The Effect of Desire on Identity in the *Harry Potter* novels.
Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari Against Psychoanalysis

Taija Piippo
University of Tampere
School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies
English Philology
Pro Gradu Thesis
November 2006

Tutkielmassani käsittelen J. K. Rowlingin Harry Potter -romaanisarjaa psykoanalyysin, etupäässä Sigmund Freudin ja Jacques Lacanin, sekä jälkistrukturalististen Gilles Deleuzen ja Félix Guattarin teorioiden valossa. Tarkemmin tutkimuskohteenani ovat eri henkilöhahmojen halut ja toiveet sekä niiden suhteet ja vaikutus kunkin identiteettiin ja sen muotoutumiseen. Aiheesta ei ole juurikaan aikaisempaa tutkimusta, ja pyrin samalla myös selvittämään, kuinka Deleuzen ja Guattarin psykoanalyysia vahvastikin kritisoiva teoria yleisesti ottaen soveltuu kirjallisuudentutkimukseen.

Aloitan määrittelemällä oman sijoittumiseni Harry Potter -tutkimuksen kentässä ja esittelemällä lyhyesti eri tutkijoiden käsityksiä halusta ja identiteetistä. Tutkimukseni painotuksen vuoksi teoriaosuuteen sisältyy myös Deleuzen ja Guattarin esittämää kritiikkiä psykoanalyysin näkemyksiä kohtaan.

Pääpaino on tekstin analyysillä: suurin huomio kohdistuu romaanien päähenkilön Harry Potterin haluihin ja toiveisiin hänen identiteettinsä kehittymisen osina. Näihin palaan useassa kappaleessa joko yksittäisinä esimerkkeinä tai toiseen henkilöhahmoon liittyen. Myös sarjan muut hahmot tuovat esiin ja käsittelevät haluja erilaisin tavoin, ja olen pyrkinyt jakamaan analyysiosan luvut pääotsikoilla näiden tapojen mukaan.

Eräs tulkintani avainkäsitteistä on Deleuzen ja Guattarin käyttämä rihmasto, jota he soveltavat biologian alalta yhteiskuntaan. Hyödynnän tätä määritelmää monessa yhteydessä kuvaillessani romaaneissa kasvussa olevaa (mikro)yhteiskuntarakennetta; vastakohtana nousee esiin hierarkkinen yhteiskuntarakenne.

Johtopäätöksissäni korostan sitä lopputulosta, ettei mikään näistä teorioista yksinään selitä täysin uskottavasti tutkimusongelmiani. Niistä yhdessä muodostuu silti kattava kokonaisuus, jonka osat tuottavat vuorovaikutuksessa keskenään rakentavia kuvaus- ja arviointitapoja. Mitä yksittäisiin henkilöhahmoihin tulee, heidän haluillaan vaikuttaa usein olevan samanlainen pohjavire, jota voi myös kutsua Deleuzen ja Guattarin mukaan halun virtaukseksi. Halu liittyy lähes jokaisen hahmon kohdalla tavalla tai toisella sosiaalisiin tavoitteisiin ja motivaatioon, mutta tavat pyrkiä saavuttamaan haluamansa vaihtelevat suuresti, samoin kuin se, mikä kutakin motivoi.

Lisäksi kiinnitän johtopäätöksissä huomiota kysymyksiin, jotka jatkuvasti kulkevat romaanisarjassa tapahtumien taustalla. Tällainen on muun muassa epäily siitä, onko ensinkään hyvä saada haluamansa – lähes aina halu päätyy turhautumiseen tai vaikeuksiin. Tähän liittyy myös halujen näkeminen "hyvinä" tai "pahoina" siinä merkityksessä kuin hyvän ja pahan vastakkainasettelu esiintyy fantasiakirjallisuudessa.

Avainsanat: desire, identity, Deleuze and Guattari, rhizome

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* novels have since their first publication attracted a lot of attention and have been read by children and adults alike. Like many children's books, they include a good deal of moral and ethical, even philosophical thematics, which might not be that obvious for a child reader. An adult, however, is able to detect these instances and consider the story as more than an exciting adventure tale. As Clare Bradford says:

> Children's books commonly thematize ideas about personal growth and development, frequently within a schema in which focalized characters move along a continuum in which they are depicted as manifesting progress…. The catalyst for such movement is generally an event or series of events in which a character is tested by the necessity of making choices or decisions.[1]

The Harry Potter series (six books so far) forms a continuum of personal as well as plot development, in which each of the novels takes a step forward with its events. Thus an orphan boy's way goes from finding out on his eleventh birthday that he belongs to the wizarding society to the realisation at the age of sixteen that he is himself, as well as are the people he is surrounded by, a sexual and mortal being.

The *Harry Potter* novels have often been criticised, perhaps due to the massive excitement they have elicited, and even more for the commercial culture they have created. However, I will keep here to the academic criticism and to situating my work within it. Some approaches that have so far been popular in the research of the *Harry Potter* series study for example religion, the school setting, gender roles and language, even politics and the hero story or the Bildungsroman quality.

