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I. Introduction

The purpose of this research paper is to understand the role of ideology in shaping our political evaluations of cultural content, such as literature. A host of political scholars theorize that foundational and underlying ideological beliefs, of which individuals often unwittingly subscribe, foster how we evaluate and politicize the content of information that is presented to us. To better understand the role of ideology in fostering political evaluations, I will examine the formation of ideologies through a process that I attribute to the cultural theory, and the expression of ideologies through the politics of assent framework. I argue that individuals access their deeply-rooted ideological foundations to interpret content and make political evaluations based upon them. By doing so, the content is processed to fit within existing ideological beliefs and reaffirm what individuals already “know.” In order to test this theory, I will use JK Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* as a case example to show how interpretations through differing, and often conflicting, ideological viewpoints can actually change the political evaluations and outcomes of content.

This paper will begin with background information on ideology and its importance as well the central tenets of the four ideological frameworks employed to analyze *Harry Potter*: Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, Radicalism, and Marxism. I will also provide the reasoning behind the selection of *Harry Potter* as a case example and a brief overview of the *Harry Potter* storyline in the background section. In the literature review section, I will introduce the theoretical frameworks- cultural theory and politics of assent- that are related to the formation of ideology and the expression of ideology. I will also use this section to familiarize readers to Marxist critical theory. The methods section will begin by introducing discourse as a way of thinking about the language of politics, and then introducing critical discourse analysis as a way of analyzing the
language of politics. In the analysis section, I will analyze the discourse of previous scholarly evaluations of the politics in *Harry Potter* to search for indicators of Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, and Radicalism discourse. I will then perform critical discourse analysis on the text in conjunction with the application of Marxist critical theory to successfully re-evaluate the book from a Marxist ideological viewpoint. A Marxist interpretation, with its emphasis on socioeconomics, is in direct contrast to its previous Anglo-American ideological interpretations of the book and will prove that political evaluation is subjective to preconceived ideological beliefs.

II. Background and Overview

What exactly is ideology and why is it so important? For the purpose of my research, analysis, and findings, I will use the definition of ideology provided by scholar Michael H. Hunt. Derived from his article entitled “Ideology,” it defines ideology as “an interrelated set of convictions or assumptions that reduces the complexities of a particular slice of reality to easily comprehensible terms and suggests appropriate ways of dealing with that reality.”¹ Ideology is essentially the system of beliefs through which we view, process, and interpret our reality. It has become a prominent area of research in the social sciences, and specifically political science, because of its foundational importance, its perceived range of influence, and how influential it is in the “formulation of preferences.”² Everyone has an ideology and that ideology strongly influences how we interpret the world.

² Joseph T. Ripberger and Geoboo Song and Matthew C. Nowlin and Michael D. Jones and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, “Reconsidering the Relationship Between Cultural Theory, Political Ideology, and Political Knowledge.” *Social Science Quarterly* 93, no. 3 (2012): 713.
There are countless amounts of proposed ideological frameworks. There are even ideological frameworks within ideological frameworks. It is a seemingly endless font of fodder for political thought. To keep things relatively simple, this paper will only focus on four specific ideologies. Three of these- Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, and Radicalism- are most often linked to Anglo-American political thought. The fourth ideology, Marxism, is also considered somewhat of a Western ideology, but it lacks a foundational emphasis on the rights of the individual, choosing instead to focus on the collective and therefore, contrasts the other three ideologies to offer an alternative perspective.

At this point, it is important to lend some insight into the basic tenets and central principles of the ideological frameworks that I will be using. Classical Liberal ideology is, perhaps, the most common and prominent ideology in Anglo-American political thought. Not to be confused with the modern interpretation of the word liberal, this ideology has, historically, emphasized the promotion and protection of the individual, an open market-based economy, and a minimal role of government. Classical Liberalism stems from the writings of political and economic philosophers such as John Locke, Adam Smith, and Thomas Malthus. Their writings provided the foundation upon which the United States government was built, as the Founding Fathers were heavily influenced by their work. Some of the main political themes and concepts of Classical Liberalism that I seek to find in Harry Potter are the idea that the only purpose of government is to protect people from one another, an emphasis on placing the wants and needs of the self over the collective society, and the safeguarding of individual rights. I will present the analytical interpretations

---

courtesy of scholar Benjamin Barton in the analysis section as a case example of how Classical Liberal ideology can be derived from the discourse of the book.

Classical Republicanism has its roots deeply embedded in the concept of civic humanism. This ideal of humanitarianism is believed to be achieved through the promotion of civic virtue, morality, and an emphasis on the role of citizenship (or, patriotism). According to one scholar, Joyce Appleby, Classical Republicanism is now considered to be the “reigning social theory of the 18th century” - the time period when the US government was developed and solidified - and as a result, Classical Republican ideology is heavily rooted in Anglo-American beliefs along with Classical Liberalism. Classical Republicanism evokes the work of philosophers such as Plato and Thomas Hobbes who wrote about the value and importance of the roles of citizens within a society. These key values include vita activa, which is basically civic participation, and vivere civile, which is basically civic engagement. In the analysis section, I will provide an analysis of the discourse summarized in the findings of scholar Anthony Gierzynski following a study he performed on the effects of Harry Potter on Millennial politics. The main Classical Republican ideological concepts I will uncover from his analysis include active participation and engagement from the citizens, a focus on the well-being of society as a whole, the promotion of patriotism, and an emphasis on morality (what is right and what is wrong).

Radicalism has long stood hand in hand with Classical Liberalism and Classical Republicanism as a common Anglo-American political ideology. While the US government was created using ideas central to Classical Liberalism and Classical Republicanism, it is radicalism that provided the fuel for the initial revolution from England. Radicalism is a much more extremist ideology and

---

approach to politics. The overarching goal of radicals is to “get to the root of the problem” and this is achieved by challenging existing structures. Radical ideology is not limited to either end of the political spectrum. Regarding US politics, there is a presence of radicalism in both the left and the right wings. Some examples of radical ideology-based movements through US history into early abolition of slavery efforts, the feminist and suffrage movements, and the ecological and environmental waves. In the analysis section, I will examine an article by Noel Chevalier and note the elements of radical discourse that are present in his political evaluation of the story. These elements include identifying a problem in society that cannot be fixed through institutions, deviation from traditions and societal norms, and the presence of an anti-hero or a conflicted hero.

Marxism is an ideology based on the philosophy and writings of Karl Marx that emphasizes socioeconomics as the platform on which all things are built upon. Marxist ideology looks at class relations and the means of production as evidence of the presence of a socioeconomic foundation. The unbalanced socioeconomics can lead to societal tension. Early Marxist writings identify two key groups— the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (or “the haves” and “the have-nots”) - as the main actors and source of conflict. According to Marxist ideology, the proletariats are the working (or lower) class members of society and the bourgeoisie are the aristocrats (or upper class) members of society. The proletariat class is subservient to the bourgeoisie and an array of techniques are employed by the bourgeoisie to keep the proletariats content and actively producing, and to prevent their uprising. Some of the techniques used by the bourgeoisie include repression ideologies such as classism and patriotism. The goal of these repressive ideologies is to create tension within the proletariats that keep them fighting among each other and mislead or distract them from their

---


oppressor and exploiter— the bourgeoisie. I will further define and explore these ideologies in the analytical framework section of this paper when I introduce Marxist critical theory.

Instead of using a previous scholar’s political evaluation of *Harry Potter* to uncover Marxist ideology, I will perform critical discourse analysis on the text along with applying Marxist critical theory to the story. The main discourse that I am searching for and attempting to identify will pertain primarily to socioeconomics, class, and social conflict or tension. Much of this discourse will include metaphors that point to the presence of social classes such as the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, and subdivisions within the proletariat class. I will also look for evidence of, and language relevant to, the repressive ideologies within overall Marxist ideology such as classism and patriotism. Marxist critical theory, which I will further explore in later sections of the paper, will provide a general framework of Marxist ideology and also questions to ask of the text to see if it embodies Marxist ideology. Meanwhile, the discourse analysis will look at the actual language that is used in the text in search of phrasing that also helps solidify a Marxist ideological evaluation.

