periphery. Hence, this thesis will analyse not only questions of power but will furthermore try to answer questions concerning the motivations, effects, and means of surveillance in the series. Who controls whom and to which extend? Which instruments of surveillance do the various authorities use? Why is surveillance necessary to sustain power?

The first chapter will deal with a general perspective on power and the main theories of power and legitimate power, also called authority, according to Max Weber, Richard Sennett, and Michel Foucault. The following chapter will draw on those theories in order to establish a general perspective on the practice of surveillance, with a specific focus on the United Kingdom and its mechanisms of surveillance like CCTV. It will be complemented by an overview of the ideal joining of power and surveillance in an architectural structure called ‘Panopticon’ as proposed by Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the Prison*. Whereas the first two chapters deal with an overview of the main theories and scholars which build the basis for the following analysis, the third chapter will deal with systems of power and authority and means of surveillance in the *Harry Potter* universe, by taking a closer look

at the Wizarding World, its international and national institutions. The third chapter will use a deductive approach, progressing from the relatively weak system of power that is the Ministry of Magic, to the dictatorial system which is tied in with Voldemort, culminating in the closed system Hogwarts with Albus Dumbledore and Harry Potter at its helm. Each system will be analysed according to power, authority, and its means of controlling inferiors and equals through the “eye of power” (*Power/Knowledge* 146). The three main systems will be defined as separate panoptic Towers with their respective guardians, which try to exert influence over each other and which need to have a tight grip onto its subjects in order to function, while trying to bridge the obvious gap in the means of surveillance in the Muggle and the Wizarding World by proposing possible equivalents. The focus shall lie on the system Hogwarts, as it is the only system the reader fully experiences through the eyes of Harry Potter. Furthermore, because it is a closed system, or by conferring to Goffman's work *Asylums* a total institution, it is the most appropriate system to apply Foucault's and Bentham's theory to. Each subchapter will try to answer four main questions: Who is in power? How is power legitimised? Which instruments of surveillance are used in order to achieve obedience? Why is the system not sustainable in the long run?

The fourth chapter will sketch Harry's status as a docile, unknowing inmate of the Panopticon, who has been given the instruments to become a guardian and his mentors successor himself. These, what Jamie Warner calls “zones of shade” will be explored briefly in order to answer the question, whether Hogwarts, if it is a Panopticon in the Foucauldian sense, is truly safe.

2.1 Power and Authority

You had to live—did live, from habit that became instinct—in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and except in darkness, every movement scrutinised.
(Orwell 7)

2.1.1 Power

Power, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, can be defined as “[p]hysical strength and force exerted by something or someone”, “[t]he capacity or ability to direct or influence the behaviour of others or the course of events” as well as “[p]olitical or social authority or control” that is either exercised by a government or given to a person or a body. Thomas Hobbes, who stated in the first part of *Leviathan or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Common Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil* that “[t]he power of man [...] is his present means, to obtain some future apparent good; and is either ‘original’ or ‘instrumental’” (Hobbes par. 1). Hobbes explains that natural power or original power is the “eminence of the faculties of body or mind, as extraordinary strength, form, prudence, arts, eloquence, liberality, nobility” (Hobbes par. 2), whereas instrumental power is defined as the “means and instruments to acquire more, as riches, reputation, friends, and the secret working of God, which men call good luck” (Hobbes par. 2). These basic definitions have a few points in common. The focus lies on terms such as ‘control’, ‘strength’ of mind and body, ‘force’ and by extension ‘coercion’ and ‘violence’, as well as on the concept of two opposing positions namely a group of people who hold power, in whichever form, and of a group of people or a person upon which power is exercised. Furthermore, power has the ability to shape and alter behaviour and people, to regulate and organise them. However, these definitions even though they offer a general framework of what power might be, fail to explain between which individuals power is exercised and how it is done, which instruments those in power use to exercise it or simply whether there is more to power than the general idea one has in mind.

Before one may explain power, it is necessary as Foucault explains in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* that

[w]e must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes’, it ‘represses’, it ‘censors’, it ‘abstracts’, it ‘masks’, it ‘conceals’. In fact power produces; 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. (194)

Power, therefore, is neither negative nor positive – it simply exists. Foucault goes on to describe in *The History of Sexuality* as well as in *Subject and Power* that power is not something that people ‘have’ or possess and freely wield over one another

(Foucault, *Sexuality* 94) as it does not exist “universally in a concentrated or diffused form” rather than as an action to be engaged in as “[p]ower exists only when it is put into action” (Foucault, *Subject and Power* 219). Though power is usually connoted with a hierarchical structure from ruler to subject or inherent to the state, Foucault states that power is distributed vertically and horizontally, between different individuals either on different levels or on the same level. Consequently, every relationship between individuals or groups may be defined as a power relationship (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 205), which “always entails a set of actions performed upon another person’s actions and reactions. Although violence may be a part of some power relationships, in itself the exercise of power is not violence” (Foucault, *Subject and Power* 220). Additionally, he states: “[w]here there is power, there is resistance” (Foucault, *Sexuality* 95). Resistance does belong to every power relation and manifests itself in different forms and with different aims. There is no “locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary” (Foucault, *Sexuality* 96) but a plurality of resistances, which sometimes undermine and often confirm power. This opposition shows, that ‘the Other’ as a reference point for confirmation does play a role within power relations. Still, there are other aspects to power. Power has to be “continuously excised in foundations of society, in the subtlest kinds of ways”, it has to “function outside of sovereignty” (Foucault, *Discipline* 208), it should be “light and effective” (Foucault, *Discipline* 209) and needs to be “permanent[ly] visib[le to assure its] automatic functioning” (Foucault, *Discipline* 201). Moreover, it has to have a repertoire of instruments and mechanisms in order to be sustainable. The most effective and productive ones are discipline and punishment. Discipline in that regard describes a mechanism of power, “which regulates the behaviour of individuals in the social body” (Foucault, *Discipline* 210) by organizing space, time and people’s activities and behaviour. It is enforced by complex systems of surveillance, which will be further explored in chapter 2.2. Punishment, in this instance, is one of the instruments of discipline, as non-conformity to the given rules is met with deprivation of liberties, rationing of food, or inflicting physical or psychological pain upon the individual (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 13–15). The fear of punishment, no matter how severe, ensures the success of discipline and obedience of those subjected to power.

Power “as a set of forces that have productive capacities, that are in constant flux, and that manifest in larger assemblages of material, social, and symbolic relationships” (Monahan 106), is often attributed to the concept of binary positions, to visibility, to an imbalance of power between those that hold power and those over which it is wielded. Therefore, power is about compliance, secured by the use of force or by others choosing to surrender. By choosing to accept the will of others over one’s own will power becomes legitimate.

2.1.2 Authority

Another term, that is commonly and most importantly synonymously used with power is the term 'authority'. Power itself exists, according to Max Weber, in two types: power as authority, which means legitimate power that is accepted and rightful and power as coercion, which is illegitimate and forces people to bend to someone's will under the threat of violence and unjust punishment (cf. Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* par. I 16; Sennett 3). In this regard, power ('Macht') is defined as "jede Chance, innerhalb einer sozialen Beziehung den eigenen Willen auch gegen Widerstreben durchzusetzen, gleichviel worauf diese Chance beruht" (Weber par. I 16), whereas authority ('Herrschaft') means „die Chance, für einen Befehl bestimmten Inhalts bei angebbaren Personen Gehorsam zu finden“ (Weber par. I 16). The process of legitimising power is needed by those in power to be accepted by those subjected to power. Thus, legitimacy is the acceptance and recognition of power, as well as the transformation of power into authority. According to Weber, here are three ideal types of legitimate rule: rational legal authority, traditional authority and charismatic authority. Rational legal authority is concerned with how political order is perceived as legal in the eyes of the population. It is "resting on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands" (Weber, *Economy and Society* 215) and is maintained through references to a legal code. Traditional authority questions how order can be maintained by the constant reference to customs, traditions and conventions. It is "resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them" (Weber, *Economy and Society* 215). The third ideal type, the charismatic authority is concerned with the leader's personality and in how far this personality legitimises the power. It is "resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him" (Weber, *Economy and Society* 215). These types of authority will be dealt with in greater detail and applied to the literary example of *Harry Potter* in chapter three. However, as they are very much focussed on economic and rational terms, an emotional component has to be taken into account, as authority is often severed from rational decisions, trying to appeal to intrinsic and basic needs of subjects.

Authority, according to Sennett, is built on images of strength and does represent the emotional expression of power (cf. 4). It is the attempt to interpret the conditions of power and to "give the conditions of control and influence a meaning by defining an image of strength" (Sennett 19) that is solid and stable. People are in need of authority as they "are ravenous for the comforts of someone stronger" (Sennett 23) but simultaneously they fear authority and "rage against the very strength [they] so desire" (Sennett 23). However, said fear also steams from the possibility of a disappearance of authority and the fear of what

someone could do with power (cf. Sennett 40). Still, authority is needed, because it provides “[a]ssurance and superior judgement” but also has the “ability to impose discipline” and the “capacity to inspire fear” (Sennett 17). Sennett focuses in his work mainly on the emotional aspect of legitimate power, which he divides into two sections: authority without love and authority of false love. The latter one, he deems, is effective because it addresses archaic and infantile images and needs underneath the struggle with power (cf. Sennett 46). His example is the connection between the father and the boss/leader, a metaphor that joins two terms that usually do not belong together. However, due to said joining both are transformed, as for instance the term ‘boss’ or ‘leader’ is “infused with a sense of emotional potency” (Sennett 78). Therefore the phrase “the boss is a father” (Sennett 77) has the “power to dominate the affections of others” (Sennett 79) which the term ‘boss’ alone could have never had. Formal control of an office or a person over other people is “joint to experiences of face-to-face control each person has felt deeply within the family” (Sennett 79) thus affecting them in an intimate way and making this form of authority effective. The need to be cared for as opposed to being free of authority is stated to be intrinsic. Albeit, the union of power and care is utterly false as “it is just decoration and pure rhetoric” (Sennett 192).

Authority without love on the other hand addresses no infantile images but describes “images that make not pretence of care” (Sennett 84). In this case, the person in power is more needed by others than he/she needs them and can therefore be indifferent towards them. Contrasting Weber, who states that authority needs to be legitimate in the eyes of the subjects, Sennett offers another possibility: “we feel attracted to people and strong figures we do not believe to be legitimate” (Sennett 25). However, as attraction involves a form of recognition on the part of the subject, thus accepting authority based on strength, this statement is questionable. Nevertheless, whether he takes legitimate figures of authority or illegitimate figures, he confers with Foucault and expresses resistance and rejection of authority to be an important part of the bond between subject and superior. However, rather than stating that one “rebel[s] *against* authority” (Sennett 33, emphasis FR) he remarks that one “rebel[s] *within* authority” (Sennett 33, emphasis FR). He proposes three “bonds of rejection” (Sennett 28): disobedient dependence, idealised substitution, and the fantasy of disappearance. The first bond describes the process of not refusing to follow the rules of authority but proposing an alternative, which cannot be accepted by said authority. It is based on a “compulsive focusing of attention of what [the authority] would want” (Sennett 33) and has little to do with real autonomy but rather with a rebellion on said authorities terms (cf. Sennett 33–35). The second bond sees the authority as a negative model, which is regarded as such by those subjected to it. It draws upon the opinion of the subjects that “whatever they do we [the subjects] want the opposite” (Sennett 38). However, authority is also a reference and key point in order to state why one is dependent (cf. Sennett 38–39). This dependence on the authority results in the fear of being cut loose from it, of having no moorings, thus leading to the painting of a positive picture of said negative authority. The third bond is, as

the name indicates, built on a fantasy of disappearance, claiming that “[e]verything would be alright if only the people in charge would disappear” (Sennett 39).

Similarly, to Foucault, Sennett's attempt at defining authority as legitimate power is based on the assumptions, that power is covert, apparent in most social interactions and confirmed rather than challenged by resistance against and within it. The aspect of surveillance is not perceived as crucial part of authority, as the focus lies on the emotional aspect of power relations, the need for care and recognition by a stronger figure as well as the interpretation of authority as a process of interpreting archaic images.

An aspect, which Foucault stresses several times in his works and which Weber hints at, is the relation between power and knowledge. Knowledge, and the access to knowledge, is vital in sustaining power. Foucault “abandone[s the] tradition that knowledge can only exist where power relations are suspended and that knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands and its interests – power produces knowledge (not simply encouraging it because it serves power or applying it because its useful“ (Foucault, *Discipline* 27). Power and knowledge are in all respects mutually dependent. Knowledge is acquired by those in power, for instance the government, through an extensive network of records (such as birth date, name, parents, school records, etc.) about an individual, which may also be seen as already being a part of a vast and complex network of mechanisms of surveillance.

CCTV, biometric recognition, interception of telephone communications, data piracy, data mining, identity theft – those features that sound as if they were taken directly from “dystopian sci-fi scenarios are now part of our everyday life” (Müller-Wood 3). We are living in a surveillance society (cf. Wood, *Living in Surveillance Societies* 259), surrounded by a culture of control in which we are watched from cradle to grave (cf. MüllerWood 3). While surveillance is nowhere near the level of complete penetration of surveillance into the smallest details of life portrayed in *1984*, it is still at an extremely high level in modern society. “For example, BBC News (2002) reported that the average UK citizen is captured on closed circuit television (CCTV) 300 times per day” (O’Donnell et al. 135). However, it is not only governmental surveillance that people are subjected to, but also surveillance through institutions like schools and hospitals, through cameras installed in shops, and, most importantly with the rise of social media, through new media and new technologies such as smartphones, which are for instance keeping track of a person's movements via GPS even if the phone is offline.

Finding an appropriate definition for the term surveillance has been attempted by several scholars, defining surveillance “as the focussed, systematic and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction” (Marwick 380), or simply stating that surveillance “is about exercises of power and the performance of power relationships” (Monahan 495). It seems as if surveillance is therefore “always about power” (Monahan et al. 106). In the report *Citizens and the State* published 2009 by the House of Lords surveillance is defined as follows:

The term “surveillance” is used in different ways. A literal definition of surveillance as “watching over” indicates monitoring the behaviour of persons, objects, or systems. However surveillance is not only a visual process, which involves looking at people and things. Surveillance can be undertaken in a wide range of ways involving a variety of technologies. The instruments of surveillance include closed-circuit television (CCTV), the interception of telecommunications (“wiretapping”), covert activities by human agents, heat-seeking and other sensing devices, body scans, technology for tracking movement, and many others. (House of Lords 11)

As power needs to be secured and people subjected to that power need to be regulated and governed one can assume that surveillance is most likely about domination: “If we think of surveillance as just *watching*, we err, because surveillance is never really just watching. It's not just vision, but *supervision*. It's not just sight, but *oversight*. Surveillance assumes, advances, and/or creates a relationship of domination“ (Gilliom 205). Gilliom's definition evokes sinister images of surveillance, shaped and supported by popular novels and movies, and brings the picture of an omnipresent, oppressive, faceless, and controlling entity that knows everything to the mind. However, as referring to Sennett, who stated that our need for care, for a stronger figure makes people prone to accept an authority even though it would eventually result in the restriction of personal liberties, surveillance is met

with increasing enthusiasm (cf. Wood 262). Especially the installation of CCTV cameras, which “are a visible manifestation of the state's concern about crime and security [because] [t]hey show something is being done [...] thus [being] symbols of safety in a society in which everything is seen as a potential source of risk, and where fear dominates” (Wood 263), are met with more and more enthusiasm. It seems to be as if the idea that someone is watching and therefore watching out for them, puts people's minds at ease, thus making surveillance somewhat more acceptable, helping the process of normalising surveillance. Still, surveillance can “serve democratic ends if it brings about openness, transparency, accountability, participation and power equalization among social groups and institutions” (Monahan 498) if it is used appropriately.

Albeit, there is more to surveillance; more aspects that need to be included in order to form a better picture. As already mentioned, the installation of cameras contributes to a sense of security as well as to a “latent sense of fear, which they claim to abate” (Müller-Wood 4). Therefore, forms of surveillance can be positioned along a “spectrum from ‘care’ to ‘control’, from watching over one for purposes of protection to scrutinizing one's behaviour in order to enforce discipline” (Monahan 497). Surveillance exists in different forms and on different levels. Registration and recordings of people, their birth or death dates, medical records, school reports and location are parts of state surveillance. Collecting, processing and monitoring personal data and using this data systematically via information technologies, is usually referred to as ‘dataveillance’ (cf. House of Lords 12). Both types of surveillance work on a vertical level; they involve an asymmetry as individuals are monitored by stronger structural entities, with the balance of power tipped in favour of the supervisor (cf. Marwick 381). In contrast, social surveillance takes place between individuals and does not necessarily involve a stronger hierarchical figure but functions on a horizontal level, thus conferring to the assumption that power is intrinsic to every social relationship. In comparison to dataveillance and state surveillance, social surveillance is reciprocal, meaning that “each participant is both: broadcasting information that is viewed by others and is viewing content broadcasted by others” (Marwick 379), resulting in a stronger self-monitoring, which strives for a balance between publicity and seclusion. Additionally, the House of Lords in the report *Surveillance: Citizens and the State* states two “broad types of surveillance [...]: mass surveillance and targeted surveillance.” (House of Lords 13) Mass surveillance “is also known as ‘passive’ or ‘undirected’ surveillance. [...] It is not targeted on any particular individual but gathers images and information for possible future use” (13). Targeted surveillance, in contrast, singles out individuals and accumulates specific information about them.