Studies based on religion have emerged fairly soon after the series has reached worldwide popularity. Especially the conservative Christians (frequently in the United

---

[1] Clare Bradford, "Possessed by the Beast: Subjectivity and Agency in *Pictures in the Dark* and *Foxspell.*" *Mystery in Children's Literature: From the Rational to the Supernatural.* Ed. Adrienne E. Gavin and Christopher Routledge (New York: Palgrave, 2001) 152.

States) have voiced loud objections about Harry Potter's "corrupting" influence. One of the most condemning contentions has been Richard Abanes' *Harry Potter and the Bible. The Menace behind the Magick*.[2] He has received instant feedback from Francis Bridger[3] and John Killinger,[4] who have been concerned to prove that there is nothing sinful in the series. Connie Neal[5] has stood between these two opinions.

The gender roles has also been a much studied subject, and there are quite a few articles concerning them; some have appeared as parts of collections of articles, such as those of Elizabeth E. Heilman's[6] and Eliza T. Dresang's.[7] A somewhat related topic is the boarding school setting where girls and boys are mixed in the same houses. Karen Manners Smith[8] and David K. Steege[9] among others have written critically on this. The *Harry Potter* novels have been criticised perhaps most and severest of all for the claim that the writing is traditional: it conforms to the conservative outlook on the world and is after all not much more than a plain boring "boy-scout" story.[10]

Harry's position as the saviour of the wizarding world has attracted much attention among scholars as well as his development throughout the series. In a recent collection of articles there are some interesting compositions under the heading

---

[2] Abanes, Richard. *Harry Potter and the Bible. The Menace behind the Magick*. (Camp Hill: Christian Publishing-Horizon Books, 2001).

[3] Bridger, Francis. *A Charmed Life. The Spirituality of Potterworld*. (New York: Doubleday-Image Books, 2002).

[4] Killinger, John. *God, the Devil, and Harry Potter. A Christian Minister's Defence of the Beloved Novels*. (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2002).

[5] Neal, Connie. *What's a Christian to Do with Harry Potter?* (Colorado Springs: WaterBook Press, 2001).

[6] Heilman, Elizabeth E. "Blue Wizards and Pink Witches. Representations of Gender Identity and Power." *Harry Potter's World. Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. Ed. Elizabeth E. Heilman. (New York: Routledge, 2003).

[7] Dresang, Eliza T. "Hermione Granger and the Heritage of Gender." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter. Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana Whited. (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2002).

[8] Smith, Karen Manners. "Harry Potter's Schooldays. J. K. Rowling and the British Boarding School Novel." *Reading Harry Potter. Critical Essays*. Ed. Giselle Liza Anatol. (Westport: Praeger, 2003).

[9] Steege, David K. "Harry Potter, Tom Brown, and the British School Story: Lost in Transit?" *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter. Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana Whited. (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2002).

[10] Acocella, Joan. "Under the Spell: Harry Potter Explained." *The New Yorker* 31st Jul 2000; Pennington, John. "From Elfland to Hogwarts, or the Aesthetic Trouble with Harry Potter." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 26.1 (2002); Zipes, Jack. *Sticks and Stones. The Troublesome Success of Children's Literature from Slovenly Peter to Harry Potter*. (Routledge, New York: 2001).

"Harry's Roots in Epic, Myth and Folklore": Mary Pharr[11] and Katherine Grimes[12] have examined his role as a hero. His psychological development has been analysed for example by Catherine Jack Deavel and David Paul Deavel, who point out that "Harry Potter is not really about magic, but about character."[13]

In this thesis I wish to examine an aspect of identity that has so far been overlooked in academic criticism. I will concentrate on a topic that especially labels the first novel in the series, *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (1997), but also comes forth in the whole series: desire. This novel ends the first stage of Harry's personal growth and development with a discussion between him and Dumbledore, which specifically sums up the novel's teaching about desire:

> [Dumbledore tells Harry] 'You know, the Stone was really not such a wonderful thing. As much money and life as you could want! The two things most human beings would choose above all – the trouble is, humans do have a knack of choosing precisely those things which are worst for them.' [14] […]
> 'How did I get the Stone out of the Mirror?'
> 'Ah, now, I'm glad you asked me that. It was one of my more brilliant ideas, and between you and me, that's saying something. You see, only one who wanted to *find* the Stone – find it, but not use it – would be able to get it, otherwise they'd just see themselves making gold or drinking Elixir of Life.'[15]

Desire in the *Harry Potter* novels in general is often rather implicitly expressed but can be observed in many things the characters do, being a base for their actions and even their whole existence. More specifically, I will examine the main character Harry Potter's desire: how it is presented, what it reveals about and how it contributes to the development of his (yet undeveloped) identity. There will also be chapters examining

---

[11] Pharr, Mary. "In Medias Res: Harry Potter as Hero-in-Progress." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter. Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon.* Ed. Lana Whited. (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2002).
[12] Grimes, Katherine. "Harry Potter: Fairy Tale Prince, Real Boy, and Archetypal Hero." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter. Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon.* Ed. Lana Whited. (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2002).
[13] Deavel, Catherine Jack and David Paul Deavel. "Character, Choice, and Harry Potter." *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 5.4 (2002).
[14] Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (London: Bloomsbury, 1997) 215.
[15] Rowling, *PS*, 217.

other characters' desires, the way they bring out several points that could not be otherwise illustrated, and how they contribute to the whole of the plot. On the whole, I will examine the question of how the deeper meaning behind a desire can be interpreted, in other words, what lies behind an outward reflection of a desire or a certain type of behaviour.