The next question that emerges from this topic is “Why Harry Potter?” Beyond understanding ideology itself, it is equally important to understand the significance of studying and analyzing the use of politics in cultural products such as works of literature. The role of ideology in the creation and understanding of literature, even children’s literature, is significant for many reasons. Literature is a vehicle through which authors can spread messages, provide social commentary, and address societal and cultural norms of time periods. In the article “Hidden Persuaders: Political Ideologies in Literature for Children”, scholar Robert D. Sutherland notes that ideology plays a prominent role in both the writing and the interpretation of the material, stating:

---

To publish books which express one’s ideology is in essence to promulgate one’s values. To promulgate one’s values by sending a potentially influential book into public arenas already bristling with divergent, competing, and sometimes violently opposed ideologies is a political act. Seen in this light, the author’s views are the author’s politics; and the books expressing these views, when made accessible to the public, become purveyors of these politics, and potentially persuasive.\(^9\)

Sutherland’s approach about the persuasion of politics and ideology in literature is a compelling argument that will be further explored in the literature review section. However, one clarification I seek to make is that, although, an author’s ideological platform of intent is most definitely an important topic, it is not the focus of this research. This paper will explore how readers use their existing ideology to interpret and evaluate the story, not necessarily how the author’s ideology influences the story. This is one of the main reasons for selecting Potter as a case example- while there is evidence of an underlying political theme, it is not overt. This allows for readers to draw conclusions and make evaluations based on their existing and underlying beliefs. This is a type of ideological expression that Sutherland refers to as the politics of assent framework. Essentially, this framework states that the expression of ideology in literature reaffirms what readers already know because the work is derived from similar ideological beliefs.

The growing interest revolving around the politics in Potter and the effects of those politics on readers is also another reason for this case selection. Millennials were the generation raised on Potter and are noted for their dystopian views and political apathy. An interest in the Potter effect on Millennial politics paved the way for a study performed Dr. Anthony Gierzynski, a professor of political science at the University of Vermont. Gierzynski conducted his research on over 1100 college students and began by ranking the students based on their self-reported levels of *Harry Potter* fandom. He then used surveys to measure the political outlooks of the students. His findings

were chronicled in his book *Harry Potter and the Millennials: Research Methods and the Politics of the Muggle Generation*. What Gierzynski concluded was that, overall, Potter fans seemed to be much more politically engaged than the non-Potter fan students.\(^\text{10}\) He also found the Potter fans tended to have more liberal (in modern context) and progressive political opinions.\(^\text{11}\) There are some downfalls to the study. After all, it uses a relatively small sample size compared to the overall amount of Potter readers. Also it is limited to college students who already typically exhibit more liberal and progressive political opinions. Despite its flaws, though, this study is still compelling and serves as testament to the power, influence, and importance of *Harry Potter*, particularly regarding the role of politics in the series. One can understand why Potter warrants, and is worthy of, further research.

The final reason for selecting Potter as a case study is based on the book series’ sheer popularity. There is little to no doubt that the *Harry Potter* book series, written by JK Rowling, has been a successful and significant force in American popular culture. According to Scholastic’s website, the company that published all of the US versions of the *Harry Potter* novels, there are over 160 million copies of the seven book series in print in the US alone and worldwide sales exceed over 450 million copies.\(^\text{12}\) The book series was also successfully developed into eight feature films that grossed over $2.3 billion combined in the US and over $7.7 billion worldwide.\(^\text{13}\) Along with the commercial success of the book and film series, the inspirational story of “The Boy

---


"Who Lived” has had an impressive impact on American values and thought, and is believed to be shaping the views of millions of its’ young readers. While there are many life lessons to be learned throughout the Potter series such as heroism and self-reliance, it is JK Rowling’s prevalent and daring use of politics within the storyline that has emerged as a key area of interest among scholars.

Before one can reframe and re-evaluation the underlying political themes with the Harry Potter books, one must understand the character Harry Potter and his story as a whole. While the tale of Potter is extensive and spans over seven books and seven years, I will provide a brief summary of the general story outline to provide context. Harry Potter is a young orphan living a difficult life with his borderline abusive Uncle and Aunt Dursley. On his eleventh birthday he is informed that he is actually a wizard and that he has been accepted into the prestigious Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry to study and cultivate his natural born magical talents. Harry is escorted to Hogwarts by the school’s groundkeeper named Hagrid and learns that his parents were not killed in an automobile accident, as he previously was told, but were actually murdered by an evil wizard named Lord Voldemort.

Throughout the series, Harry studies many different disciplines of magic including defense against the dark arts and potions while befriending several other young students including Ron Weasley and Hermione Granger. Harry also develops a close kinship and relationship with the school’s headmaster, Professor Dumbledore, and learns many life lessons from his mentor. During his time at Hogwarts, Harry is plagued by normal adolescent challenges such as dating and making

---

sports teams as well as coping with the loss of his parents. However, most of Harry’s detriments arise from the return of Lord Voldemort. While it was previously thought that Voldemort had been nearly destroyed during his first attempt at wizard domination, he has actually been quietly plotting his grand return. His goals are to eradicate “Muggles” (non-magical people) as well as rid the wizarding world of “Mudbloods”, those who are descended entirely or partially from Muggles. While much of the magic world denies his return, Voldemort commits numerous heinous acts to rid the world of Mudbloods and Muggles as Harry and his friends attempt to defeat him.

Much of the political interest in Potter stems primarily from the governing body of the wizard world, known as the Ministry of Magic. Rowling’s Ministry of Magic is a massive and intricate body of bureaucratic governance in the wizard world and is also the subject of endless scholarly and political examination. The Ministry is a complex bureaucratic institution with many departments, levels, and offices. There are seven main departments in the Ministry and they are: Department of Magical Law Enforcement, Department of Magical Accidents and Catastrophes, Department for the Regulation and Control of Magical Creatures, Department of International Magical Cooperation, Department of Magical Transportation, Department of Magical Games and Sport and lastly, Department of Mysteries. At the head of this bureaucratic monstrosity is an official called the Minister of Magic, a position that is generally considered to be won by an election. However, there is at least one occasion throughout the story where the Minister is fired and replaced without a proper election. The Ministry is also home to a judicial body called the Wizengamot who is responsible for the trials of wizards.

The Ministry is similar to the structure of Anglo-American governments with its executive and judicial branches but there is little mention of a legislative branch. It is unclear in the books who drafts the legislation that governs the wizarding world and the Ministry’s main responsibility
appears to be law enforcement as opposed to law making. Two other noteworthy organizations in Potter are The Order of the Phoenix and Dumbledore’s Army (The DA). These secret organizations both spring up in response to Lord Voldemort’s attacks by wizards seeking to protect one other and defeat him. The Order of the Phoenix dates back to Voldemort’s original reign of terror while the DA is developed by Harry and his friends to continue to learn defenses against bad magic when the Hogwarts’ class on the subject is suspended. Both organizations are important because they work separately and independently from the Ministry to defeat Voldemort and are the driving forces in his downfall.

III. Literature Review and Analytical Framework

There is growing scholarly interest about the role of ideology in its influence over political evaluations. With that interest, comes a small body of literature and theoretical frameworks intended to understand this particular role of ideology. In this section, I will review several of the more credible, popular, and contemporary theories on the subject. I will begin this review by examining two key concepts: the formation of ideology and the expression of ideology. I argue that the four ideological frameworks that I use for my discourse analysis of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* appear to be closely link or related to the four worldviews pertinent to cultural theory. Cultural theory, therefore, could be closely linked to the formation of ideology as well as political evaluation of content, and my aim is to further explore this relationship.

Cultural theory focuses on the “broad social orientations upon which individuals rely to formulate more specific opinions.”16 Developed by an anthropologist, a political scientist, and a social psychologist, cultural theory is actually more of an umbrella theory in social science than a

---

16 Joseph T. Ripberger and Geoboo Song and Matthew C. Nowlin and Michael D. Jones and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, “Reconsidering the Relationship Between Cultural Theory, Political Ideology, and Political Knowledge.” *Social Science Quarterly* 93, no. 3 (2012): 713.
focused area in political philosophy or ideology. Cultural theory seeks to link perception and evaluation in relation to specific categorized cultural types that individuals adhere to. These cultural worldviews include fatalism, hierarchism, individualism, and egalitarianism. The criteria and categorization of how these worldviews emerge is based on two variables (or dimensions) of an individual’s social organization and are called the group and the grid. The group variable “defines the degree to which an individual understands his or herself to be incorporated into bounded units or social collectivities.” Its purpose is to measure and assess an individual’s level of inclusion in his or her community and social groups. The grid is “the set of constraining classifications which may impinge on people’s behavior” such as “social rules and norms”. These variables are only measured on two levels- high and low- and the combinations lead to the four different worldviews.