Generally speaking, surveillance exists in two types: it is either covert, meaning without the knowledge of those subjected to it, or overt, as in the installation of cameras as a preventive procedure to stop people from committing crimes (cf. Harbisher 17). In all forms of surveillance one principle can be stated as commonly accepted: surveillance is subtle and

“is seen as ubiquitous, it is everywhere and we are all subject to it on an ever increasing scale” (Wood 266), which leads to Foucault's assumption that

[t]he perfect disciplinary apparatus would make it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly. A central point would be both the source of light illuminating everything, and a locus of convergence for everything that must be known: a perfect eye that nothing would escape and a centre towards which all gazes would be turned... Surveillance thus becomes a decisive economic operator both as an internal part of the production machinery and as a specific mechanism of the disciplinary power. (*Discipline* 173–175)

Surveillance assists the maintenance of power, without someone present to enforce it and results in the transformation of subjects into docile bodies, as they are constantly aware of the fact that they are being watched, even though they are not sure when, whether and where exactly. This fear, permanent visibility, acceptance, and awareness of being watched makes surveillance an effective tool, which serves the accumulation of knowledge by a higher hierarchical entity of power.

Therefore, surveillance has to fulfil four points: the attention has to be purposeful, meaning that “watching has a point that can be justified, in terms of control, entitlement, or some other publicly agreed goal” (Wood et al., *A report on Surveillance Society* 4), it has to become routine, being integrated in our daily life, it has to be systematic, implying that “it is planned and carried out according to a schedule that is rational, not merely random” (Wood et al. 4) and lastly, it has to be focused, meaning that it is concerned with details rather than a general overview. Scholars like David Lyon, David Murkami Wood, Torin Monahan and others have termed modern society to be a surveillance society in which constant surveillance has become normal; a part of everyday life. Going even further, they claim the normalisation of surveillance to be supported by a increasing demand for safety even if “[m]ass surveillance has the potential to erode privacy” (House of Lords 10), thus rendering the statement that “[t]he public is ready to trade in their freedom for their safety” (Mueller, *Movie Review*) all too true.

2.2.1 The Panopticon

In his work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* Michel Foucault takes Jeremy Bentham's concept of the Panopticon and develops it further, linking it to his assumptions of discipline and power. The Panopticon, according to Bentham, is a building, which is structured as follows:

at the periphery, an annular building; at the centre, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other, on the outside, allows the light to cross the cell from one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor [the guardian of the Panopticon] in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy. (Bentham in Foucault 200, annotation added FR)

It is in its form an ideal type of surveillance and power relations and can be applied to several institutions, which concern themselves with the governing, the education, the regulation, and the disciplining of individuals (cf. Foucault 197–200). Whereas surveillance, as a concept, does not necessarily manifest itself in a physical form, the Panopticon is the manifestation of it in an architectural structure; it is an

enclosed segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and the periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which every individual is constantly located, examined and distributed among the living beings, the sick, and the dead – all this constitutes as compact model of the disciplinary mechanism. (Foucault 197)

Inside the Panopticon, three groupings of people are to be found: the inmates, the staff or the employees and the guardian of the structure, who is the highest hierarchical entity. Supervision by the hierarchical figure penetrates every aspect of life within this enclosed and confined space. The prisoners are not separated into binary sections, but there are multiple separations tailored to and dependent on the individual, serving the purpose of attributing the appropriate punishment upon them specifically (cf. Foucault 199). Furthermore, as Foucault states, the cells are backlit (200) making the prisoner, patient, or schoolboy permanently visible and observable by the supervisor, thus withdrawing any form of darkness, which ultimately might have offered some kind of protection or a place to hide from the panoptic gaze for the prisoner. Hence, “visibility is a trap” (Foucault 200). The prisoner is an object of information, he is constantly seen by the guardian, and apart from the central tower as the personification of power and surveillance, he does not see. As power or surveillance should not only be visible but also unverifiable, the inmates do not

know “when or whether they are being looked at but it must be sure that it may always be so” (Foucault 201). Furthermore, the prisoner is latent invisible, as the divisions of the building make him invisible to other inmates and make the inmates invisible to him, which also serves to prevent revolts within this structure (cf. Foucault 200). The latent invisibility and the visibility of both the supervisor, and the prisoner are guarantees for order. Still, visibility is not only a trap for the prisoner, as the apparatus can also serve for “supervising its own mechanisms” (Foucault 202), implying that employees can be observed by the guardian, who can “judge them, impose on them the methods he thinks are best, [and] alter their behaviour” (Foucault 203) according to his will. Additionally, the guardian of the Panopticon, whose fate was linked with those of the inmates (cf. Foucault 203), might be observed in the same way by an instructor from outside or the general public, who will prevent the system from descending into tyranny and who will briefly or permanently take the same position as the guardian. (cf. Foucault 206) This results in a permanent and conscious visibility of inmates, employees and guardian that assures the functioning of power within the Panopticon. It strives to

arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. (Foucault 201)

Linking the Panopticon to Foucault's assumption that power is exercised throughout the entire body of society as so called ‘capillary power’, it can be added that power is hierarchical, not concentrated on a person, as everyone would be able to operate the Panopticon, and that it should be “continuously exercised in foundations of society, in the subtlest kinds of ways, function outside of sovereignty [as well as] light and effective” (Foucault 208–209). Power and surveillance, according to Foucault, have to be effective and productive (206). Power has to be productive in shaping individuals and in being exercised throughout the entire body of society, however it can only be so, if surveillance is effective. Effective in the way that few people should watch the many and that intervention should be possible at every moment, or even if surveillance is endowed with a preventive character that intervenes before the offence is committed (cf. Foucault 206). Thus, power through its instrument of surveillance obtains and produces knowledge. The body as such steps into the background, as within the Panopticon the power of the mind should be exercised over the mind.

The Panopticon as an ideal form of the interplay between power and surveillance became a model for disciplinary networks, ordering multiplicities, and served to create networks that were de-institutionalised, “everywhere, always alert and running through society without interruption in space or time” (Foucault 209). In ordering the multiplicities, the Panopticon had the function to “reduc[e] everything that made the masses

unmanageable”, to “dissipate complicated groupings of individuals” (Foucault 219), and to “establish calculated distributions” (Foucault 219), for instance timetables. It was supposed to “arrange power [and] intend[ed] to make it more effective and economic” (Foucault 208) as well as to “strengthen social forces, increase production, spread education, develop economy [and] increase public morale” (Foucault 208). Treilhard, in Foucault, expressed the perceived omnipresence of the Panopticon and its application to an entire state as follows:

You may consider that no part of the Empire is without surveillance, no crime, no offence, no contravention that remains unpunished, and that the eye of the genius who can enlighten all embraces the whole of this vast machine, without, however, the slightest detail escaping his attention. (217)

Goffman, in his work *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*, takes Foucault into account when he proposes the theory of total institutions, which are institutions with “encompassing tendencies” (Goffman 5), characterised by constant surveillance and record keeping as well as a strict hierarchical structure (cf. Goffman 17–18). These total institutions form heterotopias, which create a contrast to utopias, because they do exist in society. They are “a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites [...] are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Foucault, *Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias* par. Heterotopias). Thus, they are, according to Foucault, “absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about” (Foucault, *Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias* par. Heterotopias). Both terms heterotopia and total institution will be applied and explained a tad more extensively in the chapter on Hogwarts later on. Even though many scholars perceive modern society and governments of some states as the realization of Bentham's Panopticon, others state that it largely remains what it has been – a utopia.²

3 Power, Authority and Surveillance in the Wizarding World

There is no good and evil, there is only power,
and those too weak to seek it...
(Rowling, *Stone* 291)

“Watching – spying – might be following
us,” muttered Uncle Vernon wildly
(Rowling, *Stone* 44)

Thinking of Harry Potter, few people would note that the series is full of “Foucauldian themes of surveillance, power, and authority” (Reynolds 275). The world the reader enters together with Harry Potter, the black haired, green eyed, scrawny wizard with the lightning bolt scar on his forehead (Rowling, *Stone* 27), in the first book, *Harry Potter and the Philosophers Stone*, is in all respects magical. It astounds and bewitches the reader as it does Harry within the book. It is not until the third book, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, that the story evolves in favour of continuously darker themes, including death, destruction, imperfect characters, moral ambiguity and the loss of innocence.

However, from the earliest conversations between Harry, Hogwarts’ Headmaster Albus Dumbledore and others, the idea of the power to choose one’s own destiny as well as the difference between actively seeking power and simply possessing it have been the cornerstones of the Harry Potter series (cf. Rowling, *Chamber* 358; *Stone* 234). Power is held by various individuals and institutions in the magical world, a world, which resembles the nineteenth century, Victorian England in many respects (cf. Reynolds, 273). The first institution mentioned within the series is Hogwarts, a boarding school presumably situated in Scotland, with its headmaster Albus Dumbledore, who besides being headmaster holds various other offices, including the positions “Grand Sorcerer, Chief Warlock of the Wizengamot [and] Supreme Mugwump” (Rowling, *Stone* 60). The second institution mentioned in the *Philosophers Stone* is the Ministry of Magic, which hides the Wizarding World from the Muggle world (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 74–75) via the International Code of Wizarding Secrecy (cf. Rowling, *Fantastic Beasts XVI*). Its leader is the Minister of Magic, Cornelius Fudge, who stays in office until the sixth book, followed by Rufus Scrimgeour and Pius Thicknesse, the latter one being Minister during the course of the final book. The third base of power and authority within the Wizarding World is Lord Voldemort and his circle of followers named ‘the Death Eaters’. Although he belongs to none of the institutions mentioned above, he exerts more and more power as the series progresses, culminating in the undermining and the takeover of the magical community through coercive domination.

The various forms of authority, power, and discipline are experienced through the eyes of Harry Potter, who is subjected to the intersecting panoptic gazes of all three

institutions and individuals. The most powerful one being Dumbledore, who ensures that “[Harry’s] moments of gaining self-knowledge are carefully monitored and prepared in such a way that the child actually learns nothing about himself as an individual but, instead, learns about Dumbledore’s own vision for him as an object in the magical world” (Reynolds, 282). Harry develops according to Dumbledore’s carefully plotted plans, remaining an object of the panoptic gaze, thus giving the headmaster the opportunity to assert his authority over him. However, as the following chapter will explore, the shades of grey that Rowling attributes to all her characters as well as to the story itself, result in slight shift of authority and the reattribution of the panoptic gaze to Harry, who becomes a guardian of the Panopticon that is Hogwarts.

The magical world is a parallel world nestled firmly within the Muggle world. It is, according to Sterling-Folker and Folker, a nation-state, as its inhabitants identify with their origins, in terms of the Wizarding World as being descendants of Merlin, and have “developed state structures that are similar to our own and participate in rudimentary international institutions and cooperative activities” (Sterling-Folker and Folker in Nexon 103). Through the International Confederation of Wizards, which seems to be a rough equivalent to the United Nations, or the Department of International Magical Cooperation, which deals with foreign affairs, such as trading standards and international law, and is probably an equivalent to the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the ministry, a bureaucracy with a multi-layered structure, is involved in international matters (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 55–57). The global events such as the Triwizard Tournament and the Quidditch Worldcup show that there are other distinctive magical communities with their own identity, nationality, sporting team, language, ministry and educational institutions (cf. Sterling-Folker and Folker in Nexon 104).

The state is constantly engaged in conflicts and war, in which nationalism or the nation-state does not play a role (Sterling-Folker and Folker in Nexon 103). The main conflict, in which every witch and wizard seems to be engaged in, is the conflict borne from the hierarchical structure of the Wizarding World. The magical world is divided in different segments, according to the blood status of each and every one. The top position is held by Purebloods, who form the elite of the social system, followed by Half-bloods, Muggleborns, also pejoratively called Mudbloods and Squibs, who are children without magic born into magical families (cf. Rowling, *Chamber* 114–115, 144). The bottom of this structure is formed by “beings”, meaning half-breeds, such as werewolves or “magical creatures with near-human intelligence”, such as goblins or centaurs, and Muggles (Rowling, *Fantastic Beasts* xii; *Order* 754). The conflict between Purebloods and Muggleborns is a central part of that series from the beginning, as Draco Malfoy states in *the Philosopher Stone* that “the other sort”, who have not been brought up “to know our [the pureblood] ways” should “not be let in[to] [Hogwarts]” (Rowling 61). It reaches its climax in the last book *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, as the Ministry of Magic, additionally to the approach “Magic is Might” (Rowling 241), introduces the Muggle-born Registration Commission

(Rowling 241), issuing a pamphlet named “MUDBLOODS – and the Dangers They Pose to a Peaceful Pure–Blood Society” (Rowling 249). This hierarchical structure implies, that power and authority lie with pure–blood wizards, as they are depicted to be strong, wealthy and sometimes exempt from the given rules (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 193–194) regarding those with different blood status as lesser beings. Generally, the structure within the books “is predicated upon status quo and a formal understanding of authority in which hierarchical structures are a given. What is at stake and potentially vulnerable is never the hierarchy itself, but only he who occupies its upper reaches” (Chapell 284).

When it comes to legitimising power, most theories of legitimacy and authority will be rather difficult to apply, as even after close reading the books it is unclear how the WIZARDING WORLD works. As, for instance, Weber's theory is exceedingly based upon economy, application runs into problems, because the economic system of the magical world is not elaborated. The reader learns about a third economic sector, which does exist in the form of banks, several shops in Diagon Alley, restaurants and pubs and mail services, et cetera, but in how far the first economic sectors play a role remains elusive. During the course of the thesis, it will be assumed that the economic system of Muggle Great Britain is applicable to the WIZARDING WORLD as well.

As Harry enters the magical world, he is, with the moment he touches his wand, thus becoming a full member of the wizarding society, subjected to its governing authority. It is established during the course of the first book that the magical world, even though it seems to be entirely different from the Muggle world at first, still needs to have a political entity, a governing body, to function. Hagrid's explanation of the Ministry's main function and its leader reflects rather negatively upon this institution, rendering it rather one-dimensional, as he states that

“They wanted Dumbledore for Minister, o’ course, but he’d never leave Hogwarts, so old Cornelius Fudge got the job. Bungler if ever there was one. So he pelts Dumbledore with owls every morning, askin’ fer advice.” (*Stone* 74–5)

Thus, the picture of the Ministry and its leader is that of an institution run by “buffons with relatively little magical power” (Sterling–Folker and Folker in Nexon 144). Harry is astounded that the Wizarding World would need a government, or, for that matter that it would be established enough to form a proper government. The main purpose of said body, namely keeping “it from the Muggles that there's still witches an’ wizards up an’ down the country” (Rowling, *Stone* 75) is already hinted before Harry steps into the magical world, specifically the Leaky Cauldron, for the first time:

If Hagrid hadn’t pointed it out, Harry wouldn’t have noticed it was there. The people hurrying by didn’t glance at it. [...] In fact, Harry had the most peculiar feeling that only he and Hagrid could see it. (Rowling, *Stone* 52–53)

During the course of the series, the reader, and Harry, learns, that hiding the magical world from the Muggles is indeed the main objective, as there are many departments within the ministry, which deal with altering memories after an encounter between both worlds (Accidental Magic Reversal Squad, Oblivator Office, Office of Misinformation, Muggle–Worthy Excuse Committee), or protecting Muggles from magical artefacts or Muggle artefact imbedded with magic (Muggle Liason Office, Missuse of Muggle Artefacts Office) through laws like the Muggle Protection Act (cf. Rowling, *Chamber* 336). This approach to secrecy is not tied only to the United Kingdom, but enforced by the International Code of Secrecy, which states, that

[e]ach wizarding governing body will be responsible for the concealment, care, and control of all magical beasts, beings, and spirits dwelling within its territory's borders. Should any such creature cause harm to, or draw the notice of, the Muggle community, that nation's wizarding governing body will be subject to discipline by the International Confederation of Wizards. (Rowling, *Fantastic Beasts and where to find them* xvi)

The only time, during which this statute can be disregarded, is in times of danger, if something happens “that's likely to affect the Muggles” (Rowling, *Half-blood Prince* 3) or on the occasion of the election of a new Prime Minister (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 11). On those occasions, the Minister of Magic approaches the current Prime Minister in order to

inform him. However, during the series the ministry progresses from an institution on the periphery, mainly existing to discipline its citizens in maintaining their worlds hidden status, to a more prominent entity with more authority, power and mainly influence over the lives of its citizens. Furthermore, the ministry becomes more and more narrow-minded and problematic, trying to extend its authority over the entire magical community and Hogwarts with Dumbledore, who serves as the ministry's adversary, at its helm.