The most central theories for my study are Sigmund Freud's and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's theories of desire, the former being more oriented to desire in a familial context, the latter to collectively constructed desire. I will also briefly discuss Jacques Lacan's mirror stage theory, even though my main point will be to show his view of desire as lack is not entirely convincing. I will begin by giving brief accounts of the theories and proceed to apply them to a close reading of the novel. As regards Freud, I will pay special attention to the theory of dream formation and the concepts and applications, for example the notion of unconscious, it encompasses.

I will bring out Freudian and Lacanian views on different questions and aspects of desire and identity. However, my main concern is to prove that neither theory alone is sufficient to explain the complex effects of society on an individual, or an individual acting in his/her environment. In my analysis I will centrally concentrate on bringing forth Deleuze and Guattari's notion of identity as social and multiple rather than individual, as well as that of desire being unending flows produced by machines. I will also take up their concept of rhizome and apply it to different people acting in society; in this purpose I will also be able to use what Deleuze and Guattari have said about fascism in society. The subjects covered will also include how wisdom might rise above desire.

It is something of a hindrance that Deleuze and Guattari do not accept persons or things as objects of desire or desiring-machines but insist on the nomadic and migrant

nature of desire. It is, however, virtually impossible to generalise so much as to handle this topic entirely without concrete examples of objects of desire, so I have taken some from Harry's and other characters' lives and then applied Deleuze and Guattari's concepts and theory structures to them. The machine-like characteristics, that is, the continuous and unstoppable flow of desire as well as the demand of de-individualisation has been taken into account the best I could. One central aim of this thesis will be to assess how far Deleuze and Guattari's theory is useable in analysing works of literature.

2. Definitions of Desire

Freud's account of desire is essentially more down-to-earth than Deleuze and Guattari's. He is mainly concerned with sexual desire, but the concept of desire also includes drives, instincts and passions that "naturally" determine a person's behaviours and beliefs, even as those behaviours and beliefs are continually repressed.[16] However, it would not be extremely exaggerated to say that all of Freud's work is based on the research of the human psychosexual development and its disorders, and in the context of this thesis we need to give up those overtly sexual associations connected to the word "desire" and start with a very basic definition: A desire is "a strong wish to have or do something" or "a person or thing that is wished for."[17] More specifically, "[i]f you say that someone or something is your heart's desire, you mean that you want that person or thing very much; a literary expression."[18]

Lacan claimed himself to be a strict Freudian, but many others take him as the first poststructuralist on account of his theory having to do more with language than biology. He is of the opinion that when people first construct their fantasy-version of reality, they inadvertently base desire on lack, since fantasy does not correspond to the real world. Fantasies always fail, or even prevent people from coming into full contact with the real. This lack inherent in desire, nevertheless, ensures we continue to desire: it is the most beneficent not to fully attain the object of one's desire (in Lacanian terms, *petit objet a*) in order not to find out the discrepancy between fantasy and reality. Thus desire needs the lack to persist and reproduce itself.[19]

For Deleuze and Guattari, desire is a primary psychic force or process, which is

---

[16] http://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/theory/psychoanalysis/freudmainframe.html
[17] "Desire" at http://www.oup.com/oald-bin/web_getald7index1a.pl.
[18] "Desire" in *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary* (1995).
[19] http://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/theory/psychoanalysis/lacanstructure.html,
http://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/theory/psychoanalysis/lacandesire.html

often separated from need, want or drive that are seen as products of social institutions[20]

or entirely biological instincts[21] – in other words, it is separated from the status of "a

secondary function of preliminary needs or goals". Instead of lack, they describe desire

as production, a free-floating energy (which Freud termed libido and Nietszche, who

Deleuze especially esteems, will to power), essentially nomadic and anonymous.[22]

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of deterritorialisation refers to ideas that have been

separated from their original context or relation and applied to others; thus desire is "a

concept deterritorialized from adult sexuality… applicable in any context or relation: it

is a spontaneous emergence that generates relationship through a synthesis of

multiplicities".[23] This results from the fact that their *Anti-Oedipus* (1983, originally

published in 1972) has been written as a criticism of the old "idols" of psychoanalysis,

most notably Freud.[24]

Deleuze and Guattari depict desire as machine-like,[25] seeing it as an endless

and unstoppable flow. There is no organising or generative centre or origin, not even a

self that would produce desire. No law can subject desire; indeed, the whole idea is to

deterritorialise the forms of thinking that link it to some law or identity. "The subject

does not produce desire but the flow of desire plays a role in the constitution of the

subject."[26]