A high group, high grid leads to the hierarchical worldview. Individuals that fall into this worldview have deep connections to their communities and social groups as well as an extensive amount of socially prescribed rules and norms to which they are bound. Individuals with the opposite- low group, low grid- dimensions are said to form an individualist worldview. These individuals have very little connection to their community and place little emphasis on social

prescriptions. Egalitarian worldview is comprised of a high group, low grid dimensions so these individuals tend to have a strong link to community but prefer less social prescriptions. Lastly, the fatalist worldview is based on low group, high grid dimensions. Individuals with this worldview “consider themselves subject to binding external constraints, yet they feel excluded from membership in important social groups.” Based on the explanations that I provided in the background section of Classical Liberal, Classical Republican, Radical, and Marxist ideology, some of these descriptions may sound very familiar. These worldviews carry a lot of the same values and beliefs of the four ideologies that I am using to interpret and evaluate *Harry Potter*.

In previous articles on cultural theory and political evaluation, scholars have focused primarily on understanding liberal/conservative evaluations and connecting them to egalitarian/individualist worldviews. This is not an entirely new concept, but it is faulty and could be significantly improved upon. The individualist worldview is often linked to modern conservatism, and the egalitarian worldview to modern liberalism. An article entitled “The Relationship between Cultural Values and Political Ideology, and the Role of Political Knowledge”, by scholars Kristy E. H. Michaud, Juliet E. Carlisle, and Eric R. A. N. Smith, further elaborates on the connection between these two worldviews to modern conservatism and liberalism. This article cites a performed study by cultural theory creators Aaron Wildavsky and Karl Drake in which a series of questions were asked of individuals who were considered either modern conservatives or modern liberals. Their responses

---


were recorded and evaluated. Individuals who considered themselves to be modern liberals responded most positively to the following questions:

- “If people in this country were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems.”
- “The government should make sure everyone has a good standard of living.”
- “Those who get ahead should be taxed more to support the less fortunate.”
- “I would support a tax change that made people with large incomes pay more.”
- “I support government efforts to get rid of poverty.”

Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith considered these questions to be representative of the egalitarian worldview and therefore, concluded that modern liberals held egalitarian worldviews. On the other hand, individuals who identified as modern conservatives responded positively to a different set of questions that were linked by Michaud to an individualist worldview:

- “In a fair system, people with more ability should earn more.”
- “A free society can only exist by giving companies the opportunity to prosper.”
- “People who are willing to work hard should be allowed to get on.”
- “In this country, the brightest should make it to the top.”
- “If a person has the get-up-and-go to acquire wealth, that person should have the right to enjoy it.”

Though it can be said that modern liberalism certainly enjoys shared roots with a Classical Republican ideological foundation, I argue that a hierarchical worldview is much closer to Classical Republican ideological formation than an egalitarian worldview. It is said that

---

individuals who have been shaped by a hierarchical worldview “prefer that people have defined roles in society, and place great value of procedures, lines of authority, social stability, and order.”

If one looks at some common themes of Classical Republican ideology, we see similar connections to community and social groups. Classical Republican ideology places strong emphasis on the role of citizenship and as scholar Joseph T. Ripberger states individuals with the hierarchical worldview “place the welfare of the group before their own, and they are keenly aware of whether individuals are members of the group or outsiders.”

Concerns over the welfare of citizens and emphasizing the importance of citizenship form the entire basis of Classical Republican ideology.

Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith are far more accurate in their linkage of the individualist worldview to modern conservatism. The individualist worldview is described as preferring “a libertarian society based on bidding and bargaining without many rule and regulations, and hesitate to define themselves in terms of group memberships.”

This is certainly reiterative of central tenets of Classical Liberalism that place emphasis on the role of the individual and warns of the dangers associated with large government. One flaw that both Ripberger and I notice, however, is that the Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith article neglects further analysis of the hierarchical and fatalist worldviews. Since I have previously related hierarchical to Classical Republicanism, it has

---

adequately been described and a connection made. Individuals with a fatalist worldview, as described by Ripberger, “believe that they have little control over their lives and that one’s fate in life is much more a matter of chance than choice.”33 This sentiment echoes the foundations of Radical ideology. Often individuals who subscribe or who are influenced by Radical ideology feel a strong sense of oppression (grid) and little control to change it within the existing structures or system (group).

Deviating from Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith’s correlation between modern liberalism and the egalitarian worldview, I find this worldview to be much more closely linked to Marxism and its Communist ideals. An egalitarian worldview prefers “a society based on equality rather than differentiated status, express a powerful sense of social solidarity, and vest authority within the community rather than externally defined experts.”34 According to Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith, “egalitarians are especially concerned with risks caused by what they see as inegalitarian institutions- big government and large corporations. They are also more likely to favor policies that reduce risks at the expense of economic growth.”35 Marxism looks toward uprising from the disenfranchised proletariat to rise up above their oppressors, the bourgeoisie, and navigate through a series of economic levels that ultimately lead to Communism. With Communism, the means of production are owned by the citizens and gains are forgone in lieu of equality and shared, vested interests. Classical Republicanism is not nearly as progressive as this ideological framework and it is Marxist ideology that truly appears to evoke the egalitarian worldview or vice versa.

The main challenges to cultural theory is that it does not take into consideration for prior political knowledge and engagement when formulating preferences and perceptions. When testing cultural theory among individuals, Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith noted “in particular, people who know little about politics generally do not hold consistent opinions or have coherent worldviews, while people who know a great deal about politics generally have consistent opinions and worldviews which can be described with the liberal-conservative continuum.”\(^36\) Their article and the Ripberger article both believe that aligning cultural theory to a liberal-conservative continuum threatens the theory to become just another explanation of ideology. However, the Ripberger study does assert three findings that refutes Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith’s claims:

“Our findings are threefold: (1) people with low levels of political knowledge are able to sort egalitarianism and individualism into coherent worldviews; (2) people with high levels of knowledge do not collapse egalitarianism and individualism onto a single scale of political ideology; and (3) regardless of levels of knowledge, survey respondents are able to recognize all four of the value orientations proposed by CT (cultural theory).”\(^37\)

While many scholars find this to be a fault with the theory, I agree with the Ripberger assessment, and I argue that these alleged faults actually help to solidify its connection to basic ideological beliefs. It is self-evident that people with more political knowledge are going to have stronger adherence to one of these worldviews. They will make an intentional and deliberate effort to align with their party or political group beliefs. By omitting fatalism and hierarchism from the equation, Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith’s study does not offer a full scope of ideological foundations. Essentially their test is merely representative of the highly “polarized” parties in the United States, that realistically do not vary all that much. A United States “liberal” is hardly


aligning with the European socialist models of governance and to compare US liberals to egalitarianism is a farce.

Ultimately, despite its perceived shortcomings, critical theory can be a useful theory for understanding either the formation of ideology, the formation of political preference, or, in this case, both. I conclude that ideology and preference work together to influence individual political evaluations of content. For the intent and purposes of the arguments that I make in this paper, I consider cultural theory responsible for the formation of both ideology and preference. Although Michaud, Carlisle, and Smith take issue with certain areas of cultural theory, they note its significance and potential, concluding that “the grid-group argument underlying cultural theory offers a possible explanation of ideologies and values. Cultural theory offers a promising path.” Next I will provide a brief exploration of how ideology can be expressed in literature through the politics of advocacy, politics of attack, and politics of assent frameworks.

For the expression of ideology frameworks, I return to Robert D. Sutherland’s article “Hidden Persuaders: Political Ideologies in Literature for Children.” Sutherland establishes three types of approaches that authors use when producing literature. These approaches include politics of advocacy, politics of attack, and politics of assent. Identifying ideology in children’s literature is important according to Sutherland because “comprehensive critical appreciation of a literary work would include an understanding of the ideologies it expresses, since frequently it is these that shape and color it. Since the ideologies may not be readily apparent, but implicit only (masked or submerged beneath a distracting surface), discerning them may sometimes be difficult.”