3.1.1 | The Ministry – Power and Authority through Law

The Ministry exerts power over its subjects through laws, as it is the ruling body of the Wizarding World, which has to power to ratify laws as well as to judge and prosecute individuals. At its disposal, there are the several, hierarchically structured Departments within the Ministry, which attempt to regulate every single aspect of magical life. It aims to establish “what one might call a new ‘economy’ of power, that is to say procedures which allowed the effects of power to circulate in a manner at once continuous, uninterrupted, adapted, and ‘individualised’ throughout the entire social body” (*Power* 119), which means that it has to establish rules and guidelines that are legal, thus accepted and obeyed by everyone. In order to stabilise its power, the Ministry needs a vast network of surveillance, in order to obtain superior knowledge over its subjects.

Generally the Ministry's authority could be denoted as a rational legal authority, according to Weber. Rational legal authority is, in its purest form, exercised by an employed bureaucratic administrative staff, which conducts its official business strictly according to a set of rules (cf. Weber 217). This form of authority rests on the acceptance of several ideas:

1. That any given legal norm may be established by agreement or by imposition, on grounds of expediency or value-rationality or both, with a claim to obedience at least on the part of the members of the organization.
2. That every body of law consists essentially in a consistent system of abstract rules which have normally been intentionally established. [...]
3. That thus the typical person in authority, the “superior,” is himself subject to an impersonal order by orienting his actions to it in his own dispositions and commands.
4. That the person who obeys authority does so, as it is usually stated, only in his capacity as a “member” of the organization and what he obeys is only “the law.”
5. The members of the organization, insofar as they obey a person in authority, do not owe this obedience to him as an individual, but to the impersonal order.

(Weber 217–218)

The law is the most important part of this rule, rendering even the superior and staff mere subjects under the application of the law. Weber proposes, that no one, regardless of his

standing within society or the hierarchy, is exempt from the law and therefore has to abide by it. Furthermore, obedience is not dependent on a certain person but solely on the law itself. However, Weber names more categories and ideas, which serve to define rational legal authority. According to Weber, the “organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one” (Weber 219), the members of the administrative staff “should be completely separated from ownership of the means of production” (Weber 219) and that “[a]dministrative acts, decisions, and rules are formulated and recorded in writing, even in cases where oral discussion is the rule or is even mandatory” (Weber 219). The administrative staff is also supposed to function according to several rules, which are:

- (1) They are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations.
- (2) They are organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices.
- (3) Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence in the legal sense.
- (4) The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. Thus, in principle, there is free selection.
- (5) Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualifications.
- (6) They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a right to pensions.
- (7) The office is treated as the sole, or at least the primary, occupation of the incumbent.
- (8) It constitutes a career. There is a system of “promotion” according to seniority or to achievement, or both. Promotion is dependent on the judgment of superiors.
- (9) The official works entirely separated from ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.
- (10) He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of the office.

(Weber 220-222)

Following those rules would eventually achieve the establishment of a purely bureaucratic type of authority, which would be “capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of exercising authority over human beings. It is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability” (Weber 223). In consequence rational legal authority should be based upon “[t]he dominance of a spirit of formalistic impersonality: ‘Sine ira et studio’, without hatred or passion and hence without affection or enthusiasm. The dominant norms are concepts of straightforward duty without regard to personal considerations” (Weber 225). It is, on the part of its subjects and on the part of those exercising it, free of any emotional bond, thus rendering Sennett theory inapplicable.

When it comes to the Ministry of Magic, the application of those rules proves to be difficult. Even though Barton states that “[the Ministry of Magic] appears to be one hundred percent bureaucracy” (Barton 1533), and there is evidence that proves bureaucratic tendencies, the entire Ministry is only bureaucratic when it comes to the hierarchy of offices. The laws of the magical world, as provided by the Ministry are hazy and, apart from the “Decree for the Reasonable Restriction of Underage Wizardry” (Rowling, *Order* 147), it is unclear in how far wizards and witches have to abide by them. Additionally, the Minister of Magic seems to have the power to change laws at will, ruling out a democratic process in formulating laws. This possibility, to write laws that benefit a selected group, is shown in a dialogue between Fudge and Dumbledore during the *Order of Phoenix*, when Fudge remarks that “[l]aws can be changed”, prompting Dumbledore to agree to this and assert that Fudge “certainly seem[s] to be making many changes” (149).

Furthermore, the legitimacy of a rational legal authority could be questioned in terms of the selection or election of employees, including the Minister himself. There is no hint of a vote by either the public or the Wizengamot, the High Court of the Wizarding World, to install a new Minister. Instead it seems as if a Minister can be “sacked” (Rowling, *Prince* 12) simply on the grounds of public opinion without any election process as Fudge explains to the Prime Minister that “[t]he whole Wizarding community has been screaming for my resignation for a fortnight” (Rowling, *Prince* 12). Even the technical qualifications for a new Minister are not mentioned and apart from “looking like an old lion” and having an “an immediate impression of shrewdness and toughness” (Rowling, *Prince* 12) around him, as well as having been the Head of the Auror office, Rufus Scrimgeour seems to have no qualifications whatsoever.

Another problematic fact in which the Ministry engages in is blatant corruption, framing the Wizarding World as a “society in which the principal elements are not community and public life but private individuals and the state” (Foucault, *Discipline* 216). This is emphasised by Harry, for example, as he notices “the gentle clinking of what sounded like a full pocket of gold” (Rowling, *Order* 175) when interrupting a private meeting between Lucius Malfoy and Fudge, and later on a criminal is not prosecuted in exchange for information on Harry (Rowling, *Order* 614). Therefore, even though they are paid a fixed amount of money and even though they should subject themselves to the law, the Minister and some officials are prone to corruption by individuals, thus greatly diminishing their power. The apparent lack of oversight by a higher entity encourages corruption. The Wizengamot, which might provide supervision, “is substantially controlled by the Minister of Magic, and it certainly does not seem to be an independent check on Ministry authority” (Barton 1533). Moreover, as officials work in a “clearly defined sphere of competence” (Weber 220) that is the sole occupation of said official, the Ministry tends to defy this idea, as Fudge can pass or change laws without the supervision of a higher office even though he is only the Minister

and Dolores Umbridge holds a teaching position as well as the positions of Undersecretary to the Minister and High Inquisitor of Hogwarts at once, thus exceeding her competences.

3.1.2 Prominent and Problematic – Cornelius Fudge and Dolores Umbridge

Where at first Fudge seems to be a “kindly figure, a little blustering, a little pompous, but essentially good-natured” (Rowling, *Goblet* 707) he becomes more and more paranoid, favouring peace and tranquillity and rather choosing “strategies that are easy at the expense of strategies that are effective” (Barrett 107). Even later on, the ministry “has to be seen doing something” (Rowling, *Chamber* 261) and instead of effectively fighting Voldemort, it convicts innocents without trial. Whereas, in the beginning, Fudge sought out Dumbledore for advice (Rowling, *Stone* 75), he is later on convinced that “Dumbledore's after his job” (Rowling, *Order* 94) as Fudge knows “[d]eep down, [that] Dumbledore's much cleverer than he is, a much more powerful wizard” (Rowling, *Order* 94). This realisation, as well as his love for his office, by which he is blinded (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 708) has managed “to convince him that he's the clever one and Dumbledore's simply stirring up trouble for the sake of it” (Rowling, *Order* 94). He has become fond of power and he is reluctant to relinquish his hold over it. He asserts his power over Dumbledore, claiming that it was solely through special allowances that Dumbledore even possesses the power he holds, when Fudge says:

Now, see here, Dumbledore...I've given you free rein, always. I've had a lot of respect for you. I might not have agreed with some of your decisions, but I've kept quiet... But if you're going to work against me—' (Rowling, *Goblet* 709)

Fudge seeks to increase his own resources, autonomy and prestige, which becomes apparent in *The Order of Phoenix* when the Daily Prophet, the magical worlds' newspaper, transforms into the mouthpiece of the Ministry, discrediting its biggest competitors for power: Dumbledore and by extension Harry. Using the only seemingly credible newspaper in the Wizarding World, it is ensured that the Ministry's views are circulated and spread to a large audience. The MoM is therefore in possession of a convenient source of power and knowledge, and an instrument by which it can spread its views within the entire magical society. Sennett states that “[p]eople do not think about power mostly, they think what the powerful inculcate them to believe” (Sennett 20), a principle which can be applied to the Daily Prophet and the Ministry. The citizens do not think about whether the Ministry or the Daily Prophet is powerful or right or wrong, they have come to think what the MoM wants them to think and believe. By choosing what to print and what to leave out, or by printing official versions, the Ministry seizes control over the only credible source of information for

many citizens, thus transforming the Daily Prophet into a Ministry propaganda tool. Thus, the Ministry monopolises political benefits, the press as well the technologies linked to distribution and printing. By discrediting its competitors and by writing about the MoM's achievements, the government tries to preserve and stabilise itself. However, after the MoM cannot deny the return of Voldemort any longer, the tone changes:

“Yes, they’re very complimentary about you now, Harry,” said Hermione, now scanning down the article. “A lone voice of truth... perceived as unbalanced, yet never wavered in his story... forced to bear ridicule and slander...’ Hmmm,” said Hermione, frowning, “I notice they don’t mention the fact that it was them doing all the ridiculing and slandering, though...” (Rowling, *Order* 847)

This conduct proves that even in the Wizarding World media have long been recognized as an instrument in fostering ‘moral panics’ and circulating misleading information about public threats (cf. Monahan 500) and that possessing and influencing this source of knowledge is a main objective of authority. Still, in denying Voldemort's return, by discrediting Dumbledore and Harry, the MoM does not only pave the way for the Dark Lord but also shows that “[c]ollective action for a public good becomes all the more difficult when that good is something contrary to the interests of those in authority” (Barratt 87).

Apart from Fudge, there is another prominent, and rather negatively displayed Ministry official who exerts power and fosters governmental surveillance. In an attempt to supervise and control Hogwarts the MoM appoints an instructor within the panoptic tower of Hogwarts who will “judge them, impose on them the methods he thinks are best, [and] alter their behaviour” (Foucault 203), thus trying to extend the panoptic gaze of the Ministry to Hogwarts and ultimately ensuring that surveillance is deinstitutionalised and organised by the state (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 211). Hence, the Ministry's power would then be “continuously exercised in foundations of society, in the subtlest kinds of ways [and] function outside of sovereignty” (Foucault, *Discipline* 208). Even though Umbridge is only appointed as a teacher and an instructor for Dumbledore, she starts to accumulate more and more power, resulting in her taking over the post of the guardian of the Panopticon. Umbridge indicates her main objectives, namely gaining access to knowledge, restricting knowledge that could be dangerous to the Ministry, preventing students from forming their own opinions and disciplining them into docile bodies, in her first speech during the welcoming feast:

The Ministry of Magic has always considered the education of young witches and wizards to be of vital importance. The rare gifts with which you were born may come to nothing if not nurtured and honed by *careful instruction*. [...] The treasure trove of magical *knowledge amassed by our ancestors must be guarded, replenished and polished* by those who have been called to the noble profession of teaching. [...] Every headmaster and headmistress of Hogwarts has brought something new to the weighty task of governing this historic school, and that is as it should be, for without progress there will be stagnation and decay. There again, *progress for progress's sake must be discouraged*, for our tried and tested traditions often require no tinkering. A balance, then, between old and new, between

permanence and change, between tradition and innovation because some changes will be for the better, while others will come, in the fullness of time, to be recognised as errors of judgement. Meanwhile, some old habits will be retained, and rightly so, whereas others, outmoded and outworn, must be abandoned. Let us move forward, then, into a new era of openness, effectiveness and accountability, *intent on preserving what ought to be preserved, perfecting what needs to be perfected, and pruning wherever we find practices that ought to be prohibited.* (Rowling, *The Order of Phoenix* 212-214, emphasis FR)

Instead of preventing the Panopticon Hogwarts under Dumbledore from descending into tyranny, Umbridge does not only enforce Ministry regulations but “transforms Hogwarts from a heterotopia into a thinly disguised arm of the Ministry, stamping out students’ civil liberties, prohibiting freedom of speech and assembly, and forcing resistant students like Harry to ‘do lines’ in their own blood” (Cantrell 203). Umbridge takes punishment, control, and authority to frightening places. She is “a new sort of enemy [...] Umbridge seeks a total purge of unsuitable information, and the Ministry gives her nearly unlimited power in order to achieve it” (Flaherty 95). Umbridge seemingly believes in Foucault’s theory that “[p]ower is essentially that, which represses. Power is that which represses nature, instincts, a class, or individuals” (Foucault, *Society* 15), resulting in her being able to “pass judgment upon the performance of her fellow teachers and even dismiss them (*Order* 308), disband all “Student Organizations, Societies, Teams, Groups, and Clubs” and not allow them to reunite without her express permission (cf. *Order* 351), to override the punishments doled out by other teachers (*Order* 416), and even forbid the other professors from speaking to students about any topic outside of their specific teaching subjects (*Order* 551). Under her authority every movement in Hogwarts is monitored and anything she disapproves of is banned under the threat of punishment. Surveillance is realized through a newly formed group called the Inquisitorial Squad, who ranks as high as the prefects do, but reports directly to Umbridge. She is also not averse to using criminals and other unfair practices for her purposes:

“I have testimony from Willy Widdershins, Minerva, who happened to be in the bar at the time. He was heavily bandaged, it is true, but his hearing was quite unimpaired,” said Umbridge smugly. “He heard every word Potter said and hastened straight to the school to report to me —”

“Oh, so that’s why he wasn’t prosecuted for setting up all those regurgitating toilets!” said Professor McGonagall, raising her eyebrows. “What an interesting insight into our justice system!”

“Blatant corruption!” roared the portrait of the corpulent, red-nosed wizard on the wall behind Dumbledore’s desk. “The Ministry did not cut deals with petty criminals in my day, no sir, they did not!” (Rowling, *Order* 613–614)

Added to this, Umbridge has the approval to monitor the Floo network of Hogwarts, going as far as closing it down completely and leaving only her fireplace open for communication. Even communication by owl becomes impossible for the students, as owls are intercepted, and Umbridge reads private mail (cf. Rowling, *Order* 631). Furthermore, she

uses Filch and his knowledge of the castle to her advantage (cf. Rowling, *Order* 628). This becomes evident in a conversation with Harry, after he had attempted to get in contact with his godfather:

The might of the Ministry stands behind me. All channels of communication in and out of this school are being monitored. A Floo Network Regulator is keeping watch over every fire in Hogwarts — except my own, of course. My Inquisitorial Squad is opening and reading all owl post entering and leaving the castle. And Mr. Filch is observing all secret passages in and out of the castle. If I find a shred of evidence . . . (Rowling, *Order* 631)

If regulations and rules are not followed, Umbridge doles out strict punishments that range from restrictions of personal liberties, such as banning Harry from playing Quidditch, to corporal punishment. Foucault explained in *Discipline and Punishment* that the body faded from being a focus for punishment (Foucault 10), as punishment should “reach something other than the body” making “physical pain no longer part of penalty” (Foucault 95). Pain was supposed to be “abstract and idealised, working on the imagination of the criminal rather than on his body. Penalties were supposed to represent pain rather than actually cause it” (Foucault 95). Umbridge reverses this principle and brings physical pain back into focus, as she forces students to write in their own blood, or threatens them with the Cruciatus curse, which brings “pain so intense, so all-consuming [...]” as if “white-hot knives were piercing every inch of skin” (Rowling, *Goblet* 661). Umbridge's biggest supporter is Filch, who, after chanting “Approval for Whipping...Approval for...I can do it at last...They’ve had it coming to them for years...” pulls out the Educational Decree Twenty-nine, kisses it and seems happy to be allowed to whip children as a punishment (cf. Rowling, *Order* 673). Umbridge's aim is the control of minds through fear and suspicion, and the control of bodies through discipline. “Discipline produces subjugated and practiced bodies, docile bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes the same forces (in political terms of obedience)” (Chapell 287). In short, it produces bodies that willingly obey a higher power figure, without a second thought, rendering them into tools rather than individuals.

Umbridge's authority, as it does not rest on legitimate power, is constantly undermined by students, for instance by forming the resistance and defence group Dumbledore's Army, by teachers, who are helping students to rebel against Umbridge (cf. Rowling, *Order* 634) or simply by self-policing on the part of the students. Being aware of the interception of communication, the students develop more effective means of communication, such as the galleons used by the D.A. or by using code words, as for instance Harry tells Snape that “[Voldemort]'s got Padfoot at the place where it's hidden!” (Rowling, *Order* 745), thus revealing the information to Snape but obscuring it in the same process. As Umbridge, in the position of the guardian of the Panopticon, is not supervised by the public or a higher entity, but holds the unlimited power through permanent surveillance in her hands, her rule over the school descends into tyranny. This reflects back upon the capabilities of the Ministry,

and proves that in order for a system or a bureaucracy to function, the defined space of competence as well as holding one office at a time should be maintained. Furthermore, attempting to control another system, which has a different aim, without the necessary authority is depicted as being impossible.