A central argument in Deleuze and Guattari's theory recognises desire as a

---

[20] Goodchild, Philip. *Deleuze and Guattari. An Introduction to the Politics of Desire.* (London: Sage Publications, 1996) 5.
[21] Wolfreys, Julian. *Critical Keywords in Literary and Cultural Theory.* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) 51.
[22] Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze and Guattari.* (London: Routledge, 1989) 89.
[23] Goodchild, 4.
[24] Michel Foucault in the Preface to Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane (London: The Athlone Press, 1984) xii.
[25] Translated "machinic" by the translators of *Anti-Oedipus.*
[26] Wolfreys, 51.

machine, a string of machines connected to each other, a machine-like arrangement.[27] According to them, "[a] machine may be defined as a *system of interruptions* or *breaks*",[28] without which no machine can actually function,[29] and which produces a producing or product identity, "an enormous undifferentiated object", an unproductive body without organs.[30] The whole process of production is recorded on this body without organs.[31]

Any and every machine is always linked to a continual material flow,[32] a decoded flow of desire that forms the free energy of the desiring-machines.[33] The interplay of machines and their agents underneath the determinations that link desire to a person or an object in the framework of representation are monitored by deterritorialisation from which subjective abstract desire cannot be separated.[34] Desire, however, does not take persons or things as its objects, but the entire surroundings, its flows and vibrations, adding breaks and captures, characteristically a nomadic and migrant desire.[35]

All desiring-machines are both technical and social, which makes them all essentially the same. They cannot be divided into social production of reality on the one hand and desiring-production that is merely fantasy on the other, but are intertwined into one kind of production, the production of reality.[36] Deleuze and Guattari simply state that "*social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions*". They proceed to explain that the social field is a historical

---

[27] Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane (London: The Athlone Press, 1984) 296.
[28] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 36. All italics in quotations are original.
[29] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 151.
[30] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 7–8.
[31] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 15.
[32] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 36.
[33] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 315.
[34] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 300.
[35] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 291.
[36] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 28, 33.

product of and immediately invested by desire, and that the libido is able to invade and invest the productive forces and the relations of production without requiring a psychic operation. Indeed, *"[t]here is only desire and the social, and nothing else."* From this results that even the most repressive and fatal forms of social reproduction are produced by desire, and this is where Deleuze and Guattari come to the point of including fascism in their theory, using Wilhelm Reich's remark about people wanting humiliation and slavery as evidence. He will not accept ignorance or illusion as an explanation, but wants one that takes desire into account.[37]

Deleuze and Guattari question fascism, not in its historical meaning, but the fascism in everyone's everyday behaviour: "the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us."[38] The most central principle is perhaps the one that places de-individualisation above the rights of the individual: "The group must not be the organic bond uniting hierarchisized individuals, but a constant generator of de-individualization." This is because an individual is produced by power and must not love or crave power.[39]

Deleuze and Guattari claim that psychoanalysis concentrates on desire producing fantasies,[40] whereas desiring-machines do not produce fantasies or dreams. Fantasies are labelled secondary expressions, which derive from the identical nature of the two kinds of machines in any set of circumstances. Fantasy is therefore never individual, but group fantasy or utopia, where the libido may invest all of a social field even at its most repressive or make a full turnabout and connect desire to the social field as a source of energy.[41] Deleuze and Guattari also criticise the idea that dreams are regarded the road of desire and the unconscious, when all they are is the manifestation

---

[37] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 29.
[38] Michel Foucault in the Preface to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xiii.
[39] Michel Foucault in the Preface to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xiv.
[40] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 25.
[41] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 30.

of a superego. However, machines work at the heart of dreams, fantasy and delirium, preventing them from being imprisoned in their scenes and representation with their functioning towards deterritorialisation.[42]

Deleuze and Guattari reproach psychoanalysis for having stifled the order of production, shunting it into representation instead. They accuse the agency of family of distorting and disfiguring social desiring-production and representation of inflating itself with all the power of myth and tragedy to keep a rein on production. Family must be presented as mythic and tragic; myth and tragedy, familial. Instead of allowing the child's desiring-machines to communicate with those of his/her father, Freud insists on the father being inflated with all the "forces of myth and religion" and with phylogenesis.[43] The orphan libido, then, invests an early childhood field of social desire, of production and antiproduction with its breaks and flows, where the parents figure in nonparental functions and roles confronting other roles and other functions.[44]

2.1. Freud on Desire

Freud's psychoanalytic theory concentrates on an individual's inner dynamics, emphasising the importance of childhood experiences. As Goodchild puts it when explaining Freud, "[w]here families do not function successfully enough to internalize Oedipus, children will grow into adults who are not quite adjusted to society".[45] Freud's dream theory, being founded upon a person's unconscious desires, fits to explain both an adult's and a child's dreams.