Sutherland’s methodological frameworks help to discern the intent behind the literary work and identify the presence of particular ideologies. Politics of advocacy and politics of attack can be

---

similar in nature because they both call attention to an issue. Advocacy involves active and direct promotion of a particular cause, or maintains a certain point of view or course of action as correct.\textsuperscript{39} Sutherland notes that fairy tales are a prime example of politics of advocacy because they often have explicit moral lessons.\textsuperscript{40} Politics of attack is the converse of advocacy in the sense that it does not seek to promote a cause, but instead admonish an ideological principle that runs counter to the author’s.\textsuperscript{41} Sutherland points to Mark Twain’s \textit{Huckleberry Finn} and its commentary on racism as an example of politics of attack.\textsuperscript{42}

Rowling’s Potter novels, at first, come across seemingly as both politics of advocacy and politics of attack. Many readers seem to note that the books embody a classic good versus evil plot, while others note its social commentary aspects. However, as evidenced by this paper, political evaluation is subject to interpretation and once Rowling’s work is interpreted through differing ideological frameworks, it emerges as a politics of assent piece. Politics of assent is described by Sutherland as “fully as persuasive, in its own way, as advocacy, it does not advocate in any direct sense, but simply \textit{affirms} ideologies generally prevalent in society.”\textsuperscript{43} Literature written under the politics of assent framework tends to reinforce common ideological beliefs and serves as a reflection of society as a whole. This is one of the reasons why Potter makes such an intriguing case example. The use of politics in the story is not so overt that readers are inundated with messages and signals. But the use of politics is apparent enough that readers will even

\textsuperscript{40} Robert D. Sutherland, “Hidden Persuaders: Political Ideologies in Literature for Children.” \textit{Children’s Literature in Education} 16, no. 3 (1985): 145.
subconsciously make some type of political evaluation of the book. Therein lies the next piece of the puzzle—understanding how political evaluations can be made of the book. In the analysis section, I will couple ideological frameworks formed through cultural theory with a book written from a politics of assent framework. I will analyze the language used by previous scholarly evaluations to identify language linked to Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, and Radicalism. Lastly, I will interpret the book using Marxist critical theory to draw out Marxist ideology, analyze the discourse, and provide a fourth evaluation of the book that conflicts with previous interpretations.

In order to perform critical discourse analysis on *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* and determine if it embodies Marxist ideology, I will interpret the text using Marxist critical theory. According to critical theorist Lois Tyson, a “Marxist analysis of human events and production focuses on relationships among socioeconomic classes, both within a society and among societies, and it explains all human activities in terms of the distribution and dynamics of economic power.”

Veering away from the typical Anglo-American political ideologies that primarily focus on the individual’s role in society, my analysis of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* will place an emphasis on socioeconomic status and the conflicts or tensions that arise as a result. The overall objective is to enable readers to critically re-think the story of Harry Potter using a Marxist ideological lens, regardless of whether or not Rowling intended a Marxist agenda.

To begin, Marxist critical theory considers both the historical situation and the material circumstances under which the socioeconomic classes operate and live. Marxism must emerge from a specific set of circumstances that foster its development. Marxist critical theory divides

---

individuals in to groups based on their socioeconomic status, or classes. The most common labels used for these classes in Marxism are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Tyson simplifies these terms by referring to them as “the haves” and “the have-nots.”\(^{46}\) In Marxism, the proletariats are the working class members of society and the bourgeoisie are the aristocrats or upper class members of society. The proletariat class is subservient to the bourgeoisie and an array of techniques are employed by the bourgeoisie to keep the proletariats content and to prevent an uprising. In my Marxist analysis of Harry Potter, these will be important terms and concepts to absorb as the proletariats and bourgeoisie will be identified in the story, along with the techniques used by the bourgeoisie for distraction and oppression.

After identifying and classifying the individuals (proletariat and bourgeoisie) examined through Marxist critical theory, central components of Marxist ideology will also be applied to the text to draw out additional evidence of Marxism. These components include the use of repressive ideologies by the bourgeoisie as a means of control over the proletariat. Classism is one of these repressive ideologies and is described as a belief system that links an individual’s worth to the individual’s class in society. Tyson notes that “the higher one’s social class, the better one is assumed to be” and this idea is based on a belief that “quality is in the blood.”\(^{47}\) As an ideology in Marxist critical theory, classism allows for one group of individuals to take precedence and importance over another group of individuals, purely based on one’s blood or social status. It is acceptable in society to presume that people in higher social classes are more intelligent, more refined, and worldlier than people in lower social classes and therefore, are deserving of their prestige. Given the blind acceptance and perpetuation of this belief, individuals in higher social


classes can remain in power and can repeatedly reinforce the ideology. There are generally five classes in Anglo-American political thought and they are the underclass, lower class, middle class, upper class, and aristocracy. Classism and the aforementioned specific classes are indeed present in the Harry Potter story and provide the foundation on which the story is built. Classism exists between the Muggles and the Wizards as well as within the Wizard community and the topic will be further explored in the analysis section of this paper.

Patriotism is another ideological belief that is used in Marxist critical theory and can be applied to the Harry Potter story. The basic goal of patriotism is to keep classes fighting among one another to help the upper classes remain in power. As Tyson reminds us, “undesirable ideologies promote repressive political agendas and, in order to ensure their acceptance among the citizenry, pass them off as natural ways of seeing the world instead of acknowledging themselves as ideologies.”48 The overall goal of ideology, according to Marxist critical theory, is to program people to process repressive beliefs as normal and the patriotism ideology operates under this premise. Patriotism plays on one’s satisfaction to be a member of a nation as opposed to a member of a class.49 By forging an allegiance to a larger group, one will overlook the vast inequalities within the established classes and opts, instead, to be satisfied to simply be a member of society at all. Instead of criticizing the ruling classes, the lower classes strive for that level of prominence that they associate with the upper classes and will compete with one another to in an effort enhance their social status. All the while, the conflict between lower classes keeps them distracted and their patriotism gives them a blind, subconscious allegiance that is present in Potter.

The final ideology that will be presented before moving on to the Marxist critical theory questions is rugged individualism. This ideology is almost exclusive to American political thought and is considered to be the “cornerstone of the American dream.” It is the story that many Americans have heard time and time again about the individual who strikes it out on his own in search of a better life despite the risks associated with the process. Although Rowling is a British author and Potter is considered, primarily, British literature, there is quite a bit of rugged individualism in the story. Rowling weaves it so effortlessly into her story that is almost difficult to believe that she is not an overly sentimental, flag-waving patriotic American. Marxist critical theory will point out, however, that despite Rowling being British this ideology has a distinct place within her writing. Rugged individualism, Tyson states, is “an oppressive ideology because it puts self-interest above the needs- and even above the survival- of other people.” This self-absorbed ideology helps foster the ideas that a person can help himself and move up in life if he works hard and puts in effort. It also allows an ideology like patriotism to thrive as it pits the lower classes against one another by exploiting the shortcomings (lack of effort) instead of trying to help one another.

Now that a proper foundation has been laid for how to understand the development and use of ideology in political evaluations, it is time to build upon it. In the upcoming methods section, I will describe the importance of ideological language and how I will analyze the language and discourse found in both the previous scholarly analysis of Potter as well in my own Marxist evaluation of the story.

IV. Methods

---

The language used in ideology is of particular interest in the field of political science because of its influence and consequence on society. Language, discourse, and rhetoric are all socially constructed and are used to enhance and articulate the basic beliefs of particular ideologies. Socially created ideas that are based on ideology and distributed through language can be transformed into societal norms, and from there, influence politics, political evaluation, and political action. As a result, ideology cannot be separated from society and language becomes increasingly narrowing and far less emancipatory. It becomes essential to examine the language that is being used in society and politics. Of the importance of analyzing discourse, scholar Hunt tells us “the proponents and practitioners of this approach urge scholars to look beneath the explicit meanings of texts convey to the deeper structures of language and rhetoric that both impart and circumscribe meaning.” Discourse analysis of ideological language allows researchers to dig deeper.