3.1.3 Instruments of Surveillance

When it comes to surveillance, the MoM has some rather effective instruments at its disposal. The most prominent ones being the monitoring of the Floo network by the Floo Network Authority, which establishes, maintains, monitors, and regulates the network. Those with the authority have the power to observe and monitor Floo Network connections, and may eavesdrop on conversations held through the Network (cf. Rowling, *Order* 129, 373, 631). Furthermore, during *The Prisoner of Azkaban* Fudge urges Harry to “promise to stay in Diagon Alley where there were plenty of wizards to keep an eye on him” (Rowling, *Prisoner* 67). This implies that the citizens have internalized the Ministry's panoptic gaze insofar as Fudge can use them to his advantage by making the wizards of Diagon Alley extensions of his own gaze in order to monitor Harry's movements during his stay. Additionally, the MoM keeps records of the location of witches and wizards and monitors certain areas thoroughly:

“We have no record of any witch or wizard living in Little Whinging other than Harry Potter,” said Madam Bones at once. “That situation has always been closely monitored, given . . . given past events.” (Rowling, *Order* 143)

The Ministry seems to be certain to have records about the most important on goings of the magical world, which are, as revealed in *The Order of Phoenix* prone to manipulation. Fudge, during Harry's trial, seems to be certain that there would be a record if someone had ordered the Dementors to Little Whinging (Rowling 146), however, these records, which are necessary to maintain order have either been destroyed or never been made, as Umbridge remarks that Fudge “never knew [she] ordered Dementors after Potter last summer, but he was delighted to be given the chance to expel him, all the same [...]” (Rowling 747).

However, its most effective tool is the Trace. The Trace is a Charm put on the wands of the wizards and witches who are underage. If any magic is performed in the vicinity of the underage wizard or witch the Ministry will be alerted immediately, thus leading them to the exact location of the wizard or witch in question (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 47). It is said to be impossible to be put on an adult (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 168). The Trace is used to assert

authority over children and to discipline them from early on, until they internalise the gaze of the Ministry in so far, as they will not practice magic outside of school.

The Ministry enforces the panoptic gaze upon the entire population, by rules, laws, the Trace, the monitoring of the Floo network, by keeping records, by intercepting communication and simply by tracking and following someone, thus being reflective of Foucault's ideas of power as he states, “above all there was established [...] what one might call a new ‘economy’ of power, that is to say procedures which allowed the effects of power to circulate in a manner at once continuous, uninterrupted, adapted, and ‘individualised’ throughout the entire social body” (*Power* 119). Power, therefore, becomes economical and enforces itself, when everyone is aware of its existence and enforcement, if everyone has internalized it, and polices him- or herself consciously and unconsciously (cf. Rowling, *Order* 745). The governmental power, with its authority resting not in physical strength or psychological terror, but rather in effective bureaucracy and permanent surveillance, which penetrates many aspects of daily life, makes the ministry effective and productive. It is its disciplining gaze that shapes its citizens, and ensures compliance to laws and guidelines. However, as surveillance should be invisible to those subjected to it (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 200) it is questionable in how far the Ministry's control reaches, as the awareness of being watched results in circumventing the rules for one's own advantage by searching for and finding loopholes. Additionally, on the part of the other powers, Voldemort and Dumbledore, there is no motivation to control the Ministry, no plan to destroy and rebuild new form of government in its place or on its foundations. However, they do use its instrument of power, namely laws, rules and most importantly its means of surveillance for their puposes. “Obviously wizards do not need it, because they can obtain their preferences” on their own often through violent conflicts (Folker-Sterling and Folker 114). In the end the elements named above “depict a Ministry of Magic run by self-interested bureaucrats bent on increasing and protecting their power, often to the detriment of the public at large” (Barton 1525). Not only corruption and power hungry officials pose a problem, it is the Ministry's inability to exert its power subtly, lightly and effectively at the foundations of society, which prevents the MoM from being a sustainable and truly powerful entity within the Wizarding World. Sennett's idea that authority is “the emotional expression of power” (Sennett 4) to the Ministry seems unfulfilling if applied to the relation between Ministry and citizens, however if it is applied to the relationship between office and official, it depicts blind ambition that suggests the unreliability of those in power (cf. Sennett 5). The lack of emotion and identification on the part of the citizens might be another fact that ensures the Ministry's ruin.

Referring to the opening question of Benjamin Barton essay *Harry Potter and the Half-crazed Bureaucracy*

What would you think of a government that engaged in this list of tyrannical activities: tortured children for lying; designed its prison specifically to suck all life and hope out of the inmates; placed citizens in that prison without a hearing; ordered the death penalty without a trial; allowed the powerful, rich, or famous to control policy; selectively prosecuted crimes (the powerful go unpunished and the unpopular face trumped-up charges); conducted criminal trials without defence counsel; used truth serum to force confessions; maintained constant surveillance over all citizens; offered no elections and no democratic lawmaking process; and controlled the press? (Barton 1524)

it can only be noted, that such a system is tyrannical, not legitimate and bound to be destroyed by either good or bad forces between which it exists.

Voldemort and the Death Eaters

The previous chapter has established, that “[b]eing watched by anyone can be potentially threatening. When the watcher is the government its gaze implies consequences, measured in the provision of benefits—or the application of sanctions” (Barratt 117). However, such a gaze “becomes all the more threatening when the watcher is an enemy, an Other whose motives we may inherently distrust” (Barratt 117). The results of this threat become more and more apparent as the Harry Potter series progresses. Even though Voldemort is introduced relatively early on, he remains just a latent threat until the end of the fourth book, when, instead of remaining “less than spirit, less than the meanest ghost” (Rowling, *Goblet* 653) he returns in flesh and blood. The power he had held, is hinted at throughout the first four books and displayed on various occasions, however, it is not until he becomes real that he is able to assert his power properly over his followers, the magical community and Harry.

3.2.1 Voldemort – Power and Authority through Fear

Voldemort, as everyone in power, needs staff. His staff is called the Death Eaters, who consist, in their perception, of pure-blood wizards and witches. However, as Hermione Granger remarks: “[t]he Death Eaters can’t all be pure-blood, there aren’t enough pure-blood wizards left. I expect most of them are half-bloods, pretending to be pure” (Rowling, *Prince* 160). As Barratt states, the Death Eaters can be seen as a ‘terrorist group’ (95), with Voldemort as their leader. “Their masks, their love of theatrics, their choice of targets and tactics with powerful emotional impact, and their ability to hide in plain sight—in many ways they are the quintessential ‘terrorist group’ as it has been constructed in the popular collective consciousness, and they similarly bedevil the ‘legitimate’ power of the Ministry to stop them” (Barratt 95). The Death Eaters are hierarchically and cellularly structured, “commands passed from centre throughout a network of cells, while maintaining the crucial defensive advantage” of not being identifiable to each other (Barratt 98), which prevents “someone [...] from turning them all in” (Rowling, *Goblet* 588). When questioned by the Ministry for names, Igor Karkaroff states that “we never knew the names of everyone of our fellows - he alone knew exactly who we all were” (Rowling, *Goblet* 588), which is later on confirmed, as Snape could not provide Dumbledore with Pettigrew’s name, thus unable to expose a possible spy among the members of the Order of Phoenix. Furthermore, the members of Voldemort’s circles are wearing hoods and masks, both during missions and during the meetings, which aids their anonymity. Apart from being unidentifiable to each other, the cellular structure provides Voldemort himself with an advantage, as the Death Eaters are not able to successfully plot against their Lord, simply because they do not

know enough members, making it impossible to assess the numbers of members loyal to Voldemort. However, despite having “a single leader at their hub, they lack a well-defined organizational structure beyond this” (Barratt 99). In order to maintain control over his servants, Voldemort tends to place a “great deal of emphasis [...] on loyalty, so much that members are often asked to renounce their outside affiliations and adopt the insurgent group as their only social network” (Barratt 98). This behaviour is visible for instance on the part of Bellatrix Lestrange, who after the Dark Lords perceived death, renounces her loyalty in torturing Alice and Frank Longbottom, leading up to her imprisonment. After her breakout during *The Order of Phoenix* she returns to Voldemort, adopting the Death Eaters as her only social network. Up to a point, the same can be said for Peter Pettigrew. Disloyalty on the other hand, is punished severely through physical pain by the Cruciatus curse or by death. With Voldemort, physical pain and the body as the focus for punishment come into focus ones more. Not only does he torture his followers for disloyalty or out of anger, but the dark mark, which is branded into the left forearm of each Death Eater, burns when they are called, and makes it possible for them to apparate to his side (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 710).

Voldemort asserts power over his followers and the wizarding community mostly through a rule of terror. Terror itself is “intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act” (United Nations 2005). By choosing symbolic targets, such as the death of high ranking officials (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 12), the abduction of well-known citizens such as the wandmaker Ollivander (Rowling, *Hallows* 349) or the attack on a family of Muggles during the Quidditch Worldcup, as well as by using “unconventional means to create mass emotive impact and even targeting the innocent” (Barratt 100) Voldemort's reign can only be fully understood as a performance (cf. Barratt 100). Apart from the aspect of terror and utmost discipline, Voldemort's rule could be understood, in Weber's terms, as a mixture between charismatic and traditional authority. Traditional authority is defined by the belief in the “virtue of the sanctity of age-old rules and powers” (Weber 226). The one who exercises power is not a superior in the sense of rational legal rule, but a personal master, whereas his “administrative staff does not consist mainly of officials but of personal retainers, and the ruled are not “members” of an association but are either his traditional “comrades” or his “subjects”” (Weber 226). Hence, “[o]bedience is owed not to enacted rules but to the person who occupies a position of authority by tradition or who has been chosen” (Weber 226). However, the master does not need an administrative staff. The staff consists of those “related to the chief by traditional ties of loyalty” (patrimonial recruitment) (Weber 226), such as slaves, kinsmen or clients, or of those recruited extra-patrimonial:

- a) persons in a relation of purely personal loyalty such as all sorts of “favorites,”

- b) persons standing in a relation of fealty to their lord (vassals), and, finally,
- c) free men who voluntarily enter into a relation of personal loyalty as officials.

(Weber 227)

The master's commands are legitimised in two ways:

- a) partly in terms of traditions which themselves directly determine the content of the command and are believed to be valid within certain limits that cannot be overstepped without endangering the master's traditional status;
- b) partly in terms of the master's discretion in that sphere which tradition leaves open to him; this traditional prerogative rests primarily on the fact that the obligations of personal obedience tend to be essentially unlimited.

(Weber 228)

Voldemort certainly refers to tradition and bases his aims on tradition, namely the tradition of pure-bloods. He remarks during *The Deathly Hallows*, that “[m]any of our oldest family trees become a little diseased over time” (Rowling 11), thus stating that it would be necessary to prune them in order to keep them healthy (cf. Rowling 11) leading to the comment that “[they] shall cut away the canker that infects [them] until only those of the true blood remain” (Rowling 11). By focussing on the dichotomy between pure-bloods and Muggle-borns and half-bloods, he refers to his ancestor Salazar Slytherin, who was keen on keeping “magical learning [...] within all-magic families [and unwilling to take] students of Muggle parentage, believing them to be untrustworthy” (Rowling, *Chamber* 150). Most of his Death Eaters share this belief, thus being convinced of the “sanctity of age-old rules and powers” (Weber 226). His followers, who address him by the title “master” or “my lord” respectively, thus emphasising their status as his loyal servants, might follow him out of free will, or fear, or perceived loyalty and the promise of wealth and power, but they are rendered slaves, as Voldemort brands them with his personal mark, stigmatizing them and literally marking them as his. This allows him to deal with them as he sees fit. However, his rule, especially his first rise, could also be defined by charismatic authority. The term charisma will be

“applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a “leader.” (Weber 241)

Although Voldemort is said to have been “quiet albeit brilliant boy”, “committed to becoming a first rate wizard” (Rowling, *Prince* 184; 239), charismatic and accumulating followers early on, the quality that marks him as extraordinary and is not accessible to any ordinary person, is certainly not positive. Dumbledore remarks that the followers gravitated towards him, because he “could show them more refined forms of

cruelty” (Rowling, *Prince* 292). The recognition must be “freely given and guaranteed by what is held to be a proof [...] and consists in devotion to the corresponding revelation, hero worship, or absolute trust in the leader” (Weber 242), which marks the point where the application of charismatic rule seems troublesome, because even though many Death Eaters claim “that they are in his confidence, that they alone are close to him, even understand him” (Rowling, *Prince* 184) they are ultimately wrong, as Voldemort prefers to operate alone (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 184) and “shows just as little mercy to his followers as to his enemies” (Rowling, *Stone* 240). The Death Eaters follow him out of various reasons. They are “a motley collection; a mixture of the weak seeking protection, the ambitious seeking some shared glory, and the thuggish gravitating toward a leader who could show them more refined forms of cruelty” (Rowling, *Prince* 361), or out for fear of his unpredictability. Foucault argues “one may have a hold over others’ bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, ‘docile’ bodies” (*Discipline* 138). Hence, the Death Eaters knowledge of the potential of his power disciplines them into docility and obedience. They internalize his gaze, and even though they are supposed to enforce his power, they are victims to it as “[The Panopticon]’s a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised” (Foucault, *Power* 155-156). As Weber denotes his types of legitimate rule as “ideal types”, which do not exist in their pure form, the application of the traditional type shall suffice, if it is delivered with the remark of including a few point that could be considered a part of charismatic authority.

However, the entire magical community cannot be defined as being loyal to Voldemort, or even being a follower. His power over the entire Wizarding World rests on being invisible to the wider public, spreading fear, paranoia, mistrust and suspicion, as confirmed by Arthur Weasley:

“Imagine that Voldemort’s powerful now. You don’t know who his supporters are, you don’t know who’s working for him and who isn’t; you know he can control people so that they do terrible things without being able to stop themselves. You’re scared for yourself, and your family, and your friends. Every week, news comes of more deaths, more disappearances, more torturing...the Ministry of Magic’s in disarray, they don’t know what to do, they’re trying to keep everything hidden from the Muggles, but meanwhile, Muggles are dying too. Terror everywhere... panic...confusion...that’s how it used to be.” (Rowling, *Goblet* 526- 527)

It functions, because he is “raising the general level of fear within the population, creating a sense of uncertainty that can be exploited to further the terrorists’ goals, suppressing dissent, discrediting the regime in power, provoking governmental overreaction that in turn achieves this same aim and potentially providing a truly global audience for a terrorist message” (Barratt 104), as for instance the most lively street, Diagon Alley, lies deserted during *The Deathly Hallows* (cf. Rowling 525). However, even in his absence, like

an empty panoptic Tower, his power is enforced over the inmates, as he is able to discipline the citizens behaviour, as no one, even after ten years of absence, calls him by his name (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 42.) The invasive and pervasive power Voldemort holds reflects Foucault's assumption that

power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives. [It is] so to speak, a synaptic regime of power, a regime of its exercise within the social body, rather than from above it (Foucault, *Power* 39).

Through the fear, the citizens internalize his gaze either in supporting him or in fighting the Dark Lord and the ideals he represents. However, no matter which side one chooses, there is the underlying, paranoid feeling that he might be watching, thus forcing the citizens and his followers to police themselves in order to protect themselves from him. The widespread terror forces them to “keep their heads down, being unobtrusive, making them reluctant to criticize the government during times of crisis, when [they] become more reliant on its protection, or at least more aware of this reliance” (Barratt 105). Yet, the government in question is as helpless as its subjects and becomes, after Scrimgeour's death, utterly unreliable as Death Eaters, or those sympathising with the cause infiltrate it. Thicknesse, under the influence of the Imperius curse, which forces the individual to bend to someone else's will, “has regular contact not only with the Minister himself, but also with the Heads of all the other Ministry departments [making it easier] to subjugate the others” (Rowling, *Hallows* 5-6). Furthermore, as already stated, the corruption within the MoM, the personal power and influence which many Death Eaters exercise within the MoM (cf. Rowling, *Order* 174-175), aids the submission and conversion of the institution that lacks formal power.

Voldemort's greatest power is his power over the minds of those who follow him and over the minds of those who fight him. His invisibility in person and name, as no one dares to call him by it, is much more threatening as if he were visible. Visibility, through rebellion for instance, becomes a trap. At this point, Sennett's definition of authority without love, or the presumption of authority having an inherent, seductive quality, might be more appropriate. Voldemort's power is, in the eyes of the citizens, not a legitimate one as legitimate rule rests on the voluntary acceptance of the person in power. If the subjects “have to be coerced it is because they don't find the rulers to be legitimate” (Sennett 26). Even this coercion does not result in legitimacy. It rather drives the subjects to desire the indifference of those in power due to the fear of punishment (cf. Sennett 95). A tyrant, and Voldemort can be denoted as such, should follow a few principles: “everything he does is clear and distinct, nothing is hidden, all fits together” (Sennett 165) which would result in the question how anyone could resist him. However, Voldemort does not follow those principles, neither before his followers, as his obsession with Harry remains unclear until the end, not before the public.