"What instigates a dream is a wish, and the fulfilment of that wish is the content

---

[42] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 316.
[43] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 296–298.
[44] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 356.
[45] Goodchild, 90.

of the dream".[46] The beginning concept of Freud's theory is the manifest dream-content,[47] which is the superficial, conscious recollection of a person awakened from a dream. According to Hans G. Furth's interpretation of Freud, however, the manifest dream is only the product of the unconscious dream work, not the dream itself. Thus the dream work should be regarded as really the dream; it is named dream work because it operates on a content called the latent dream thought, which connects with both conscious activity and unconscious dream work, being itself preconscious.[48] The latent thought, however, is not the dream, but the psychological occasion for it. The latent thought has two components, the active affective and the passive image component, but it is related to the former rather than the latter: "This affective component has the psychological reality of a wish in contrast to the dream, which is experienced as something known or perceived".[49]

The connection between the conscious activity (or the day's residue) and the latent thought is formed when a person's thoughts, which may have been present during the day and can even occupy the person's awareness during sleep, attach themselves to the latent thought.[50] More important for the latent thought's quality, nevertheless, is the fact that it is also open toward unconscious wishes and impulses.[51] It thus provides the channel through which usually hidden intimate affective drives and wishes can leak into the conscious mentality while the level of consciousness is lowered. In other words, "the unconscious wish provides the psychological energy, the motivation of dream formation, and the latent thought is welcome to the unconscious wish in so far as it

---

[46] Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Trans. James Strachey. Ed. by James Strachey and Angela Richards. (London: Penguin Group, 1991) 160.
[47] Freud, 150–151.
[48] Hans G. Furth, *Knowledge As Desire. An Essay on Freud and Piaget* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987) 44.
[49] Furth, 47.
[50] Furth, 44; Freud, 159.
[51] Furth, 44.

lends itself to express the wish as fulfilled."[52] In the process of joining the unconscious impulses, the latent thought is pulled down to the state of unconscious.[53]

The problem is that the unconscious wishes are in everyday life denied, and they are hardly likely to be admitted to be an integral part of a person's inner dynamics even if exposed in a less guarded state of mind – a person might not indeed even recognise the wishes belonging to him/her. Consequently, they are apt to cause anxiety, which threatens the intent to sleep. It is the dream work's function to avoid this anxiety by disguising the unconscious wishes into symbols, which express their fulfilment in an acceptable form.[54] Freud notes that in childhood, due to the incomplete separation of the preconscious and the unconscious, there may not exist such an urgent need to disguise the desire,[55] so that the manifest and the latent dream coincide.[56] In short, "for Freud a dream is the product of an unconscious activity that works against a habitual repression to re-present a wish derivative as fulfilled".[57]

Repression has an important role in Freud's theory as a force creating a continuous strive towards the fulfilment of a desire. It results in unconscious symbols that attract the conscious, finding their way out not only through dreams but also by forming the basis of human endeavours and values. The repressed drive will always aim at its full satisfaction by repeating a primal satisfying experience; this is a continuous process because there is an eternal difference between the desired and the actual satisfaction. As it is, "the Eros drive together with the results of primal repression sufficed to explain personal development and any apparent or real social progress".[58]

---

[52] Furth, 45.
[53] Furth, 47.
[54] Furth, 45; Freud, 160.
[55] Furth, 49.
[56] Freud, 159.
[57] Furth, 48.
[58] Furth, 62.

2.2. Lacan on Mirror Stage, Desire and Lack

Lacan's theories are frequently brought up in the discussion where Freud's psychoanalysis and its application are concerned. Rosemary Jackson emphasises psychoanalytic theories, especially Lacan's, which extends Freud's theory on human development by connecting the first two stages that a child goes through – the oral and the anal stage – with a recognition of the self as object, as if seen in a mirror constituted by looks of other people.[59]

The mirror stage is most simply understood as identification in a wide sense: "the transformation that takes place in the subject when he assumes an image", which Lacan calls an imago.[60] For the imagos, the reflection in the mirror marks the border of the visible world[61] – that is to say, a relation between the organism and its reality is established. The child goes through a fragmented body image to an ideal, unified self for him/herself and finally enters the Oedipal phase.[62] In Jackson's opinion, crucial to Lacan's theory is "its understanding of the ego as a *cultural construction*": the ideal self, *Je-ideal*, measures and judges the self that attempts to meet the demands of this social other. Before entering the mirror stage, a child is its own ideal and thus there is no controversy between self and other. "To get back, on to the far side of the mirror, becomes a powerful metaphor for returning to an original unity, a 'paradise' lost by the 'fall' into division with the construction of the subject."[63]

Lacan has also attempted a combination of desire and identity into the same construction, coming surprisingly close to Deleuze and Guattari's views of identity. As Jackson puts it, the goal underlying more or less every fantastic mode of art is finding a

---

[59] Jackson, Rosemary. *Fantasy. The Literature of Subversion.* (London: Routledge, 1981) 88.
[60] Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience." *Écrits. A selection.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. (London: Tavistock Publications, 1966/1977) 2.
[61] Lacan, 3.
[62] Lacan, 4–6.
[63] Jackson, 89.

single point of "absolute unity of self and other, subject and object, at a zero point of entropy". According to Lacan, the desire for this unity is the profoundest one the subject has, a desire for a nonrelationship where identity is meaningless, encompassing everything at the same time.[64]