To evaluate the political content of Potter through numerous ideological frameworks, I will perform this method of analysis called discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a complex and complicated method of research in the field of social science and can have several definitions. To put it simply, though, it is the analysis of modes of communication. These modes of communication include language (but not individual words) and semiotics. The overarching goal of discourse analysis, as a method of research, is to evaluate how this socially-produced and institutionalized language is being used within a body of text. Ideology generally produces a language consisting of metaphors and phrasing that are representative of the principle beliefs of
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that particular ideology and, eventually, that language becomes institutionalized. Therefore my
aim is to identify and seek out the institutionalized language of the four aforementioned ideologies-
Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, Radicalism, and Marxism. This will show how a
variety of institutionalized ideological beliefs can be hidden in the language or themes of the text
and that readers will only identify with the institutionalized language that represents their
ideological beliefs.

Discourse analysis can be further broken down into theoretical categories. Some of these
theoretical subfields of discourse analysis include positivists, realists, Marxists, structuralists, and
critical discourse analysis.56 The three scholarly articles I will elaborate on in the analysis section
all use a positivist approach to the text. Positivists see discourses as “frames” made by groups to
interpret their worlds in the same way, and for specific purposes.57 The positivist approach makes
sense as a method of analysis when considering that scholars may unwittingly employ pre-existing
ideological frameworks when approaching the text for analysis. Influenced and persuaded by their
ideological beliefs, the work of these scholars and their political evaluations are merely a reflection
of the current values and beliefs of Anglo-American ideologies. I will examine the discourse used
by Benjamin Barton, Anthony Gierzynski, and Noel Chevalier in their respective articles regarding
Harry Potter to search out metaphors and terms pertinent to specific ideologies.

For the Marxist ideological based analysis that I will perform on the text, I will be using the
critical discourse analysis method. Critical discourse analysis works by calling attention to the
phrasing and metaphors that deviate from societal norms and diverge from common ideological
beliefs. The main advantage of this type of discourse analysis for political scientists is that it is

perri

considered to be an emancipatory process. It is intended to challenge current interpretations of the text by exposing how these interpretations are products of existing ideals and are molded to fit these ideals. After identifying the discourse associated with Anglo-American ideological foundations, it will add another layer to the growing number of ways to evaluate the politics in *Harry Potter* and provide support to my claim that ideology fosters political evaluations.

The process of critical discourse analysis is rather extensive and involved. The first step is to establish the social and historical context from which the text developed. In Marxist critical theory, these are referred to as the material circumstance and historical situation. In the analysis section, during the Marxist evaluation, I will examine both the social and historical context of the time period when Potter was written. The goal of this is to identify the societal and political cues during that time period that help further a Marxist ideological perspective of the text. The second step when performing discourse analysis is explore the production process of the medium and the actual medium that is produced. I have already stated in the background section the significance of literature as vehicles of politics and have briefly returned to this point in the literature review section to reiterate it. The source material for my analysis is the fifth installment from the Potter series called *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. This particular book of the series is considered by scholars to be a pivotal turning point in the role and portrayal of government in the story line. It is also considered to be the book in which politics takes on a much more explicit role within the plot.

The third step of discourse analysis is coding the material for analysis. Since this analysis focuses on ideological language and phrasing, not specific words, I will be scanning the text for
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metaphors linked to each of the ideologies that I have identified as frameworks for political
evaluation. Coding is a challenging process but I have broken it down into a few basic metaphors
from each of the ideological frameworks. Below are tables with examples of the metaphors and
themes I will be searching for in the previous evaluations and in my own analysis. The charts are
organized by columns: feature (central tenet of ideology), presence (yes or no), and an example
(metaphor or theme).

**Classical Liberalism Criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature:</th>
<th>Presence?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangers of large, central government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on liberty (or freedom)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong self-reliance and role of individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual humility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society composed of individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classical Republicanism Criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature:</th>
<th>Presence?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong role of the citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangers of materialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Radicalism Criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature:</th>
<th>Presence?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicted hero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No solution within existing structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation or exclusion from majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard for authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marxism Criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature:</th>
<th>Presence?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeoisie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proletariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tensions/Conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other repressive ideologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideological superstructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### V. Analysis

In support of the argument that ideology fosters individual political evaluations, I will now present a case study that interprets a work of literature through four different ideological lenses. This case example serves to demonstrate how specific political conclusions can be drawn from the text based on ideological expectations. The literary example I will be using for this analysis and subsequent argument is the fifth installment from the politically-themed Harry Potter book series entitled, *Harry Potter and The Order of the Phoenix*. I will begin this analysis by evaluating the discourse of previous interpretations of the book. These existing evaluations all employ typical Anglo-American ideological lenses that include Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, and Radicalism and I will provide discourse evidence of this. After presenting the political evaluations of these three previously existing interpretations, I will analyze and re-evaluate the text using critical discourse analysis and Marxist critical theory. This evaluation will employ a Marxist ideological lens and offer a fourth political evaluation of the book that greatly deviates from typical Anglo-American evaluations. The outcomes of approaching the text with a Marxist ideological perspective will demonstrate that ideology can foster and change political evaluations of content.
Classical Liberalism is the first ideological approach, and subsequent political evaluation, that I will be analyzing in this section. This example case is derived from an article written by legal scholar Benjamin Barton entitled “Harry Potter and the Half-Crazed Bureaucracy”, in which he uses a Classical Liberal lens to evaluate the political context of the Harry Potter story. With Classical Liberalism, the assumption is that the best ways to secure the needs and desires of individuals is through private efforts. The thought is that society is composed of separate individuals, who are rational, self-interested, and entitled by nature to certain rights such as life, liberty, and property.  

Classical Liberalism and its emphasis on the rights of the individual play a prominent role in Barton’s analysis of the Harry Potter books. In his work, Barton claims that Rowling offers readers a “scathing portrait of government” and that her negative portrayal of government is successful because of how closely it parallels Anglo-American governments.

Barton is particularly critical of the governing bureaucratic body that Rowling created in the wizard world, called the Ministry of Magic, and its flagrant over-extension of power. Barton claims that the Ministry of Magic showcases the dangers of removing emphasis on individual rights, and instead focusing on asserting the legitimacy and strength of a governing structure. He notes that a jarring fact is the non-existence of elections in Rowling’s government and that the Ministry is the sole governmental body with no other governing institutions to “check” the power of the Ministry. The illustrious and greatly revered Founding Fathers of the United States government subscribed to the Classical Liberal beliefs of limiting the role of government and took deliberate steps to develop a system of checks and balances to ensure this. This protection of
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individual rights and interests is still deeply ingrained into the psyche of Americans. Rowling’s web of bureaucracy emerges as a threat to the emphasis and protection of individual rights.

In his article, Barton spells out several examples of the Ministry’s extreme and desperate attempts to maintain legitimacy by suppressing individual rights. After Harry attempts to inform the public of the return of Lord Voldemort with the help of Hogwarts Headmaster Professor Dumbledore, Barton writes:

*The Ministry attempts to kick Harry out of school, strips Dumbledore of his various government positions (including headmaster of Hogwarts), sicks the evil-bureaucrat par excellence Dolores Umbridge on Hogwarts, and generally brings the full weight of the Ministry’s powers to bear upon Harry and Dumbledore.*

Rowling allows the Ministry to hyperextend its’ power and control throughout the course of her novels but with destructive intent. As the Ministry strengthens and asserts its’ power by punishing the individuals who challenge its’ legitimacy and authority, Barton says that readers can begin to “fully sympathize with Harry’s refusal to help the Ministry; how could he do otherwise?” Rowling effectively leaves readers fearing the government structures and cheering for the individual, Harry Potter.