3.2.2 Instruments of surveillance

At his disposal, Voldemort has a vast network of instruments of surveillance. Surveillance is at its most effective when it does not need to be enforced by the panoptic Tower, but rather when the subjected individuals create an atmosphere of suspicion and enforce it on their own. As, during his second rise, everyone is a possible enemy, as a capillary effect, mistrust spreads throughout the entire social body, controlling it. The first instrument of surveillance is both, his name and the Dark Mark. During *The Deathly Hallows* Harry learns, that Voldemort has put a “taboo” on his name, a charm that breaks protective enchantments and enables him to track people that say his name (cf. Rowling 389). As “only people who were serious about standing up to him [...] ever dared to use the name” (Rowling 389), Voldemort is able to round up those that defy him. The Dark Mark has a similar function, as Voldemort is able to locate his Death Eaters easily, when they touch the Mark (cf. Rowling 529). Furthermore, even in his wraith-like state, he asserts surveillance, as he possesses Quirrel, who becomes a literal bearer of Voldemort's panoptic gaze and, additionally, becoming a docile body. However, the true potential of his surveillance becomes visible during *The Deathly Hallows*. After the fall of Scrimgeour, Thicknesse is installed as Minister of Magic, thus bringing the Ministry under Voldemort's control and enabling him to use all forms of surveillance at the disposal of the Ministry. His surveillance becomes exponentially inescapable, leaving next to no space for the citizens to hide from his gaze. He is able to monitor and regulate Magical Transportation, pass laws, prosecute individuals, use the Trace to track wizards, use the records on wizards and witches and enforce his power through the Aurorcorps, the magical police. For example, Voldemort manages to force through a bill requiring all Muggle-born witches and wizards to “prove” their magic. Remus Lupin explains:

“Muggle-borns are being rounded up as we speak.... Unless you can prove that you have at least one close Wizarding relative, you are now deemed to have obtained your magical power illegally and must suffer the punishment” (Rowling 209)

Even the last panoptic Tower, Hogwarts, is under his control, as he has appointed Snape as headmaster, supported by two new teachers, the Carrows, who are “in charge of all discipline [because t]hey like punishment” (Rowling 573), making even Umbridge look tame. Furthermore

“Attendance is now compulsory.... This way, Voldemort will have the whole...population under his eye from a young age. And it's also another way of weeding-out Muggle-borns,

because students must receive Blood Status—meaning that they have proven to the Ministry that they are of Wizard descent— before they are allowed to attend” (Rowling 210)

By controlling Hogwarts, Voldemort is able to influence the thoughts and behaviour of all wizarding children, shaping them into docile bodies, which obey his command. With the children of all “proven” wizards and witches under his direct control, can bring up an entire generation of Muggle-hating, Unforgivable-Curse-casting Death Eaters. This is reflective of Foucault's assertion, that the

Panopticon was also a laboratory; it could be used as a machine to carry out experiments, to alter behaviour, to train or correct individuals.... One could bring up different children according to different systems of thought, making certain children believe that two and two do not make four or that the moon is a cheese (Discipline 203-4).

Moreover, by then he controls all panoptic Towers, making it impossible to escape his gaze.

Another form of surveillance, albeit, he uses rarely, is the connection between Harry and himself through the Horcrux within Harry. This link makes Voldemort's panoptic gaze feel immediate, ever-present, inescapable, disciplining Harry, without Voldemort being present. It also allows Voldemort to gain knowledge about his enemy, which he is able to use accordingly. He can supervise Harry at any given time; can manipulate him forcing Harry to apply measures, such as Occlumency, to protect himself. However, this link is reciprocal, as Harry can enter Voldemort's mind himself. Voldemort possesses a gaze “which has each individual under its weight... [and] end[s] by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself” (Foucault, *Power* 155).

In the end, power has made Voldemort mad (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 27) and even though he has an “apparatus of total and circulating mistrust [...] [a] perfected form of surveillance [namely] *malveillance*” (Foucault, *Power* 158) at his disposal, authority based on fear and sheer power is only sustainable for a short time, because, as Sennett puts it, “[t]he master is blinded by his own pleasure of power and domination [which] makes him too insensitive to recognise that it must come to an end” (165).

And tell where you belong!⁵ – Hogwarts

The initial quote “Hogwarts isn’t safe anymore” (Newell 01:52:30), taken from the fourth movie, which represents a point of transition of the whole series, might be a question asked throughout the entire series. When Harry enters the magical world, he has to face mortal peril on numerous occasions. Even though he remains mostly unscathed, it is questionable whether Hogwarts, throughout Harry's schooldays, has ever been safe. However, it is not just the threat by monsters, Voldemort, the Ministry or escaped convicts, which threaten Harry and his friends, but also the dubious distribution of power and authority of the school.

3.3.1 Hogwarts – Heterotopia and Total Institution

Hogwarts can be qualified as a total institution, according to Erving Goffman's specification of the term in his work *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Total institutions provide “an entire world” (Goffman 15) for their inmates, meaning that “the basic social arrangement in modern society” of “sleep[ing], play[ing] and work[ing] in different places, in each case with a different set of co-participants, under a different authority, and without an overall rational plan” (Goffman 17) is broken up in favour of an encompassing institution, in which all aspects of life are carried out in one place, under the same authority and “in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together” (Goffman 18). The phases of the day, including labour and meals for instance, “are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole circle of activities being imposed from above through a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials” (Goffman 18). The content of the enforced activities are “brought together as parts of a single overall rational plan purportedly designed to fulfil the official aims of the institution” (Goffman 18). Furthermore, its total character is “symbolised by barriers to social intercourse with the outside and to departure” (Goffman 15) as total institutions are often surrounded by “barbed wire, water, forests, moors” (Goffman 15) in order to prevent the inmates from escaping and establishing uncontrolled contact with family members, friends or others.

As Hogwarts is a boarding school, which is set presumably in Scotland (cf. *Prisoner of Azkaban* 102), and which is hidden from the eyes of Muggles by various protection enchantments, the students experience the breakup of the usual spheres of their aspects of life, the tight scheduling of daily activities as well as the incompatibility of family and total institutions (cf. Goffman 22), as they live away from their families for roughly nine to ten months out of twelve, with just a Christmas break in-between and no possibility to visit

or receive visits during the school year restricting contact to owl post. The only exceptions to this rule are serious accidents, which allow parents to visit their children for example when, during *The Half-blood Prince*, Ron is poisoned. Additionally the children are sleeping in dorm rooms, therefore being in close proximity with the same group of people during their day-to-day dealings and throughout their time outside of class. Hogwarts, “[a] huge, rambling, quite scary-looking castle, with a jumble of towers and battlements” (*Transcript*), is furthermore surrounded by a wall, Mountains, the Black Lake to the south and the Forbidden forest to the west (cf. McCabe 29; 329), thus heavily restricting the students to the grounds of the school, as for instance the Forbidden Forest is strictly forbidden to all students (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 101), with “all sorts of things in there” (Rowling, *Stone* 199) prompting even Hagrid to carry crossbow with him (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 198) when venturing into its depths. As various occupants of the forest attack Harry several times within it, the forest serves as an effective measure to keep the students to the grounds of the school. Furthermore, apart from the visible barriers around the school, there is another, invisible wall, an Anti-Apparation Ward, which prevents individuals from apparating into or disapparating out of Hogwarts (Rowling, *Prince* 254). However, the barriers go even further. In *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, Hogwarts transforms into a prison for most of its students. In their third year, students are, after having their guardian sign the permission, allowed to venture of the grounds and into the village close to the school, called Hogsmead (cf. Rowling, *Prisoner* 39). If the permission is denied, the student is forced to stay within the castle. During the course of the third book, additional guards, the Dementors of Azkaban, are installed around Hogwarts, thus effectively keeping the students from leaving the grounds in fear of being subjected to the Dementors’ effects. Therefore Hogwarts is circled by various “barriers to social intercourse with the outside and to [prevent] departure” (Goffman 15), which might be meant for the protection of the students.

Another key factor of total institutions is the “handling of many human needs by the bureaucratic organization of whole blocks of people” (Goffman 18). Like Foucault, Goffman attributes the efficient handling of large blocks of people to a strict system of rules, regulations, liberties and restrictions (cf. Goffman 18). Through this system

it becomes possible to use a relatively small number of supervisory personnel where the central relationship is not guidance or periodic checking, as in many employer-employee relations, but rather surveillance – a seeing to it that everyone does what he has been clearly told is required of him, and this under conditions where one person's infraction is likely to stand out in relief against the visible, constantly examined, compliance of the others (Goffman 18).

Just as the guardian of the tower is tied to the fate of the inmates (cf. Foucault 204), the personnel and the individuals within the total institution are made for each other and tied to each other (cf. Goffman 18). Whereas the inmates, the individuals that live in the institution and who have restricted access and contact to the world outside the institutions

walls, the staff works within the institution, while being “socially integrated into the outside world” (Goffman 18). The staff is allowed to leave the institution, thus the separation of the aspects of life is not applied to the personnel working in the institution. However, should the staff be required to live in the institution, Goffman states that they would “suffer special hardships” (18) presumably of the psychological kind. The two groupings, inmate and staff, perceive the member of the other “in terms of narrow hostile stereotypes, staff often seeing inmates as bitter, secretive and untrustworthy, while inmates often see staff as condescending, highhanded and mean” (Goffman 18). The staff “tends to feel superior and righteous; inmates tend, in some ways at least, to feel inferior, weak, blameworthy and guilty” (Goffman 18). The contact between the two groupings, if it is conducted, is formally prescribed, as “talk across the boundaries may be conducted in a special tone of voice”, including forced verbal deference on the part of the inmates, (Goffman 19) and should be “restricted to passage of information” (Goffman 19). The inmate should, however, be always “excluded from knowledge of the decisions regarding his fate” (Goffman 19), which supposedly “helps to maintain the antagonistic stereotypes” (Goffman 20) between the groups. Furthermore, within those institutions,

[a]reas of autonomous decision are eliminated through the process of collective scheduling of daily activity. Many channels of communication with the outside are restricted or closed off completely. Verbal discrediting occurs in many forms as a matter of course. Expressive signs of respect for the staff are coercively and continuously demanded (Goffman 45).

It is an authority of the echelon kind, as “any member of staff has certain rights to discipline any member of the inmate class” (Goffman 46). Rulings

are abundant, novel, and closely enforced so that, quite characteristically, inmates live with chronic anxiety about breaking the rules and chronic worry about the consequences of breaking them. The desire to “stay out of trouble” in a total institution is likely to require persistent conscious effort and may lead the inmate to abjure certain levels of sociability with his fellows in order to avoid the incidents that may occur in these circumstances (Goffman 48-49).

Obedience to those rules is rewarded, whereas misbehaviour is punished more severely than the inmate knew before.

In Hogwarts, students do, as already mentioned, experience the breakup of their life through portioning of life, as they live, eat, sleep and work with the same group of people everyday and most likely for seven years. Their day is tightly scheduled with the help of timetables and additional activities, such as Quidditch and regular mealtimes, all of which are “imposed from above through a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials” (Goffman 18). It is always conducted in the company of a larger group of people, without giving the students any form of privacy. However, they do not only share those activities with their housemates or schoolmates but also with the teachers, who also reside within

the castle. It is unclear whether the teachers have any living family outside of Hogwarts, as it is never mentioned, thus the social integration in the outside world is disputable. The behaviour of staff and student is characterised by a certain tone of voice, verbal deference, sometimes forced (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 120) sometimes voluntary, and the exchange of information. It is rarely denoted by the exchange of personal information or guidance. The staff is allowed to deal with misbehaviour individually, the punishment ranging from detention, taking housepoints or “of the temporary or permanent withdrawal of privileges or abrogation of the right to try to earn them” (Goffman 48), for instance banning someone from playing Quidditch (cf. Rowling, *Order* 575). Apart from the verbal deference, such as the usage of appropriate titles, and their ability to deal out punishments, the staff and the students are visibly separated in the Great Hall, as the teachers sit at the High Table. As the name indicates, the table is elevated, thus enabling the teachers to overlook the entire hall at one glance (Rowling, *Stone* 97). The difference between the staff-inmate relationship that Goffman proposes and the relationship at Hogwarts is the lack of antagonistic stereotypes. Even though the teachers seem somewhat detached from their students, and the people with authority are generally not fully trusted, there is no open aversion between the groupings. The only exception is Snape, who is disliked by most of the student body for his unfairness and abuse of his authority and who seems to reciprocate the sentiment, thinking of the students as “dunderheads” (Rowling, *Stone* 109).

Within total institutions, upon admission the future inmate “is immediately stripped of his wonted supports, and his self is systematically, if often unintentionally, mortified [...] [and] is led into a series of abasements, degradations, humiliations, and profanations of self” (Goffman 24). The admission procedures can be characterised as “a leaving off and a taking on with the midpoint marked by physical nakedness” (Goffman 28), after which the inmate has been “stripped off his usual appearance” (Goffman 29), for instance through wearing prescribed clothes provided by the institution. Upon entering the school for the first time, the eleven year olds are subjected to, what Goffman calls ‘mortification’. Albeit, the students are not subjected to the point of leaving off and taking on with the “midpoint marked by physical nakedness” (Goffman 28), they are exposed to a similar admission procedure, that marks the leaving of everything they had known and the taking on of their new life as a wizard. The students have to wait in an antechamber before they are allowed into the Great Hall while the rest of the school waits for them (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 90). Walking down an aisle, which in itself can be mortifying for a child, they are called to don the Sorting Hat, a magical item that assigns the students to their respective houses. In order to do so, it evaluates the students’ character and as the Hat states, “there is nothing hidden in your head/ The Sorting Hat can’t see” (Rowling, *Stone* 93), implying that it has the ability to look into the minds of the students, thus the student becomes figuratively transparent. There is nothing the Hat is not able to see, leaving no secrets behind. The student is therefore subjected to a psychological nakedness, which, depending on the individual, can be more mortifying and lasting than

physical nakedness could, which responds to Foucault's assertion of “the power of the mind over the mind” (*Discipline* 206) as well as the assumption that power is focussed on the mind rather than on the body of the individual (*Discipline* 206). After this moment of being subjected to the evaluation and curious gazes of the many and the look into the individuals mind by the Hat, the student is assigned to the house which fits his character best, visualized presumably by the changing of the colours and the crest on his uniform as well as the different seating and living arrangements. However, with this sorting the student is, similarly to a patient in a mental institution, stigmatised, probably for the rest of his life, asserting Goffman's statement that “when he gets out, his social position on the outside will never again be quite what it was prior to entrance” (Goffman 49). This is not only related to the fact that upon leaving the student is a full member of the magical society. As seen early in *The Philosophers Stone* the houses are equipped with implications, stating that Slytherin brought forward only evil wizards, Gryffindor is “the best” because Dumbledore was in it, Hufflepuffs “are a lot o’ duffers” and Ravenclaw is only “not too bad” (Rowling, *Stone* 84, 62, 82). As seen in the case of Severus Snape, those stigmata remain throughout ones life. Additionally, the students’ individuality is reduced, as all of them are wearing a school uniform, with only minor differences attributed to the colouring of the houses, thus appearing as one “block of people” (Goffman 18) rather than individuals.

Total institutions in general,

are social hybrids, part residential community, part formal organization, and therein lies their special sociological interest. [...] These establishments are the forcing houses for changing persons in our society. Each is a natural experiment, typically harsh, on what can be done to the self. (Goffman 23)

Hogwarts is one of those total institutions and maybe the most appropriate architectural structure, from both, an architectural and from a functional point of view, to be regarded as a form of the Panopticon with Albus Dumbledore as its watchful guardian. Hogwarts is, thus, an architectural structure conforming to the structure of a Panopticon – a structure

that is no longer built simply to be seen (as with the ostentation of palaces), or to observe the external space (cf. the geometry of fortresses), but to permit an internal, articulated and detailed control—to render visible those who are inside it; in more general terms, an architecture that would open to transform individuals: to act on those it shelters, to provide a hold on their conduct, to carry the effects of power right to them, to make it possible to know them, to alter them. Stones can make people docile and knowable. (Foucault, *Discipline* 172)

The castle consists of many smaller towers, but the headmaster's office as “the most powerful place is the aerie of a tower above it all” (McCabe 359), thus conforming to Bentham's and Foucault's assertion that the Panopticon was “an annular building [at the periphery]; [with] a tower [at the centre]; [a tower which] is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring” (Foucault, *Discipline* 220) enabling the guardian to see everything and

everyone without being seen. Whereas the Panopticon is a utopia, because it does not exist in the form Bentham's theory proposes, Hogwarts, albeit a literary example, is a heterotopia. As a heterotopia, Hogwarts is “a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Foucault, *Of other Spaces, Heterotopias* sec. Heterotopia). Institutions such as this “are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location” (Foucault, *Of other Spaces, Heterotopias* sec. Heterotopia), which relates to the fact that Hogwarts is somewhat detached from the Ministry of Magic, both in the exercise of control and in space, normally hidden from all gazes including the panoptic ones of the MoM and Voldemort, and unable to be entered without permission. It is thus “outside of all places” even though many know its location.

3.3.2 Dumbledore and Hogwarts – Power and Authority

In Hogwarts, “power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere” (*History of Sexuality* 93). Dumbledore, as the guardian of the panoptic system, is the person that unifies nearly unlimited power and surveillance, which extends beyond the castle. In contrast to Voldemort, Dumbledore is able to legitimize his power and make it sustainable, as it is based on positive emotions rather than fear. The legitimacy of his power is based on four characteristics: charisma, trust, false love and knowledge through extensive surveillance.