Lacan nevertheless emphasises the "darker side" of the matter, claiming that the subject constructs its self according to an imaginary identification with an image of the other.[65] Exactly because of the image being imaginary, that is, lacking, subjectivity is grounded in internal fragmentation and alienation: "[t]he subject… internalises otherness as its condition of possibility".[66] Lacan thus sees conflict foremost as internal and limits it to the otherness of the specular image.[67]

Lacan stresses the construction of the subject through the other and through language, as well as the description of interrelationship between self and other through image of the mirror and the gaze. Even though he acknowledges the essentiality of recognising the position of the other and the distance between the self and the other to attain subjectivity,[68] he maintains that the distance fundamentally splits the subject and thus causes feelings of loss and alienation, so that the subject becomes defined by lack and imperfection.[69]

2.3. Deleuze and Guattari's Schizoanalysis Against Freud's Psychoanalysis

Deleuze and Guattari term their approach schizoanalysis, modelled after the schizophrenic mode of thinking, and compose it contrary to psychoanalysis and its neurotic mode of thought in every aspect, most importantly against the Oedipal and

---

[64] Jackson, 76–77.
[65] McCallum, Robyn. *Ideologies of Identity in Adolescent Fiction. The Dialogic Construction of Subjectivity*. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1999) 72: Wilden (1975) p. 100.
[66] McCallum, 72: Grosz (1990) p. 43.
[67] McCallum, 73.
[68] McCallum, 70.
[69] McCallum, 71.

oedipalised territorialities (for example family, school and party) and the territoriality of the individual. Instead, they want to discover the deterritorialised flows of desire "that have not been reduced to the Oedipal codes and the neuroticized territorialities, the *desiring-machines* that escape such codes as *lines of escape* leading elsewhere".[70] These flows, along with the productions, of desire will be seen as the unconscious of the social productions,[71] which construct machines of desire, being thus productive.[72]

Deleuze and Guattari admit the contribution of Freud's psychoanalysis, that is, the production of desire and the productions of the unconscious,[73] but later point out that Oedipus disfigures desiring-production, the syntheses of the unconscious and libidinal investments in the cultural and social milieu.[74]

Their opposition to psychoanalysis is based on the fact that it reduces social manifestations of desire to family; Nietzsche, for his part, is praised for having composed "a theory of desire and will, of the conscious and the unconscious forces, that relates desire directly to the social field…."[75] Deleuze and Guattari aim at freeing the multiplicity of desire from the Oedipal neurosis and neuroticism. They equate this "oedipalization" with imperialism, claiming that depression and Oedipus are first and foremost agencies of the State, paranoia and power and only secondarily delegated to the family. In short, Deleuze and Guattari see Oedipus as a figure of power injected into the unconscious, teaching us to desire our own repression, surrounding us everywhere,[76] again bringing the discussion to fascism in everyday life.

Egos are cast aside for schizoanalysis, so that singularity and collectivity can reach an agreement and collective expressions of desire become possible. This happens

---

[70] Mark Seem in the Introduction to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xvii.
[71] Mark Seem in the Introduction to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xviii.
[72] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 180.
[73] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 24.
[74] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 175.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Mark Seem in the Introduction to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xx.

by forming and connecting new, collective arrangements that de-normalize and de-individualise, urging everyone against the power subjugating them. These subject-groups enable desire to seep into the social field, where the forms of power are subordinated to desiring-production.[77] The problem with the idea of collective experience is that it causes defensive reactions against ego-loss, states R. D. Laing; however, the goal of schizoanalysis is to forge a collective subjectivity, "a nonfascist subject – anti-Oedipus" that does not function in terms of beliefs, destroying the neurotic individual dependencies created through oedipalisation. The politics of desire banishes loneliness and depression first: if people are "anchored" to the machines of the universe and have found a harmony with their desires, they will engage themselves in the process of desiring-production.[78]

2.4. Deleuze and Guattari's Critique of Lacan and Lack

Despite their criticism of the concept of lack, Deleuze and Guattari admit the controversial nature of Lacan's views. He does not acknowledge the Oedipal imaginary, the oedipalising structure or the imaginary identity of persons,[79] but rather shows that Oedipus itself is imaginary, a myth; that these images are produced by an oedipalising structure.[80] However, the way Lacan is taking to lead Oedipus to a point of self-criticism, although different from that of psychoanalysis, is still heading in the wrong direction for Deleuze and Guattari's liking.

Altogether, Deleuze and Guattari consider the whole tradition of the logic of desire as wrong since it forces us to choose between production and acquisition. In particular, they criticise desire seen as acquisition, because that turns it into an idealistic

---

[77] Mark Seem in the Introduction to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xxi.
[78] Mark Seem in the Introduction to Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, xxiii.
[79] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 308.
[80] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 310.

conception most often described as a lack of a real object. They ironically admit that psychoanalysis perfectly explains the desire conceived of as production, but merely the production of fantasies. That is, an intrinsically produced imaginary object functions as a double of reality, but "the real object that desire lacks is related to an extrinsic natural or social production".[81]

In Deleuze and Guattari's opinion, if desire is productive, it can only be so in the real world and thus its product is real as well,[82] and therefore they conclude "[t]he objective being of desire is the Real in and of itself".[83] They consider desire a set of passive syntheses, its end product, the real, resulting from these syntheses functioning as units of autoproduction of the unconscious.[84]

---

[81] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 25.
[82] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 26.
[83] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 27.
[84] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 26.