By removing the individuals from the governing bodies, Barton claims that Rowling encapsulates the citizens of Wizard World in a “love it or leave it” mentality. The choice for the citizens is either to accept this horrific and confusing bureaucratic nightmare or leave it. Leaving it would mean refusing to accept the legitimacy of the government and becoming viewed as unpatriotic. Throughout the Potter novels, Harry constantly challenges the legitimacy of the government and is, in turn, repeatedly chastised for it. When Harry fails to subscribe to the
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principles set forth by the Ministry such as the suppression of Lord Voldemort’s return, he is faced with complete disregard and framed as a lone, crazed insurgent. Rowling allows Harry to redeem himself through his own accord. The government serves Harry very little purpose as he relies primarily on himself and individuals to ensure his basic survival. Barton asserts that through Harry’s actions, “Rowling presents a remarkably contingent and situational approach to law” and that ultimately, it is Harry’s individual actions and choices that save the day.66

The heavily embedded themes regarding the role of and the emphasis on the individual coupled with reinforcing the dangers of tyrannical government promotes the basic tenets of Classical Liberalism ideology. Barton directs readers to the central tenets of the Libertarian party—a party with Classical Liberal roots and a strong emphasis on individual rights—as the antidote to Rowling’s bureaucratic nightmare. Barton asserts that:

_The Libertarian Party claims to be the fastest-growing political party in the United States. After reading The Half-Blood Prince, I am much more convinced. The libertarian movement relies upon two interrelated concepts to recruit: (a) “that government is best which governs least” and (b) self-reliance and respect of individuals should be paramount._67

Although it is incredibly bold of Barton to immediately conclude that Harry Potter readers will eventually go on to become Libertarians, it is important to understand what he points out. Beyond the Libertarian principles, the focus on self-reliance and respect of individuals that is rampant in Rowling’s text is brimming with Classical Liberal sentiment. Given the nature of Barton’s Classical Liberal ideological approach, one can easily see how he drew these political evaluations from the text.
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Now let’s refer back to the table from the methods section to identify the metaphors and discourse of Classical Liberalism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical Liberalism Criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangers of large, central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on liberty (or freedom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong self-reliance and role of individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society composed of individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Barton presents a compelling Classical Liberal evaluation of the politics of Harry Potter, there are many other ways to frame the story and achieve different outcomes. It would be sufficient to allow Rowling’s work to fall completely under this ideological lens and remain satisfied with the political outcome, but this is only one perspective from which to view Rowling’s writing and it is certainly not the only one. In this next case example, a Classical Republican ideological lens will be employed to achieve a different, but still Anglo-American, political evaluation of the book. This case will summarize the work of scholar Anthony Gierzynski who performed a study on Millennials to determine the effects of reading Potter on their political
thought and summarized his findings in his book *Harry Potter and the Millennials*. Using a survey and data from over 1100 college students, his findings employ a Classical Republicanism ideological framework and lead to the central Classical Republican tenant of civic humanitarianism as the main take away from the Potter books.

Gierzynski paints a less self-interested portrait of Rowling’s work and serves up an analytical outcome that differs greatly from Barton’s Classical Liberal outcome. Gierzynski identifies and delivers six key political themes within the text of Harry Potter to be taken as the main political lessons from the book. These lessons, as defined in Gierzynski’s book, include:

1. Diversity and tolerance: Don’t judge a person (or creature) by their appearance or blood.
2. Political tolerance and equality: Everyone has the same rights to dignity and freedom.
3. Don’t be an authoritarian git
4. Violence and torture are bad
5. Government leaders as Corrupt, Incompetent, and Fixated on Maintaining Power
6. Be skeptical, not cynical

Classical Republicanism places an emphasis on civic humanitarianism and offers a more egalitarian approach to governance and the role of the individual. In the Classical Republican ideology, a central tenet is civic duty and placing societal needs over individual needs. What Gierzynski proposes in his work is that the selfish ineptitude of the Ministry in the Potter storyline
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drives Harry and his friends to pursue individual endeavors that restore society back to tranquility. While they generally always work and act as individuals, the safety of the community is their main vested interest and they become the heroes while the individuals who put their self and self-interests above the community are the ones who are portrayed as the villains.

One of the central ideas in Classical Republicanism is the dangers associated with corruption in the government and this is a common theme echoed in the Harry Potter storyline. According to Gierzynski, Rowling limits the corruption to those who are in power and does not blame the institutions. This is evident in the fact that the Ministry never fully falls during conflict. It remains the governing institution in the Wizard World. This idea also reiterated in the fact that, despite their difference of opinions with the current leaders in power, Harry and his friends desire to work for the Ministry. Gierzynski states that “We expect that perspective on government offered by the series- that individual politicians are the problem, not the institutions- should lead to a set of attitudes about the real political world.” Gierzynski claims that Rowling encourages readers to engage in civic participation, the Classical Republicanism antidote to corruption, by showing how Harry and his friends’ active involvement ultimately restores peace. Instead of scaring readers away from politics, it is possible that Rowling is suggesting they play more active roles in the governing process as per Classical Republicanism.

Rowling’s writings also strive to encourage egalitarianism- another main tenet in Classical Republicanism. Gierzynski makes a compelling case for this by reminding readers that the central plotline of the Harry Potter story is the mistreatment and unacceptance of individuals
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who are different or out of the norm. Lord Voldemort wages his entire war against wizards who are not descended from full wizard parentage and attempts to have them fully eradicated. Hermione Granger launches a campaign to end the mistreatment of house elves. Professor Dumbledore places both a werewolf and a centaur in teaching positions at Hogwarts despite protests. Throughout the story, readers are constantly reminded to overlook outward appearances or minor differences and are encouraged to treat others equally. Rowling severely punishes the characters who exercise prejudice or discrimination such as the Malfoy family and Dolores Umbridge. Again, we found the heroes of the book to be those who treat others equally and fairly while the villains are the individuals who act out of selfishness, discrimination, and hatred.

There is an overwhelming amount of Classical Republicanism ideology in the Harry Potter books. The political lessons that Gierzynski drew from the books and mentions in his work only begin to scratch the surface as he research was more geared toward measuring the influence of the lessons, not the specific thought behind the lessons. However, they lend support to the Classical Republicanism framework of analysis and provide an overwhelming amount of evidence that applying this framework changes the political evaluation of the story. Perhaps, though, it is Professor Dumbledore who presents that best evidence in support of the Classical Republican themes that are rampant in the books. One of the most revered, and heavily quoted, lines- uttered by Professor Dumbledore in the second book from the series- is ridden with Classical Republican undertones. As Harry laments his potential to wind up in the reviled Slytherin House but instead begs to be placed into Gryffindor, Dumbledore reminds him that "it is our choices, Harry, that
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show what we truly are, far more than our abilities.” How much more civic humanitarian does one get than that? Let’s examine the findings to see:

**Classical Republicanism Criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature:</th>
<th>Presence?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gierzynski cites Harry’s active involvement with Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic participation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gierzynski mentions that Rowling promotes this throughout books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on morality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gierzynski claims books tackle issues such as discrimination and racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong role of the citizen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gierzynski acknowledges Harry &amp; friends role in defeating Voldemort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangers of materialism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gierzynski notes punishment of wealthy Malfoy family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of citizenship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gierzynski praises the roles of individuals working together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third and final political ideological lens through which the politics of Harry Potter have been previously examined and evaluated is presented by academic scholar, Noel Chevalier. Chevalier aims to interpret and dissect the story using a Radicalism framework. Chevalier challenges both the Classical Liberalism and Classical Republicanism ideological frameworks and evaluations set forth by other scholars with his application of a Radical ideological lens. Radicalism, in and of all itself, seeks to challenge societal institutions and structures. Radicalism does not set out to embrace the current institutions or attempt to change the institutions. Instead,

---

Radicalism destroys the current system then rebuilds and redefines it. Historically, Anglo-Americans have seen this ideology in movements such as the Third Wave Feminism movement. Chevalier asserts that “Harry’s growing disgust with, and alienation from, the very world he seems to have been chosen to save undermines his civic leadership.” In other words, Harry may not be fighting Voldemort to preserve a life he was once acquainted to. He may be fighting Voldemort to overhaul an entire institution system that he views as unfair and unjust.

First and foremost to support his evaluation, Chevalier draws from the “two distinct paradigms” that Rowling uses to “establish Harry as hero” in her writing to support his Radicalism framework. He claims that Rowling deviates from a standard good versus evil approach and that Harry is a conflicted character that embodies both good and evil. While Harry’s intentions appear pure, he also shares characteristics with the books main villain, Lord Voldemort, such as his wand being made from the same phoenix feathers and his ability to understand and speak to snakes. The second paradigm is established through the moral complexity of Harry Potter. Harry frequently disregards rules, structures, and authority in his attempts to defeat Voldemort. However he also respects many authoritarian figures such as Dumbledore and abides by rules if those rules do not interfere with his good intentions. These inconsistencies allude to the Radical idea that even Harry himself is a challenge to readers’ preconceived notions of what defines a hero.