In Weber's terms, the headmaster can be seen as a charismatic ruler, as he is endowed with exceptional powers and qualities, by which he is considered extraordinary (cf. Weber, *Economy* 241). Those qualities and powers are not “accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader” (Weber 241). However, this charisma has to be recognised, because “authority depends on how many people believe in it” (Sennett 167). Žižek gives an example of this problematisation, when stating:

The subjects think that they treat a certain person as a king because he is in himself already a king, while in reality this person is a king only insofar as the subjects treat him as one...the king's charisma [is] a performative effect of their symbolic ritual...The moment the subjects take cognisance of the fact that the king's charisma is a performative effect, the effect is aborted. (Žižek in Yar 267)

Weber also remarks, that recognition is “freely given and guaranteed by what is held to be a proof, originally always a miracle, and consists in devotion to the corresponding revelation, hero worship, or absolute trust in the leader” (Weber 242). At least as long as proof of miracles and success continue, because “if he appears deserted by his god or his

magical or heroic powers, above all, if his leadership fails to benefit his followers, it is likely that his charismatic authority will disappear” (Weber 242). The charismatic leader functions without administrative organs and his staff “does not consist of “officials”; least of all are its members technically trained. It is neither chosen on the basis of social privilege nor from the point of view of domestic or personal dependency. It is rather chosen in terms of the charismatic qualities of its members. The prophet has his disciples; the warlord his bodyguard; the leader, generally, his agents” (Weber 243). Dumbledore is a charismatic authority, in ways Voldemort could never achieve. His rule, although based on surveillance, is not based on fear but on wisdom and trust. Just like Plato's philosopher king, Dumbledore is chosen as the leader of the light by popular consent on the basis of this wisdom (cf. Barratt 16; cf. Rowling, *Order* 93-94), even though a part of this popular consent might rather be based on Dumbledore's defeat of Grindelwald, the latter who had become “nearly unstoppable” (Rowling, *Hallows* 718) and the fact that Voldemort fears only him (Rowling, *Stone* 11). Trust, however, seems to be, at least for his “agents”, the main reason to follow him. Trust “is related to an absence in time and space” (Giddens 33), thus there is “no need to trust someone whose activities [a]re continuously visible and whose thought processes [a]re transparent or system in which workings were wholly known or understood” (Giddens 33). It is mostly based on love and honour, on specific knowledge on the part of the leader, but all trust, even if it is based on honourable grounds, is “in a certain sense blind trust” (Giddens 34). Harry addresses this problem quite clearly when he, in a fit of anger caused by the disillusionment after revealing Dumbledore's past, shouts “And don't expect me to explain everything, just trust me blindly, trust that I know what I'm doing, trust me even though I don't trust you!” (Rowling, *Hallows* 362). The members of the Order of Phoenix and the staff of Hogwarts however, seem to trust him blindly, taking his word above everything else (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 276-277), believing him even though he provides no evidence at all to make his claims believable (Rowling, *Prince* 405) as neither knowledge nor a transparent thought process are necessary in order to believe him. This practice can be seen every time Harry questions Snape's loyalty in front of an Order member, as the response is the same: Dumbledore trusts him and that is why we trust him too (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 361; 405). Furthermore, his power as the leader of the Order and the ‘side of the Light’, is based on the knowledge that “Dumbledore's the only one You-Know-Who was afraid of” (Rowling, *Stone* 55) and that he possesses certain knowledge about Harry and his adversary, Lord Voldemort, which enables him to organize and plan a defence against the Dark Lord's advances. His knowledge and secret keeping ensures that he is usually a few steps ahead and that he is able to keep his position as a leader. In dealing with Voldemort or the Ministry he is less regarded as someone who is to be trusted but as someone who has a lot of power at his disposal, which is strengthened by the various titles and positions he holds. He is also

recognised as superior in magical strength, as for instance during *The Order of Phoenix* the battle in the Department of Mysteries is brought to an end by his arrival (cf. Rowling 805).

When it comes to Harry, Dumbledore exercises, in a way, the authority of false love. His kind, grandfatherly exterior (Rowling, *Stone* 6) is supported by odd quirks and “a twinkle in his eyes” (Rowling, *Stone* 241) which contradicts his position as headmaster, rendering him approachable and trustworthy. This is connected with Harry noticing that “[t]he castle felt more like home than Privet Drive ever had” (Rowling, *Stone* 136), because if the school becomes the individuals home he is more inclined and willing to internalise the guardians gaze and the guardian transforms into a somewhat paternal figure, which cares for those subjected to its power. The metaphor of the guardian, or the headmaster in this case, which is joined with latent paternal feelings, creates a special meaning for its parts, as the term ‘headmaster’ is infused with a emotional potency, which the term alone would have never had (cf. Sennett 78 – 79). Harry, who, prior to entering Hogwarts, has never had someone who truly cared for him, latches unto the kindness that Dumbledore bestows upon him, placing his trust in him. However, while Dumbledore describes their relationship as being “closer than that of headmaster and pupil” (Rowling, *Order* 828) it is unclear whether he really cares for him as an individual or if Harry is only a means to an end, an instrument to achieve ‘The Greater Good’ (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 568). Hogwarts, during the same process, is infused with a similar emotional potency, as the term school is joined with the feelings Harry associates with the term ‘home’, thus the school, and its inhabitants, becomes something worth fighting for. Even though Dumbledore exercises power and authority over the student body, in his function as headmaster, and over the Wizarding World, as the head of the Wizengamot or as a former headmaster, it is Harry upon whom Dumbledore exercises most of his power.

3.3.3 Instruments of Surveillance in Hogwarts

As Reynolds states, “Harry becomes a manipulated figure incapable of achieving agency, and Dumbledore begins to resemble the omnipotent figure in a type of Benthamite watchtower” (247). Thus their relationship is not one of “guidance or periodic checking, as in many [teacher – student] relations, but rather surveillance” (Goffman 18). Foucault states that

power had to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes, and modes of everyday behaviour. Hence the significance of methods like school discipline, which succeeded in making children's bodies the object of highly complex systems of manipulation and conditioning (Power 125).

Dumbledore uses this to his advantage, because as Harry, for the better part of the year, lives in the school, the headmaster is able to shape Harry's “acts, attitudes and modes

of behaviour” early on, as nothing Harry does is out of Dumbledore's range of surveillance. As Foucault emphasises: “[i]n discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection” (*Discipline* 187). This constant visibility leads to continuous self-policing on Harry's part, even on the occasion of Dumbledore's absence. As seen during *The Chamber of Secrets*, Dumbledore's suspension from the school draws the following reaction:

“you will find that I will only truly have left this school when none here are loyal to me. You will also find that help will always be given at Hogwarts to those who ask for it.’ For a second, Harry was almost sure Dumbledore's eyes flickered toward the corner where he and Ron stood hidden” (*Chamber* 264)

By engaging Harry in this moment, Dumbledore places the expectation that he will behave in a manner Dumbledore would approve of, even if the headmaster is absent, on his shoulders. Hence, Harry proves to be an “obedient subject, the individual subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him” (Foucault, *Discipline* 128-9). The nearly blind obedience to an absent Dumbledore is a regular occurrence during the series. Whether in the form of the defence group, called Dumbledore's Army, or by terming himself as “Dumbledore's man through and through” (Rowling, *Prince* 231), or during the *Deathly Hallows* when he deliberately decides not to acquire the Elder Wand before Voldemort, as he is frightened of the possibility, “that he might have misunderstood the living Dumbledore's intentions” (Rowling 500-503). Foucault explains this concept of internalization and self-policing when he writes, “[h]e who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes a responsibility for the constraints of power [and] he makes them play spontaneously upon himself” (*Discipline* 203).

However, Harry is not the only one subjected to Dumbledore's gaze, as he, the guardian of the tower, is able to supervise Hogwarts' own mechanisms, thus Dumbledore is able to supervise the teachers as well enabling him to “judge them, impose on them the methods he thinks are best [and] alter their behaviour” (Foucault, *Discipline* 202) if he sees fit. The headmaster has, in order to exert his power properly, a vast array of instruments of surveillance, both magical and non-magical, at his disposal. The first instrument is the record system kept of the future students, and those already in school. Hagrid explains to the Dursley's that Harry's name “has been down ever since he was born” (Rowling, *Stone* 45) and even though it is never mentioned where the name “has been down”, Rowling writes, that there is a “Book of Admittance” as well as a “Quill of Acceptance”, which record every name of the individual from the moment he or she displays any form of magic (Rowling, *Pottermore* Quill), thus keeping track of the future students. This is linked with the way Harry receives his letter, which is addressed to “Mr. H. Potter, The Cupboard under the

Stairs, 4 Privet Drive, Little Whinging, Surrey” (Rowling, *Stone* 25), implying that someone does not only know where the future students live but also knows which specific room they occupy – something, that is not common knowledge. When Vernon refuses to let Harry read his letter, larger numbers of letters arrive through any available cracks in the house, the chimney, even going as far as following the family to a hotel and later on a shack on a rock, where Harry finally receives his letter. Whereas the correct address might be attributed to the Book of Admittance, the quantity of letters and the knowledge where Harry is, is not coincidental, but implies that someone is watching Harry.

Once in Hogwarts, there are other means of surveillance at work. As Harry states at the end of the first book: “I think he [Dumbledore] knows more or less everything that goes on here [...]” (Rowling, *Stone* 244), which suggests that every instrument of surveillance is either conducted by the headmaster himself or that there is a constant chain of records by the instruments reporting directly to Dumbledore. In Hogwarts, “[h]ierarchized, continuous, and functional surveillance” functions “like a piece of machinery” (Foucault, *Discipline* 176) ensuring that “[t]he gaze is alert everywhere” (Foucault, *Discipline* 195). One of the most effective instruments of surveillance are the caretaker Filch and his cat Mrs. Norris, who are patrolling the halls of Hogwarts and “who hangs on the last vestige of authority that his title gives him” (Sibley 64). He is also known for reporting directly to the teachers, should he find any student out of bed (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 165) and for being rather cruel as he wishes to punish the students more severely (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 198). He also knows “the secret passageways of the school better than anyone (except perhaps the Weasley twins) and [can] pop up as suddenly as any of the ghosts” (Rowling, *Stone* 106). His cat patrols the corridors alone, but breaking rules in front of her would result in her whisking off for Filch “who’d appear, wheezing, two seconds later” (Rowling, *Stone* 106). Furthermore, the students are watched by their peers, and by students who hold supervisory positions such as “prefect” and “head boy/head girl”, thus running constant surveillance in the form of social surveillance, exercised on both, a horizontal and vertical level. Prefects and head boy/head girl, presumably report to the teachers and enforce their own power, while being elevated from the rest of the students. Peers, however, perform surveillance on a horizontal level, as they hold no supervisory positions, thus supporting Foucault's assertion of “capillaries of power”, as power is present in every social interaction and leads to self-monitoring of the individuals (cf. Marwick 379 – 383). Additionally, their teachers, who have internalized Dumbledore's gaze, subject the students to constant examination, evaluation and surveillance during class and outside of it, both personally and academically, for instance through homework and tests, resulting in scores which allow or refuse the students entrance into certain professions upon graduation (cf. Warner 153). Another instrument, which is reminiscent of the Muggle CCTV, as only few people can access it, are the portraits and ghosts of Hogwarts. The portraits “are able to talk and move around from picture to picture [and] behave like their subjects” (Rowling, *Pottermore* 3.8.2) and even though they “are literally and metaphorically

two-dimensional” (Rowling, *Pottermore* 3.8.2) they are capable of interaction with the living world. As they are constantly awake and able to move from portrait to portrait, they see and hear more than any living person could, making them an effective instrument of surveillance for both, student and headmaster. This reciprocity can be seen in *The Deathly Hallows* as Hermione summons Phineas Nigellus painted self in order to ask about the whereabouts of the sword of Gryffindor, as he is present within the headmaster's office, thus being the extension of the trio's panoptic gaze within the school (cf. Rowling 301-303). However, they obscure the former headmaster, as to prevent him from finding out their whereabouts and passing on information about their location (cf. Rowling 301). As the access to the portrait is twofold, Snape, as headmaster, can also use it as a tool of surveillance on the trio, as they are carrying the portrait with them, making it as useful as a tracking charm. Its effectiveness is palpable:

And now Snape stood again in the headmaster's study as Phineas Nigellus came hurrying into his portrait.

“Headmaster! They are camping in the Forest of Dean! The Mudblood — ”

“Do not use that word!”

“—the Granger girl, then, mentioned the place as she opened her bag and I heard her!”

(Rowling, *Deathly Hallows* 689)

Moreover, the students are subjected to the Sorting Hat, which is, as already mentioned, a device that reads the mind of the wearer, unearthing every secret and character trait the individual has kept hidden. As it is kept in the headmaster's office, it is possible that only the headmaster has access to the same secrets uncovered as the Hat. The power of the mind over the mind has a prominent role within the series. Being subjected to Dumbledore's gaze, Harry notes that “[h]is twinkling light- blue gaze made Harry feel as though he was being X-rayed” (Rowling, *Chamber* 144), a feeling that he has rather often while in Dumbledore's presence. It is a piercing look, which “always made Harry feel as though Dumbledore were seeing right through him in a way that even Moody's magical eye could not” (Rowling, *Goblet of Fire* 209). It is not clear, whether Dumbledore is able to see through Harry because of his experience or because he uses Legilimency, which is “the ability to extract feelings and memories from another person's mind” (Rowling, *Order* 530). As Snape explains in *The Order of Phoenix* it is not simply mind reading, but still very effective (cf. Rowling 530-531). Dumbledore is said to be rather apt at Legilimency, which can function as a form of surveillance, as for instance demonstrated by Voldemort, should he choose to use it. Furthermore, Dumbledore is able to exercise surveillance personally, as he keeps an eye on Harry during the *Philosophers Stone* evaluating, disciplining and teaching him:

[...] Sitting on one of the desks by the wall was none other than Albus Dumbledore. Harry must have walked straight past him, so desperate to get to the mirror he hadn't noticed him.

“ – I didn’t see you, sir.”

“Strange how nearsighted being invisible can make you,” said Dumbledore, and Harry was relieved to see that he was smiling. [...]

“I don’t need a cloak to become invisible,” said Dumbledore gently. (Rowling, *Stone* 170)

When it comes to Harry, Dumbledore's surveillance extends beyond Hogwarts, as Mundungus Fletcher, a member of the Order of Phoenix, follows Harry into the Hogs Head dressed up as a witch, in order to remain unseen (cf. Rowling, *Order* 360). The same member supervises Harry during the summer, being stationed directly in front of Harry's home. Additionally Harry's neighbour Mrs. Figg, a squib, who had watched Harry whenever the Dursely's went out, reveals that she had been intentionally keeping an eye on Harry from early childhood onwards (cf. Rowling, *Order* 22). Harry, therefore, has never been not subjected to Dumbledore's gaze. He has always been visible, whereas Dumbledore remained largely invisible. Harry thus becomes the object of information, with surveillance penetrating into the smallest details of his life (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 198), “through the mediation of the complete hierarchy that assure[s] the capillary functioning of power” (Foucault 198). Just as the inmates in the Panopticon, Harry is constantly visible, his fame functioning as the backlighting of the cell (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 200) making it impossible for him to hide within the student body as a form of latent invisibility. Dumbledore's power within the castle is visible and unverifiable. The students see the tower, but they do not know when or whether they are being looked at, however they are sure that it may always be so (cf. Foucault 201).

Even though the power in Hogwarts seems to be concentrated on a specific person, the school can be ultimately operated by anyone, which is seen when Umbridge becomes headmistress in *The Order of Phoenix* or when Snape is appointed headmaster in *The Deathly Hallows*. It is furthermore subjected to inspections, in particular through inspectors by the ministry and inspections by the Board of Governors, the latter of which has the ability to appoint or suspend the current headmaster or headmistress by voting (cf. Rowling, *Chamber* 262). However, in terms of Umbridge's appointment, the governors are not mentioned to have any influence on that matter, which confers to their proneness to corruption by other sources. Their tendency to be manipulated is visible after Dumbledore returns to Hogwarts in *the Chamber of Secrets*, as he reveals that Lucius Malfoy had threatened to curse their families if they did not agree to suspend Dumbledore in the first place (cf. Rowling, *Chamber* 334).

“[P]ermanent exhaustive omnipresent surveillance” in Hogwarts, is conducted by “thousand eyes [...] capable of making everything visible as long as itself [remains] invisible” and is “accumulated in reports and registers” (Foucault, *Discipline* 214). The thousand eyes belong to Filch, Mrs. Norris, the ghosts, the portraits, the teachers and the students, and while some of them are certainly visible, the activity of watching remains unverifiable as the students are never certain whether they are being watched at a specific

time, they are only certain that it might be the case. It is a network “that [is] everywhere, always alert and running through [the student body] without interruption in space or time” (Foucault, *Discipline* 209) and which is used to discipline and order the students. The number of people exercising power and surveillance over the students is comparatively small, thus resembling Foucault's assumption that the Panopticon is about few people watching the many (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 206). The effectiveness “of the Panopticon is linked to a whole host of disciplinary interventions, including drills that train the body, regimes that closely regulate schedules of activity, and swift interventions that punish deviations from the prescribed norm” (Yar 256), all of which are practised within the walls of Hogwarts, as the students learn specific wand movements to channel their magic, their lessons are scheduled according to a timetable and if misbehaviour is conducted, the teachers are quick to remind their students of the rules and are able to deduct housepoints or assign detentions. Under Dumbledore's gaze, Hogwarts transforms from a normal educational institution (cf. Warner 158) into an architectural structure, which, linked with all the possibilities of magic, deserves the term Panopticon more than any other institution.