3. Definitions of Identity

Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology defines (adult) identity as follows:

> *Personal identity* refers to a sense of sameness or continuity of the self despite environmental changes and individual growth. Personal memories of the past as well as hopes and aspirations for the future provide evidence in the present of this sense of identity.[85]

This view is strongly influenced by the theory of the psychoanalyst Erik H. Erikson, who explains identity formation in adolescence as an integration or a restructuring of previous self-images and identifications, the process of which is dependent on society[86] and is only complete when the adolescent has identified him/herself in a new way and achieved sociability and a competitive status among peers.[87]

Robyn McCallum appears to emphasise the social impact on identity even more. Identity to her is really a

> …sense of a personal identity an individual has of her/his self as distinct from other selves, as occupying a position within society and in relation to other selves, and as being capable of deliberate thought and action. Concepts of personal identity and selfhood are formed in dialogue with society, with language, and with other people […].[88]

She brings out the complex intertwining of the theme of subjectivity with personal physical and mental growth of a subject and his/her relationships between the world, society and individuals – all of them frequently handled subjects in children's and adolescent fiction.[89] Subjectivity to her includes the sense of a personal identity in relation to some amount of external effects, as well as the sense of being an independent agent[90] defined above. However, McCallum wants to keep the relationship between an

---

[85] "Identity formation" in *Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Ed. Raymond J. Corsini and Alan J. Auerbach (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1996, 1998).
[86] Erikson, Erik H. *Identity. Youth and Crisis*. (London: Faber and Faber, 1968) 159.
[87] Erikson, 155.
[88] McCallum, 3.
[89] Ibid.
[90] McCallum, 4.

individual and society even, one not privileged over the other, which is a central problem for a theory of subjectivity.[91] An example of this comes later in her text, when she discusses transgression or resistance bringing an individual in conflict with social practice. This problem also presumes the coexistence of two aspects of subjectivity, now depending on the position taken towards the social conventions: a subject is placed in a conflicting or compliant relation with them, and an agent decides, whether to resist, transgress[92] or accept the social boundaries. Subjectivity is thus a wider concept than identity alone and lifts it on a different level by taking the social environment into account.

McCallum finds ways to question a character's identity or subjectivity through different narrative strategies. Displacement out of the familiar surroundings can give much information on a character either by destabilising and undermining or by affirming his/her sense of identity. This is also a means to explore linguistic and sociocultural influences on subjectivity, even more so if there is learning involved, if the character is thrown into situations where he/she is forced to interpret and understand strange social codes and discourses. The transgressive modes of behaviour already mentioned might enable examining the limitations the dominant society or culture piles on subjectivity.[93]

Deleuze and Guattari emphasise difference and multiplicity generally and specifically in discussion about identity.[94] For them, sameness implies identity,[95] and their goal is to replace identity with difference.[96] They assume there is a subject peripheral to the desiring-machines, although a very indefinite one without a fixed

---

[91] McCallum, 6.
[92] McCallum, 118–119.
[93] McCallum, 100–101.
[94] Massumi, Brian in the foreword to Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Brian Massumi. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987) xi–xiii.
[95] Bogue, 28.
[96] Bogue, 56.

identity.[97] Pierre Klossowski, too, comments on the subject without identity: if the states that he/she goes through overwhelm an individual, it is because of only seeking his/her own centre without seeing the circle he/she is part of. According to Klossowski, "an identity is essentially fortuitous", and Deleuze and Guattari see this corresponding to the Nietzschean subject "who passes through series of states", every one of which is identified as "I".[98] Deleuze and Guattari see their schizoanalytic view of identity demonstrated by D. H. Lawrence, Henry Miller and R. D. Laing, who all appear to maintain it is certain that there are no clearly defined personalities, but rather "vibrations, flows, schizzes, and "knots"".[99]

Deleuze and Guattari further this view later with the concept of multiplicity that is included in their theoretical structure of rhizomes. The rhizome cannot be reduced either to the one or the multiple. It is composed of dimensions, determinations and magnitudes, which constitute linear multiplicities laid out on a plane of consistency, and whenever a multiplicity changes dimension, it changes profoundly as in a metamorphosis.[100] A more concrete way of understanding a rhizome derives from its structure in the biological nature, from where Deleuze and Guattari might have originally adapted it. Plants that have rhizomes seem to be individual, separate plants, but they have vast and multiple connections underground forming a wide network of identical plants, an entire community. A multiplicity has neither the subject nor the object but is designated by indefinite articles or more appropriately by partitives.[101]

Deleuze and Guattari contrast the rhizome to centred and hierarchical systems, describing it as "detachable, connectable, reversible, modifiable… acentered,

---

[97] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 16.
[98] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 21.
[99] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 362.
[100] Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Brian Massumi. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987) 9.
[101] Ibid.

nonhierarchical, nonsignifying system".[102] The one word that depicts the rhizome most concisely is the conjunction "and".[103] Thus each part of the rhizome is able to function alone, but no part is above others and all are equal in the operation of the whole. In fact, even though it might appear that only one individual in the rhizome is working, or that several or all of them are doing the same thing independently, they are actually sharing the strain and the results of the labour as well. The rhizome is originally a counterpart of Noam Chomsky's model of the linguistic tree, but it extends to spread its branches across any and every domain instead of only language in its systematic structure. The rhizome connects everything from semiotics to organisations of power on to arts and sciences;[104] in other words, "[a] language is never closed upon itself",[105] but actively intertwined with every aspect of life.