Throughout the course of the story Rowling portrays Harry as the reluctant hero, led not necessarily by the belief of preserving the system, but more on the idea of doing what is morally right to him despite running the risk of total non-conformity. Chevalier reaffirms this idea by stating:

*Given Harry’s immense popularity among children and adult readers, and his unquestioned status as a hero, it is appropriate to examine Rowling’s critique of the institutions of power in the wizarding world, and Harry’s place as a heroic resistance figure, on the side of moral right, but not necessarily on the side of order and conformity.*

What is morally right to Harry takes precedence and, considering his frequent violation or disregard of rules and structures throughout the story, Rowling infers that perhaps the system itself is what is flawed and immoral. Chevalier notes that even the instruments of change that Harry employs are not part of the system. Organizations such as the Order of the Phoenix and Dumbledore’s Army are developed, organized, and run by figures outside of the government and societal norm. The organizations closely parallel the grassroots organizations that have facilitated societal change throughout Anglo-American history.

One of the most interesting points to consider, in support of Radicalism, is the fact that Rowling offers no remedy for the injustice on either side of the political spectrum. Chevalier writes:

*At the same time, Rowling wants her readers to be aware that Harry Potter is a child of the 1980s and 1990s. Karen Westman has noted the connections between the Potter books and political and social events in contemporary Britain. Westman reads the Potter books, particularly Goblet of Fire, as an allegory of the legacy of*
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Thatcherite Britain (in which Voldemort stands for Thatcher), as reflected in the Conservative government of John Major and the present New Labour of Tony Blair.81

During this same time period, the United States faced a similar shift of political power as the conservative Reagan and Bush administrations of the 1980s were followed by the liberal administration of Clinton throughout the 1990s. Neither of these time periods resulted in great strides of societal change. Reagan and Bush merely succeeded in undoing the legacy of the 1960s while Clinton set out to undo the legacy of the 1980s. In the end, the United States found itself in a constant flux of economic recessions and surpluses but little was done in the way of societal or social gains. The frustration that Rowling felt in Britain during this time period echoed the sentiments of many citizens of Anglo-American governments. It is probable that Rowling channeled this frustration into Harry Potter and he served to offer a new perspective, outside of the system.

Radicalism Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature:</th>
<th>Presence?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicted hero</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chevalier points out the Harry is both good and bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No solution within existing structures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chevalier notes the corruption of the Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots efforts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chevalier mentions the DA &amp; OOP efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation or exclusion from majority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chevalier notes that Harry is portrayed a crazy and lying by gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard for authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chevalier points out that Harry picks and chooses rules to obey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political ideologies can help simplify, interpret, and evaluate information that is set forth through a variety of mediums, including literature. Barton, Gierzynski, and Chevalier provided readers with three potential ideological frameworks from which one can interpret the political outcomes of the Harry Potter stories. The evaluations of these scholars that I have analyzed in this case study all present plausible and viable frameworks to interpret and evaluate the Harry Potter story. However, these frameworks can overlap and are limiting in the conclusions that they draw and will not present a full picture of how ideological approach can facilitate or influence political evaluation. In order to thoroughly understand the role of ideology in fostering and shaping political evaluations of creative platforms such as books, one must look beyond traditional Anglo-American ideologies and re-evaluate the book through a significantly different ideological lens.

Re-interpreting Harry Potter through a Marxist ideological lens allows for readers to deviate from Anglo-American ideological norms and explore the politics of Harry Potter in an unfamiliar way that defies their preconceived beliefs and demonstrates how ideological perspective frames political evaluation. In this example, I will apply and evaluate the politics of Harry Potter using a Marxist ideological framework. To successfully conclude a different political evaluation I will employ several strategies of Marxist ideological interpretation, including the application of Marxist critical theory and critical discourse analysis. The overarching goal of this analysis and re-evaluation will to identify the central Marxist socioeconomic platform of the story.

determine the historical and material circumstance from which the story emerged, and identify key Marxist tenets such as the presence of the bourgeoisie and proletariat as well as classic Marxism ideologies used as strategies of repression. Successful Marxist re-framing of the story will change the political evaluation and support the theory.

The critical discourse analysis and application of Marxist critical theory to *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* begins by first identifying the historical context and material circumstances from which the book series emerged. The first book in the Potter series called *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone* was originally published in 1997 in London, and then in 1998 in the United States. The book I am analyzing, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, is the fifth installment in the series and was originally published in 2003 in both London and the US. One of the most important notions to consider when examining the historical context of these books, and any subsequent evolution of the underlying political theme, is that the series bridged the pre- and post-9/11 terrorist attacks. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* is noted by scholars for being the pivotal dark turning point of the wizard government in the series and it was also the first Potter book published after 9/11.

Despite being a native of the United Kingdom, and living in Scotland at the time of the terrorist attacks, Rowling could have easily felt the shock and lack of faith in the government that reverberated worldwide following the actions of the US in response to the 9/11 attacks. British citizens in particular felt a similar sense of betrayal by their Prime Minister Tony Blair when he exploited the public’s sympathy to mislead them and join forces with the US in 2003 to invade Iraq under false pretenses.83 Left-leaning Blair was highly criticized for parlaying to conservative

---

US President George W. Bush and sending armed forces to Iraq when it was clear the Afghanistan was at fault for the attacks and Iraqi involvement could not be proven. The devolution of the credibility Ministry of Magic mirrors this rampant mistrust of the government during that time period in many ways. In the book’s opening, the Ministry of Magic copes with a mini-crisis of its wizard version of prison guards, called dementors, and their attempted attack on hero Harry through intimidation and flagrancy of the law. A summons is ordered for Harry to appear in court, despite the fact that the magic he performed while underage was clearly for self-defense purposes. The Ministry goes on to threaten his wand (a source of power) and his chances for upward mobility by threatening expulsion from Hogwarts. This theme of overextension continues throughout the book and hits a crescendo when the Ministry removes Professor Dumbledore as headmaster and replaces him with the repulsive government lackey Dolores Umbridge. It is clear that Rowling was making a statement about the questionable actions of the government that were highly relevant during this time period. The US and UK were guilty of flexing their muscles and asserting power for little reason more than maintaining control and the public was not supportive of this.

It also important to consider the material circumstances of the time period in which Potter takes place and when it was published. During the late 1990s, both the UK and the US were experiencing left-dominated politics but by 2000 the US saw the election of a right-wing President and the UK was coping with the much maligned Bush-crony Tony Blair. At the time of the writing of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, there was a growing anti-war movement, a stumbling economy, and calls for Blair to resign from office. He would eventually resign from office in 2007, an event that is foreshadowed by Rowling in the sixth book of the series that directly follows *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*.84 Regardless of whether it was pure power-

crazed stubbornness or blind naiveté and allegiance, Blair was horribly out of the touch with the public and trying desperately to maintain legitimacy by exerting power. Rowling channels the mounting dissatisfaction, negative portrayal, and mistrust of Blair into the Ministry of Magic—Minister of Magic, Cornelius Fudge. At the beginning of the book, he echoes the sneaky and megalomaniac behaviors of Blair. Harry acts as his main adversary because he poses a threat to Fudge’s power and legitimacy by challenging the Ministry’s suppression of Voldemort’s return. Hermoine is quick to remind Harry of the immense power of Fudge and his wrath, as she laments the helplessness of the situation at hand:

_I know, Harry. But you see what they're doing? They want to turn you into someone nobody will believe. Fudge is behind it, I'll bet anything. They want wizards on the street to think you're just some stupid boy who's a bit of a joke, who tells ridiculous tall stories because he loves being famous and wants to keep it going._

Another co-hort of Harry’s named Tonks similarly warns him of Fudge’s blatant disregard and denial of the truth:

_Because of the Ministry's attitude,’ said Tonks. 'You saw Cornelius Fudge after You-Know-Who came back, Harry. Well, he hasn't shifted his position at all. He's absolutely refusing to believe it's happened._

Stuck in a seemingly endless and costly war under false pretenses with a lying and deceptive Prime Minister helped set the stage for Rowling’s flashback in time. By re-winding the clock a few years and allowing the public to overthrow the problematic governing figures, Rowling shows how the material circumstances of the book’s writing could have been altered and changed the outcome of the UK at the time. Rowling’s work channeled the sentiments of the public

---

regarding the time in which the book was written and she reversed the literary clock to alter these circumstances for a different future.