Pond, in *A Story of the Exceptional: Fate and Free Will in the Harry Potter Series*, notes that “[m]ore than anyone else [...] it is Professor Dumbledore through whom fate works its way with Harry [...] Dumbledore's strength and wit at times translate into control. While providing the compass for Harry's life and the answers to his riddles, acting as his “greatest protector,” this direction also guides Harry along a fated path from the Sorcerer's Stone to the Deathly Hallows” (Pond 192). He seems to be fated to live the life of a hero, whether he wants to be “the Chosen One” (Rowling, *Prince* 26) or not. Through the control that Dumbledore exerts over him, Harry has become a docile body, disciplined to act according to the guardian's wishes and rules, even though said guardian is absent. Dumbledore's power successfully operates “within the capillary, [within] everyday aspects of people's lives” (Foucault, *Discipline* 210) until “they internalize the possibility of external gazes and then police themselves” (Warner 152) in order to “[increase] the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and [diminish] these same forces (in political terms of obedience)” (*Discipline* 210). The “possible utility of individuals” (*Discipline* 210) is increased, in this case Harry's utility as a weapon against Voldemort, through Dumbledore's control as the headmaster strives to shape him into a self-sacrificing hero. Harry becomes aware of that, when he notices that Dumbledore, a man he had trusted blindly, kept vital information from him: “Harry must not know, not until the last moment, not until it is necessary, otherwise how could he have the strength to do what must be done?” (Rowling, *Hallows* 686). He realises his own docility and Dumbledore's superior knowledge when he notes:

Finally, the truth.... Of course there had been a bigger plan; Harry had simply been too foolish to see it, he realized that now. He had never questioned his own assumption that Dumbledore wanted him alive. [...] Dumbledore had passed the job of destroying them to him, and obediently he had continued [...] (Rowling, *Hallows* 691-693)

Harry, throughout the series, obtains knowledge either through surveillance or by listening to conversations he is not supposed to be part of, as he, for instance feigns sleep in order to listen to Dumbledore and Snape (cf. Rowling, *Prisoner* 135ff.) or eavesdrops at Dumbledore's door (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 580-581). Eavesdropping for Harry, either by pressing his ear to a door, by being invisible or by using Extendable Ears (cf. Rowling, *Order* 67), has two important features. Firstly “it feeds on activity that is inherently intimate and is so because the actors are unaware of the receiver, therefore feel free to be “themselves”” (Marwick 388) thus providing Harry with real information rather than the watered down information he usually obtains. “The second feature that makes eavesdropping so interesting is related to the way information travels. It is not donated by the sender. It is stolen by the receiver” (Marwick 388), which is a fact seen in *Deathly Hallows* when Snape steals

information about the prophecy from Dumbledore, something that has dire consequences for the Potter's and Snape himself (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 676ff.).

Even though Harry is disciplined and constantly watched even before he enters the Wizarding World, the same world “also provides an extraordinary number of what Foucault calls “zones of shade,” or places where the machinery of hierarchical observation fails, where one cannot be watched” (Warner 154). These places provide Harry with enough power to operate against the given rules, showing that Harry is maybe not as docile and useful as Dumbledore wants him to be, albeit misbehaviour is often favoured over the rules by the headmaster (cf. Rowling, *Chamber* 329-330; *Order* 748ff.; *Stone* 216). Dumbledore even encourages misbehaviour and the breaking of rules as long as it happens under his supervision and according to his rules, as he is aware of everything that is going on. Harry notes that Dumbledore

“ [...] sort of wanted to give me a chance. I think he knows more or less everything that goes on here, you know. I reckon he had a pretty good idea we were going to try, and instead of stopping us, he just taught us enough to help.... It's almost like he thought I had the right to face Voldemort if I could....” (Rowling, *Stone* 302; emphasis FR)

Harry, thus, rebels within authority rather than against authority; he “disobeys, but the one in power determines the terms of the disobedience” (Sennett 28-33) which resembles Sennett's assertion of the bond of rejection, the disobedient dependence (Sennett 28) close enough to be applicable. This bond of rejection is based on a “compulsive focussing of attention to what the authority would want” (Sennett 33) and “once their will is known to act against it” (Sennett 33). Although Harry might be docile to a certain extend, he is also consciously acting against Dumbledore's orders, for instance as he during *The Chamber if Secrets* enters the Chamber, thus acting against the rules proposed by the teachers. Instead of receiving punishment, he is rewarded:

“I seem to remember telling you both that I would have to expel you if you broke any more school rules [...] Which goes to show that the best of us must sometimes eat our words,” Dumbledore went on, smiling. “You will both receive Special Awards for Services to the School [...]” (Rowling 329ff.)

This reward, or the attention the disobedient individual receives, shows how dependent on the person in power the individual is, as he or she constantly strives for the recognition by the authority, thus creating an emotional bond between the two. The individual will never go as far as to sever the bond, because he or she “lives in constant fear of being cut loose, of having no moorings [or] no point of reference” (Sennett 38) as a result. Resistance is, according to Foucault and Sennett (cf. Sennett 32 – 33), an important part of every power relationship. “[T]he exercise of power also produces resistance, which is conceived as internal to the play of “productive” forces. Thus he writes: “there are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective because they are

formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised” (Foucault in Yar 265). Furthermore, resistances

are the odd term in relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite. Hence they too are distributed in irregular fashion: the points, knots, or focuses of resistance are spread over time and space at varying densities, at times mobilizing groups or individuals in a definitive way, inflaming certain points of the body, certain moments in life, certain types of behavior. [...] But more often one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance, producing cleavages in [...] the network of power relations ends by forming a dense web that passes through apparatuses and institutions, without being exactly localized in them [...]. (Foucault, *Sexuality* 96)

It is a constant struggle of the separate parts within power relationships, as “conflict is the original meaning of being-for-others” (Satre 364). Both parts however, are dependent on one another, because “[w]hile I attempt to free myself from the hold of the Other, the Other is trying to free himself from mine; while I seek to enslave the Other, the Other seeks to enslave me” (Satre 364).

Within the series Harry resists authority in more than one way. Apart from

everyday forms of resistance [which] require little or no coordination or planning, [which are often represented] as form[s] of individual self-help, and [...] typically avoid any direct symbolic confrontation with authority or with elite norms, [and that] involve passive non compliance, foot dragging, dissimulation, false compliance, pilfering, slander, arson and sabotage...as well as moral component (Barrett 90),

Harry resists authority mainly through escaping the panoptic gaze by becoming invisible. Yar states that

[i]f one were to take at face value the claims for panoptic power, then the only seeming avenue of resistance would be evasion, to escape the “eye of power” by seeking out the gaps in the surveillant apparatus, thereby escaping its normalising power. This would entail a kind of “agoraphobia”, the organisation of one's activities dominated by the avoidance of all monitored spaces. (265)

Taking Yar's resistance through invisibility and Foucault's statement, that “visibility is a trap” (*Discipline* 200), into account, it is Harry, who uses the only tool, that allows him to hide from Dumbledore's authority – his father's invisibility cloak, that is later revealed to be a real and maybe the only true invisibility cloak (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 411). The cloak allows Harry to move freely, without being seen and places the “wearer in between existence and non-existence” (Campbell 168). The interstitiality of the cloak, to be an in-between space, to exist but not to exist, allows the wearer to see but not to be seen, thus placing him in the same position as the guardian of the panoptic Tower, as surveillance is only efficient if it remains invisible to those observed (cf. Foucault 214). Harry recognises this power, as he asserts that while wearing the cloak the whole of Hogwarts is open to him (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 163) enabling him to go anywhere, anywhere, without anyone knowing (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 163). The cloak, which is “immensely old, perfect in every respect” (Rowling, *Hallows* 715) and

thus very valuable, is given to Harry by Dumbledore who advises him to “use it well” (Rowling, *Stone* 163) and “to keep the cloak on [him], even in Hogwarts [...] just in case” (Rowling, *Prince* 79), therefore Dumbledore does, in a way, define the rules and bounds of the usage of the cloak. Even if Harry gains confidence in his own abilities, and even though the cloak provides Harry with something the Panopticon had deprived its inmates of, namely darkness or invisibility, protection and the ability to move freely without being observed, Harry cannot fully subvert Dumbledore's gaze within the castle while wearing it, as Dumbledore is the source of the cloak and thus contained within Dumbledore's discipline.

The second zone, away from the panoptic gaze, is also contained within the castle – the Room of Requirement, or as Dobby, a house elf, tells Harry:

“It is known by us as the Come and Go Room, sir [...] Because it is a room that a person can only enter,” said Dobby seriously, “when they have real need of it. Sometimes it is there, sometimes it is not, but when it appears, it is always equipped for the seeker's needs [...] Mostly people stumbles across it when they needs it, sir, but often they never finds it again, for they do not know that it is always there waiting to be called into service, sir.” (Rowling, *Order* 386-7)

Harry truly requires the room during his fifth year, when he and the members of Dumbledore's Army, need a room in which they can practise, without being caught by Umbridge, Filch or the Inquisitorial Squad. Dumbledore, who might know of the room, explains to Karkaroff that it is one of the secrets of Hogwarts he does not know (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 417-8). Its interstitiality is based on necessity, because only if the seeker really needs the room, it will appear. Neville, during the *Deathly Hallows* uses the room's service in order to hide from the Death Eaters stationed in the school, and through clever phrasing while summoning the room, it remains completely undetectable to those that wish him and the students harm (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 577). However, it “does not judge the nature of the seeker's motives—and therein resides its complexity and potential for abuse. For the D.A., the Room is a training-ground and release from the pressure of Umbridge's Inquisition, but it also acts as a [...] repository for the Dark Arts objects that students [...] cannot destroy” (Cantrell 205). Therefore Draco Malfoy is able to use the room for his own motifs that are harmful to the school in the end (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 387-388).

Another tool that enables Harry to become a guardian of a panoptic tower, rather than being an inmate, is the Marauders Map, a map made by his father and his fathers' friends. The map, which at first glance “appears to be a large, blank, worn piece of parchment” (Rowling, *Pottermore* 3.10.1) is activated by the phrase “I solemnly swear that I am up to no good” (Rowling, *Prisoner* 160) and shows “every detail of the Hogwarts castle and grounds, including the people in them, and any secret passages” thus “enabling the possessor of the map to track the movements of every person in the castle” (Rowling, *Pottermore* 3.10.1). Harry thus becomes a supervisor, able to keep track of every person within the castle whether they are alive or a ghost (cf. Rowling, *Prisoner* 160), without being seen. He can locate individuals

easily, which he uses to evade Filch and Snape, and even if he is not in Hogwarts, he is able to observe those within the castle, as he, while on the hunt for Horcruxes, takes out the Map to “watch Ginny's dot for a while” (Rowling, *Hallows* 365) and to see whether “Ron's labeled dot would reappear in the corridors of Hogwarts, proving that he had returned to the comfortable castle, protected by his status of pureblood” (Rowling, *Hallows* 313). The usage of the Map, which rightfully belongs to him, and the cloak transform Harry into Dumbledore's successor as the guardian of the panoptic tower of Hogwarts. Even though Harry is not headmaster, and has no legal authority over the students, he “has been given the instrument[s] of permanent exhaustive omnipresent surveillance, capable to make everything visible” (Foucault 214) while he himself remains invisible. Harry, after Dumbleore's death, also becomes Dumbledore's successor as a charismatic leader, as a possible successor is either found by “search[ing] for a new charismatic leader on the basis of criteria of the qualities which will fit him for the position of authority” (Weber 246), through “[r]evelation manifested-in oracles, lots, divine judgments, or other techniques of selection” (Weber 246-247), “[d]esignation on the part of the original charismatic leader of his own successor and his recognition on the part of the followers” (Weber 247) or the assumption that “that charisma is a quality transmitted by heredity” (Weber 247-248) or by “ritual means from one bearer to another or may be created in a new person” (Weber 248). Dumbledore tells some of his most trusted followers to trust Harry, as he is the best hope they have (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 72), which they recognise, resulting in unwavering trust in Harry which is similar to the trust they had formerly placed in Dumbledore. Harry, thus, is designated by his predecessor and recognised by their followers. However, through the prophecy, Harry is also appointed by an oracle, or another “technique of selection” (Weber 247), as it states that he is “the one with the power to vanquish the Dark Lord” (Rowling, *Order* 841) and because Voldemort choose him, marked him as his equal (cf. Rowling, *Order* 842) Harry is the only choice as the next leader of the Light side.

The last main tool that attributes to Harry's status as the guardian of a tower is not just his ability to supervise everyone in the castle but to look into another panoptic Tower, thus gaining knowledge of his enemy that no one else is able to acquire. The scar, which serves as a psychological link between Voldemort and Harry, enables the latter to gain access to the mind of his adversary, allowing him an alternative view on events, even events which are not covered by the Daily Prophet or members of the Order. It also allows him, not only to see through Voldemort's eyes, but to see Voldemort's perspective on Harry. The gaze, which Harry has on himself from this double perspective, serves as a mirror, according to the mirror⁶ Foucault proposes in *Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias*. Harry knows, through this connection, what Voldemort thinks of him and more importantly what he fears about him. Through this double perspective Harry also learns something about himself, about his strengths and weaknesses. As Foucault states: “starting from this gaze, that is, as it were, directed towards myself; I begin again to direct my eyes towards myself and to

reconstitute myself there where I am” (Foucault Heterotopia). At first, the connection is not as pronounced as it is to become. Harry notes: “I wish I knew what this means: my scar keeps hurting—it's happened before, but never often as thisI think it's a warning ...it means danger coming” (Rowling, *Stone* 260). The link's depth is first explored in *The Goblet of Fire* when Harry notices, in order for the scar to burn as “though someone had just pressed a white-hot wire to his skin” (Rowling 16) Voldemort does not have to be near Harry anymore (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 16-17). The scar's danger and value to both is revealed in *the Order of Phoenix*, when Voldemort discovers the link and is able to send a false vision to Harry, resulting in the Battle of the Department of Mysteries and the death of Harry's godfather (cf. Rowling, *Order* 806-807). Harry, who is unable to block the visions and lapses into Voldemort's mind, becomes tuned to Voldemort's emotions, thoughts, and eventually, his mind itself (cf. Rowling, *Order* 380 -382). He is, during his fifth year, able to constantly feel the Dark Lords gaze upon him, a gaze “which has each individual under its weight... [and] end[s] by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself” (Foucault, *Power* 155), leading to Harry's attempt at self-policing through Occlumency. This inadvertently internalised gaze frightens Harry, he feels “dirty, contaminated, as though he were carrying some deadly germ, unworthy to sit...with innocent, clean people whose minds and bodies were free of the taint of Voldemort [...]” (Rowling, *Order* 492), a reaction that shows, that even though Voldemort is able to shape and discipline Harry through the connection, it is a part that Harry is aware of and which he hates. The scar however becomes Harry's greatest weapon against Voldemort, as he knows what the Dark Lord is doing (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 526) without the Dark Lord knowing that Harry can observe him. Harry, therefore, stays invisible to Voldemort, making his surveillance light and effective, as well as omnipresent (cf. Foucault, *Discipline* 208). The link is a channel of information that neither is able to block. From the moment Harry realises that he is able to consciously invade the Dark Lords mind (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 515), Harry fully acknowledges the link and uses it to his advantage, which represents the last stepping stone on his way to defeat the Dark Lord.

With the *Harry Potter* series Rowling, by depicting the Wizarding World with its institutions and leaders, creates, in terms of surveillance, power and discipline, a nightmare for everyone, who attempts to examine the parts already mentioned (cf. Barton 1525; Warner 159). Her rather scathing portrait of the self-serving bureaucratic system or the benevolent headmaster, whose power exceeds his area, thus reaching far beyond the school, works because it bears resemblance to modern governments (cf. Barton 1525) as well as to contemporary experiences of power and authority. However, most theories of legitimacy and power, are rather difficult to apply, as even after close reading the books, it is unclear how the Wizarding World works. As for instance Weber's theory is exceedingly based upon economy, application runs into problems, because the economic system of the magical world is not elaborated.

Harry, whom “Dumbledore deliberately put [...] in danger, [because] he knows more about Harry and his past than he reveals, and that he chose to condition the child to think in a way most conducive to protecting the Wizarding World” (Reynolds 286), experiences power and authority as overbearing, constant and with a strong influence. He as “the subject of the gaze is rendered in terms of its passivity, confined to internalising the behavioural repertoires laid out by the disciplining authority” (Yar 261) which makes him docile and ensures that until the very end “Harry has no idea about reality outside of the psychological, panoptical control of Dumbledore's influence” (Reynolds 282). As it is through Harry's eyes, that the reader experiences the story, the extent of the discipline and surveillance exercised over him becomes only then clear when one detaches oneself from this point of view.