Beyond the historical situation and material circumstances of the book, it is important in Marxist ideology to emphasize the tension and rigid roles of class that are present in the work. Modern Marxist ideology is built on the foundation that socioeconomic class determines everything. To help illustrate this ideological tenet in the Potter series, I have identified the Ministry of Magic as the bourgeoisie and both the Wizard and Muggle communities as the proletariat. Critical discourse analysis allows for the coding of Marxist words and metaphors to aid in identifying these concepts within the text. Classism and patriotism are both common ideologies used for repression, according to Marxism. In order for the proletariat to maintain its power, it uses a class system to keep the proletariats and underclass fighting among one another so they never realize how the bourgeoisie are exploiting them. The actual word “class”, most commonly identified in Marxist ideology and critical theory is not present at all in the body of the text of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. However, the word “blood”- as in lineage- appears 99 times in some variation and for the purposes of this analysis, I will identify “class” as being coded as “blood” throughout the Potter series.

Let’s look at some examples of how “blood” is a metaphor for class in the text (Classism), how tensions between classes is used to allow the Ministry to maintain power and control (Patriotism), and how socioeconomics play a central role in the Potter story. “Purebloods”, for instance, are those who have full wizard parentage and looked highly upon in the wizard world. “Mudbloods”, on the other hand, is a derogatory term used for wizards who are of mixed patronage- wizard and Muggle (non-magical people). Voldemort’s main argument is to rid the world of these impure wizards who are of mixed parentage. Harry’s crotchety old house elf servant
Kreacher gives a prime example of the derogatory language used toward the Mudbloods to solidify the utter disdain of this class:

‘... smells like a drain and a criminal to boot, but she’s no better, nasty old blood traitor with her brats messing up my mistress’s house, oh, my poor mistress, if she knew, if she knew the scum they’ve let into her house, what would she say to old Kreacher, oh, the shame of it, Mudbloods and werewolves and traitors and thieves, poor old Kreacher, what can he do...’

There is the presence also of an extreme underclass in the story. This underclass is made up of Muggles and Squibs- wizard born individuals incapable of performing magic. This underclass is so despised that it is not even acknowledge as a class (or “blood”, in this case). Voldemort’s war on these two underclasses and the uprising against him all provide an excellent and effective distraction from the Ministry to increase its power and keep all the lower classes (or proletariats) from realizing their secondary class positions- a prime example of the repressive Patriotism ideology in Marxism. The absolute unacceptance, utter contempt, and blatant mistreatment of the Squib underclass is summarized in this excerpt from the book that occurs when the Ministry is bringing in any perceived insurgents for questioning:

‘I’m a Squib,’ said Mrs. Figg. 'So you wouldn’t have me registered, would you?'

‘A Squib, eh?’ said Fudge, eyeing her closely. 'We’ll be checking that. You’ll leave details of your parentage with my assistant Weasley. Incidentally, can Squibs see Dementors?’ he added, looking left and right along the bench.

Another example of the use of Patriotism and Classism by the Ministry as repressive ideologies occurs when Dolores Umbridge, now acting for the Ministry of Magic as headmistress of Hogwarts, recruits several Pureblood Hogwarts students as the Inquisitorial Squad to torment...
and harass the Mudblood students. One of the students, a Pureblood named Draco Malfoy, tells Hermione of his new role:

A select group of students who are supportive of the Ministry of Magic, hand-picked by Professor Umbridge. Anyway, members of the Inquisitorial Squad do have the power to dock points . . . so, Granger, I’ll have five from you for being rude about our new Headmistress. Macmillan, five for contradicting me. Five because I don’t like you, Potter. Weasley, your shirt’s untucked, so I’ll have another five for that. Oh yeah, I forgot, you’re a Mudblood, Granger, so ten off for that.89

Umbridge has Malfoy and his co-horts completely and utterly engaged in a dummy mission based on false pretenses to distract them from the Ministry taking control of Hogwarts. Instead of attempting to overthrow the Ministry and have Professor Dumbledore re-instated as headmaster, the Purebloods on Umbridge’s Inquisitorial Squad seek out those who they consider to be lower classes and declare a war against them. All the while, the Ministry continues to grow more powerful on the premise of the wizards’ distraction.

In this Marxist-based analysis of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, I have, thus far, identified the presence of a socioeconomic foundation at the base of the *Harry Potter* story. I have also provided examples of the bourgeoisie and proletariat as well as the presence of an underclass. I was also able determine the presence of repressive ideologies such as classism and patriotism used as a means of control by the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. While there are many more instances of Marxist ideology in the book, let’s revisit the table to show how much has already been identified in the text:

**Marxism Criteria:**

At this point, I will now draw several conclusions based on my analytical findings in conjunction with the theoretical framework from the literature review section. To recap the analysis, I was able to successfully draw on three scholarly evaluations of Potter and derive discourse representative to each of the following ideological frameworks: Classical Liberalism, Classical Republicanism, and Radicalism. I was also to interpret the text using Marxist critical theory and provide a political evaluation of the story based on a Marxist ideology framework. I will summarize all of the findings and make recommendations for areas of further research in the conclusion section.
VI. Conclusion

Ideology plays a strong role in how individuals interpret and make political evaluations of cultural content such as literature. Using JK Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* as a case example, I was able to show how prominent of a role ideology plays in fostering these political evaluations. Benjamin Barton’s analysis of Potter was heavily coded with discourse of Classical Liberalism and embodied key principles of that ideological framework. I was able to identify this discourse in his assessment to support a Classical Liberal evaluation of the story. While Barton led us to Classical Liberal ideology, Anthony Gierzynski’s assessment was ridden with discourse reminiscent of Classical Republican ideology. A thorough analysis of Gierzynski’s discourse helped evaluate the story through Classical Republican ideology. Lastly, Neil Chevalier introduced us to the Radical ideological discourse that is present in Potter. His work help enable a Radical ideological-based evaluation of the book.

In my own critical discourse analysis of *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, I found a strong presence of Marxist discourse throughout the text. The book was heavily coded with Marxist sentiment such as the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, and a class system. I also was able to identify several repressive ideologies employed by the bourgeoisie to oppress the proletariat. Given the success of drawing out four different political evaluations based on the discourse of four different ideological lenses, I can conclude that ideology is predominantly responsible for fostering political evaluations of cultural content. This conclusion lends support to cultural theory in the sense that it expands on the theory. There is current debate not only over the role of ideology in shaping evaluations, but of how ideology is formed and influenced. Cultural theory enables us to determine, in part, how ideologies are formed and on the converse, ideology can enable us to
determine how worldviews and cultural biases emerge. The subject then transitions into a “chicken or the egg” debate.

At this point in my research, I am unable to determine whether cultural theory is responsible for ideology, or vice versa. Given that ideological language is institutionalized and language is the most basic means of communication, I am inclined to lean toward ideology influencing worldviews but I remain non-committal at this time. There are several other areas that also require further research. First, this paper only explored one of the seven *Harry Potter* books. Though unlikely, it is possible that this book was a fluke in the series and just so happened to embody the discourse of all four ideological frameworks. With that in mind, I would recommend a discourse and content analysis of the entire book series. It would be helpful to see how the story and language in the book evolve over time and if the book takes a marked turn in any particular direction. Also, it is important to bear in mind that critical discourse analysis does not measure the frequency of certain words, but searches for how language is used. Another recommended field of research would be to measure the instances of words pertinent to each ideological framework and determine which ideological foundation plays the strongest role.

With those recommendations in my mind, I will now fully conclude this paper. Ideology is often described as a mystifying and baffling concept to many scholars. Its role in the field of political science has been exceptionally controversial. Scholars are constantly trying to define and redefine it and yet, it still remains an abstract concept. The goal of this paper is to lend support and encourage continued research on ideology by presenting it through a fun and contemporary medium. Regardless of which ideology forms an individual’s basic value system, I hope that readers will take away both a better understanding of the role of politics in *Harry Potter* and the role of ideology in shaping political evaluations on a much deeper level.
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