Power and authority, especially the power over knowledge is an important feature of the series, as Harry and Dumbledore constantly struggle for information, whereas Voldemort and Harry “steal” information from each other by forcefully invading each other's minds. The latter pair delivers and exchanges true as well as contorted information, whereas the headmaster tends to keep knowledge to himself, in order, as he says, to protect Harry from too much knowledge, too soon delivered. As Postman states: “we wish to keep this knowledge from children because for all its reality, too much of it, too soon is quite likely dangerous to the well being of an uninformed mind” (Postman in Chapell 290). It is also said, that knowledge has serious repercussions on the receiver and the one delivering it. As the individuals in power, whether they are affiliated with the Ministry or Hogwarts, are displayed as detached, abusive, manipulative, overly secretive, down right cruel, self interested, hypocrites and often utterly unworthy of holding power positions. Thus, “Rowling seems more comfortable when power courses through unofficial networks, as if its activist spirit is more democratic than power entrenched in official channels. [...] Rowling implies that activists are more worthy of our trust than public officials are” (Barratt 85). Furthermore, especially among the adults, the trust in those in power seems unwavering. Whether it is Percy Weasley, who is certain that the Ministry cannot do anything wrong and must always be right (cf. Rowling, *Order* 296-

298) even putting his own family beneath the views of the Ministry, Dolores Umbridge who thinks herself to be above the law (cf. Rowling, *Order* 746) or Remus Lupin, who trusts Dumbledore's decisions without a second thought (cf. Rowling, *Prince* 405). However, as Chambers puts it:

People will trust an authority to the extent that it is seen to behave in their interest and trust them in return. Research suggests that people tolerate limited surveillance provided they believe their security is being bought with someone else's liberty. The moment it becomes clear that they are in fact trading their own liberty, the social contract is broken. Violating this trust changes the definition of "us" and "them" in a way that can be dangerous for a democratic authority – suddenly, most of the population stands in opposition to their own government. (Chambers *Surveillance promotes distrust between the public and the state*)

Thus, Percy Weasley returns to his family before the Battle of Hogwarts (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 604-605), Umbridge renounces Fudge and becomes a tool of the Ministry influenced and infiltrated by Voldemort's followers and Harry, as well as many Order members, realise that Dumbledore might not have been right or truthful about everything (cf. Rowling, *Hallows* 709ff.). Towards the end of the series, it is noticeable that many "people search for human relations strong and solid the more people will abandon their freedom" (Sennett 194), as more and more people are willing to give up their freedom of choice in order to have Dumbledore, Voldemort or the Ministry to decide for them. People therefore "resort for repose and security to institutions which... destroy their civil and political rights. To be more safe, they, at length, become willing to run the risk of being less free" (Barratt 109). In terms of power and authority, Harry Potter might less be about the dichotomy of good and evil, but rather about the case that "there is no good and evil, only power and those too weak to seek it" (Rowling, *Stone* 234), leading to the assertion that "perhaps those who are best suited to power are those who have never sought it [and that those who] have leadership thrust upon them, and take up the mantle because they must, [...] find to their own surprise that they wear it well" (Rowling, *Hallows* 718).

Concerning surveillance, which is closely linked to power and authority, that one without the other does not seem to be able to exist, Harry Potter is maybe the best example of what constant, permanently exercised, invisible surveillance does to a human body and soul. Harry seems to be unable to receive privacy, neither with his friends, nor at home, nor anywhere in the Wizarding World, as he is constantly tracked and supervised. Surveillance within the Wizarding World breeds conformity. Conformity, that "is so powerful that individuals will follow the crowd even when the crowd is obviously wrong. A government that engages in mass surveillance cannot claim to value innovation, critical thinking, or originality" (Chambers *Conformity*), which renders the Ministry of Magic a stiff and unyielding institution, which is in its surveillance effective but not very productive. The state, therefore the Ministry, should have the "duty to protect free speech as well as security" (Editorial), thus "[c]itizens of free countries are entitled to protect their privacy against the state" (Editorial). With the constant surveillance, and the possibility of being

watched by Ministry officials, privacy is not possible. More productive, if in a negative sense, is Voldemort's system of fear and constant surveillance, which breeds distrust among the population. When it comes to effectiveness and productiveness in equally high measures, then Hogwarts is, of all three panoptic systems, the most sustainable one. If one applies Foucault's system darwinistic tendencies (cf. Herder-Dorneich 172ff.) to the three systems, it is not surprising, that Hogwarts, with its tight and strict rule, is the strongest system outlasting the others. The world in which Harry lives, is “[a] world in which the definition of “appropriate” thought and behaviour becomes so narrow that even the most pedantic norm violations are met with exclusion or punishment” (Chambers sec. pedestrian future). However, the part of the Wizarding World governed by the Ministry, offers comparatively more privacy and freedom than Hogwarts does as a total institution. On the outside, Hogwarts, which is the safest place besides Gringotts (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 74), might have “been a “normal” educational institution, where the ability to watch—and thus control—students was at a premium” (Warner 158), but inside students will also be monitored day and night, their actions under constant surveillance, anyone caught breaking the rules will be disciplined (cf. Warner 147). Referring to the quote “Hogwarts isn’t safe anymore” (Newell 01:52:30) it can be said, that a school, which is infiltrated (cf. Rowling, *Stone* 235; *Prince* 384ff.; *Hallows* 226), in which knowledge is limited and controlled, where students are in constant danger of being attacked by teachers (cf. Rowling, *Prisoner* 319ff.; *Goblet* 677ff.; *Order* 746), magical creatures (cf. Rowling, *Prisoner* 319; *Goblet* 337ff.) or prison guards (cf. Rowling, *Prisoner* 347), verbally and psychologically abused by other students and teachers (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 298ff.), killed (cf. Rowling, *Goblet* 673), or even deliberately put in danger in order to prove themselves worthy in a conflict no child should engage in, where punishment and reward is given according to personal preferences and in which students are under constant surveillance, is not and has never been safe. Hogwarts as a panoptic system is not safe, and has never been, for it might offer protection from the outside world but not safety or protection from those exerting authority on the inside.

The *Harry Potter* series

is an experiment in postmodernism. Rowling does not directly reject Victorian values and scenes of a 19th-century past that modernism tried so valiantly to dispose of in 20th-century texts. Instead, she merges two worlds and reveals herself as the ultimate new- Victorian writer. She composes a postmodern version of a Victorian bildungsroman that evolves into a contemporary commentary about the education and supervision (indeed, surveillance) of orphans. (Reynolds 273)

Even more so, Rowling creates an eerily stringent picture of a contemporary England, which is, according to scholars, not only sleep-walking into a surveillance state but which has already reached a state, that surpasses the fallible panoptic system (cf. Müller-Wood 4) as it is more efficient in shaping, transforming and collecting Metadata about the population and whose psychological consequences have not been explored yet (cf. Chambers sec. pedestrian future).

Anatol, Giselle Liza. *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

Barratt, Bethany. *The Politics of Harry Potter*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Barton, Benjamin H. "Harry Potter and the half-crazed bureaucracy." *Mich. L. Rev.* 104 (2005): 1523.

Böhm-Schnitker, Nadine. "From Public Opinion to the Big Society: Modulation of Surveillance in the (Neo-)Nineteenth Century." Ed. Anja Müller-Wood. *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 1 (2012): 29-44.

Booth, Jenny. "UK 'Sleepwalking into Stasi State.'" *The Guardian* 16 Aug. 2004. *The Guardian*. Web. 1 Sept. 2014.

Bowcott, Owen. "Surveillance Is 'Inescapable' Part of Life in Britain." *The Guardian*. Web. 2 Sept. 2014.

Bryfonski, Dedria. *Political Issues in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series*. Detroit: Greenhaven/Gale Cengage Learning, 2009.

Campbell, Lori M. "Harry Potter and the Ultimate In-Between." *Portals of Power: Magical Agency and Transformation in Literary Fantasy. Critical Explorations in Science Fiction and Fantasy* 19. Donald E. Palumbo and C.W. Sullivan III, eds. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co., 2010. 163-182.

Chambers, Chris. "NSA and GCHQ: The Flawed Psychology of Government Mass Surveillance." *The Guardian*. *The Guardian*. Web. 1 Sept. 2014.

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: Annual of the Modern Language Association Division on Children's Literature and the Children's Literature Association* 39 (2011): 195- 212. PDF.

Chappell, Drew. "Sneaking out after dark: Resistance, agency, and the postmodern child in JK Rowling's Harry Potter series." *Children's Literature in Education* 39.4 (2008): 281-293.

Cooke, Sonia van Gilder. "Pottermore' Secrets Revealed: J.K. Rowling's New Site Is E-Book Meets Interactive World." *Time. newsfeed.time.com*. Web. 2 Sept. 2014.

Editorial. "Surveillance and the State: This Way the Debate Goes on." *The Guardian* 23 Aug. 2013. *The Guardian*. Web. 1 Sept. 2014.

„Definition of Power in English.“ *Power: Definition of Power in Oxford Dictionary (British & World English)*. Oxford University Press, n.d. Web. 06 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/power>>.

Dostoevsky, Feodor. "THE GRAND INQUISITOR." *Project Gutenberg*. Trans. H. P. Blavatsky. The Project Gutenberg Literary Archive Foundation, 25 July 2003. Web. 2 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/8578/8578-h/8578-h.htm>>.

Flaherty, Jennifer. "Harry Potter and the Freedom of Information: Knowledge and Control in Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix." *Topic: The Washington and Jefferson College Review* 54 (2004): 93-102. PDF.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias." *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* 5 (1984): 46-49.

---. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977.

---. "The Subject and Power." *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2nd edition. Ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982.

---. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-77*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.

---. *The History of Sexuality*. London: Penguin, 1992.

Gilliom, John. 2010. Lying, Cheating and Teaching to the Test: The Politics of Surveillance Under No Child Left Behind. In *Schools under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education*, edited by T. Monahan and R. D. Torres. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 194-209.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity, 1992.

- Goffman, Erving. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Inmates*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Harbisher, Ben. “The Bureaucratisation of Dissent: Public Order and Protest in Modern Britain.” Ed. Anja Müller-Wood. *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 1 (2012): 11-29.
- Heilman, Elizabeth E. *Critical Perspectives on Harry Potter*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Herder-Dorneich, Philipp. *Systemdynamik*. Baden-Baden: Nomos-Verl.-Ges., 1988.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Of Man, Being the First Part of Leviathan*. Vol. 34, Part 5. The Harvard Classics. New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909–14; Bartleby.com, 2001. www.bartleby.com/34/5/.
- House of Lords Constitution Committee. “Surveillance: Citizens and the State.” *UK Parliament*. London: Stationery Office, 2009.
- Kendall, Gavin, and Gary Wickham. *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: Saga, 1999.
- Koski, Genevieve. “Pottermore Offers Exciting New Way to Give J.K. Rowling Your Money.” N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Sept. 2014.
- Krämer, Lucia. “Faultlines of Cinematic Voyeurism: CCTV in Andrea Arnolds Red Road (2006)” Ed. Anja Müller-Wood. *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 1 (2012): 77-87.
- Marwick, Alice. “The public domain: surveillance in everyday life.” *Surveillance & Society* 9.4 (2012): 378-393.
- McCabe, Bob. *Harry Potter: Page to Screen, the Complete Filmmaking Journey*. New York: Harper Design, 2011.
- Mendlesohn, Farah. “Crowning the King: Harry Potter and the Construction of Authority.” *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. By Lana A. Whited. Columbia: U of Missouri, 2002. 159-181.

- Monahan, Torin, David J. Phillips, and David Murakami Wood. "Surveillance and empowerment." *Surveillance and society* 8.2 (2010): 106-112.
- Mueller, Cheyenne. "Movie Review: Captain America – The Winter Soldier – Waco Weekly." N.p., n.d. Web. 5 Sept. 2014.
- Müller-Wood, Anja. "Introduction: How Powerful Is Big Brother?" Ed. Anja Müller-Wood. *Journal for the Study of British Cultures: Big Brother Is Watching You (again) - Britain under Surveillance* 1 (2012): 3-11.
- Nexon, Daniel H., and Iver B. Neumann. *Harry Potter and International Relations*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
- Norris, Clive, Wood David, and McCahill Mike. "The Growth of CCTV: A Global Perspective on the International Diffusion of Video Surveillance in Publicly Accessible Space." *Surveillance and Society* 2.2 (2004): 110-35. Web. 2 Sept. 2014.
- O'Donnell, Aisling T., Jolanda Jetten, and Michelle K. Ryan. "Who is watching over you? The role of shared identity in perceptions of surveillance." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40.1 (2010): 135-147.
- „Online Chat Transcript, Scholastic.com, 3 February 2000.“ *Accio Quote!: The Largest Archive of J.K. Rowling Interviews on the Web*. N.p., n.d. Web. 02 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.accio-quote.org/articles/2000/0200-scholastic-chat.htm#living>>.
- Orwell, George. 1984. New York: Penguin in Association with Martin Secker & Warburg, 1954.
- Pond, Julia. "A Story of the Exceptional: Fate and Free Will in the Harry Potter Series." *Children's Literature* 38.1 (2010): 181-206.
- Reynolds, Susan. "Dumbledore in the Watchtower: Harry Potter as a Neo-Victorian Narrative." *Harry Potter's World Wide Influence*. Ed. Diana Patterson. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. 271-92.

- Rowling, Joanne K. *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*. New York, NY: Scholastic, 2001.
- . *Harry Potter and the Order of Phoenix*. 1st ed. London: Bloomsbury, 2003.
- . *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. 1st ed. London: Bloomsbury, 1999.
- . *Harry Potter: And The Chamber of Secrets*. New York: Scholastic, 1999.
- . *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.
- . *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. New York: Scholastic, 2000.
- . *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. London: Bloomsbury, 2005.
- . *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury, 2010.
- . "Book of Admittance and Quill of Acceptance." *Pottermore*. J.K.Rowling, n.d. Web. 02 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.pottermore.com/en-us/samplecontent/quill-of-acceptance-and-book-of-admittance>>.
- . "Hogwarts Portraits." *Pottermore*. J.K.Rowling, 13 June 2013. Web. 20 Aug. 2014. <<http://www.pottermore.com/en/book3/chapter8/moment2/hogwarts-portraits>>.
- . "The Marauders Map." *Pottermore*. J.K.Rowling, n.d. Web. 06 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.pottermore.com/de/book3/chapter10/moment1/marauders-map>>.
- Rusbridger, Alan. "What Now for the Surveillance State?" *The Guardian* 2 Dec. 2013. *The Guardian*. Web. 1 Sept. 2014.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul, and Hazel Estella. *Being and Nothingness: A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology*. New York: Washington Square, 1992.
- Sennett, Richard. *Authority*. New York: Knopf, 1980.
- Sibley, Brian. *Harry Potter Film Wizardry*. New York, NY: Collins Design, 2010.

- Strimel, Courtney B. "The Politics of Terror: Rereading Harry Potter." *Children's Literature in Education* 35.1 (2004): 35-52. 25 Sept. 2007. Web. 2 Sept. 2014.
<<http://Muggleacademy.wikispaces.com/file/view/politics+of+terror+and+HP.pdf>>.
- United Nations News Service. "UN News - Annan Lays out Detailed Five-Point UN Strategy to Combat Terrorism." *UN News Service Section*. N.p., 10 Mar. 2005. Web. 2 Sept. 2014.
- Wakefield, Alison. "The Public Surveillance Functions of Private Security." Ed. David Wood. *Surveillance and Society* 2.4 (2004): 529-44. 2004.13 Aug. 2014.
- Warner, Jamie. "Muggles, Magic, and Misfits: Michel Foucault at Harry Potter's Hogwarts."
- Homer Simpson Ponders Politics: Popular Culture as Political Theory*. By Joseph J. Foy and Tim M. Dale. Lexington: University of Kentucky, 2013. 147-62.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society; an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York: Bedminster, 1968.
- Wood, David Murakami, et al. "A report on the surveillance society." *Surveillance Studies Network, UK* (2006).
- Wood, David Murakami, and C. William R. Webster. "Living in surveillance societies: The normalisation of surveillance in Europe and the threat of Britain's bad example." *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 5.2 (2009): 259-273.
- Yar, Majid. "panoptic Power and the Pathologisation of Vision: Critical Reflections on the Foucauldian Thesis." *Surveillance & Society* 1.3 (2002): 254-271.

- 1 *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. Dir. Mike Newell. Prod. David Heyman. By Steven Kloves. Perf. Daniel Radcliffe, Rupert Grint, Emma Watson et al. Warner Bros, 2005. 01:52:30
- 2 First there are the utopias. Utopias are sites with no real place. They are sites that have a general relation of direct or inverted analogy with the real space of Society. They present society itself in a perfected form, or else society turned upside down, but in any case these utopias are fundamentally unreal spaces. (Foucault, *Of Other Spaces*, Heterotopias sec. Heterotopias)
- 3 *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. Dir. David Yates. Prod. David Heyman and David Barron. Warner Bros, 2007. DVD.
- 4 Rowling, *Order of Phoenix* 845
- 5 Rowling, *Stone* 93
- 6 Foucault describes the function of the mirror as

In the mirror, I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent: such is the. But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy. From the standpoint of the mirror I discover my absence from the place where I am since I see myself over there. Starting from this gaze that is, as it were, directed toward me, from the ground of this virtual space that is on the other side of the glass, I come back toward myself; I begin again to direct my eyes toward myself and to reconstitute myself there where I am. The mirror functions as a heterotopia in this respect: it makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there. (Foucault sec. Heterotopias)