3.1. Conflict in a Rhizome

Deleuze and Guattari admit that "a rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot", but hasten to add that it will reformulate either on some of its old lines or on new ones. Their idea is that there are always ruptures or lines of flight that are essential to a given rhizome, but that there still is also a possibility of countering hierarchical organisations that strive to reconstitute a subject, anything "from Oedipal resurgences to fascist concretions". Groups and individuals comprise microfascisms that may crystallise at any given time. Even good and bad are "only the products of an active and temporary selection, which must be renewed."[106]

Deleuze and Guattari use as an example of a rhizome an orchid and a wasp: an orchid "imitates" a wasp in order to get its pollen transported to another orchid flower

---

[102] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 21.
[103] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 25.
[104] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 7, 36–37.
[105] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 8.
[106] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 9–10.

by a deluded wasp. Both the orchid and the wasp become deterritorialised and reterritorialised in this process: first the orchid deterritorialises by forming an image of the wasp, but the wasp reterritorialises on that image by assuming the orchid to be another wasp. The wasp is in any case deterritorialised when it becomes part of the orchid's reproduction through this imitation; however, it reterritorialises the orchid by transporting its pollen. The imitation nevertheless is not the ultimate end in this process, but rather a capture or surplus value of code, or eventually becoming – the becoming-wasp of the orchid and the becoming-orchid of the wasp.[107]

Desire is closely connected to rhizome, and when the rhizome is obstructed or broken by being forcefully moulded into an arborescent structure, desire is entirely blocked. Deleuze and Guattari accuse psychoanalysis of implementing this process by rooting shame and guilt into children treated by their methods, using Freud's case of Little Hans as an example. They see Little Hans as subjected to the family in spite of his attempts to form a rhizome with the outside world, left with the only escape route of becoming-horse, becoming an animal perceived as shameful and guilty.[108] They suggest their system of mapping as a means of remedying this obstruction of rhizome: the map is "open and connectable in all of its dimensions" and in continuous movement of transformation, modified by an individual, group or social formation.[109] All the impasses should be resituated on the map, exposing them to new or possible lines of flight either on the individual or group map. On the group map, phenomena such as leadership or fascisation, for example, may survive, continuing to build the rhizome unnoticed.[110] There also exist arborescent structures in rhizomes, but even a tree root or

---

[107] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 10.
[108] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 14.
[109] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 12.
[110] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 14.

branch might break loose and flourish into a rhizome.[111]

The ruptures or lines of flight, as said above, label the rhizome and are essential to its functioning; even a machine cannot operate properly without breaking down every once in a while. These disruptions might be equated with conflicts in a rhizome when its parts begin to clash and confront each other. Perhaps it is safer here to exclude the possibility of contrasting desires within the rhizome so as not to divide it too far from the original idea. If we also leave out every kind of outside pollution or other effect, a reasonable explanation could be an unsuccessful deterritorialisation or reterritorialisation, either arising from a failure to recognise seemingly different parts belonging to the same rhizome – in other words an inability to comprehend the whole content of its capability of change and modification (if I slightly expand the biological demand of identical parts in a rhizome for it to better suit my purposes) – or an incomplete transformation either into a "wasp" or an "orchid", thus inadvertently misleading other parts of the rhizome. Both shortcomings weaken the rhizome by causing a deficient junction, which may be easily exposed to further damage, and at any rate obstructs the process of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation from reaching their end.

3.2. Mirror Connected to Self or Double

The symbolism behind the mirror has mostly something to do with its concrete quality of reversing the image it shows and thus symbolically acting as a dividing line between opposites. These opposite forces are frequently explained from the Freudian viewpoint as residing in a single human's psyche and causing a split between the conscious ego and the unconscious, where the interference from the ego makes every

---

[111] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 15.

image and symbol from the unconscious appear in reverse.[112] The mirror often shows a person's inner self, feelings or memories;[113] however, we also use other people as mirrors to get to know ourselves.[114] This is shown quite concretely by Sabine Melchior-Bonnet, who points out that before the mirror became a means for self-reflection (or rather knowledge), it was used for grooming; in other words, it was an aid to achieving a social status or balance and adjusting to society.[115] The mirror also estimated the degree of a person's commitment to social norms when it made him/her realise his/her reflection, creating an identity from being publicly seen.[116] Thus it was expected to act as an active reflection of change and metamorphosis.[117]

It seems as if there is another world behind the surface of the mirror: it is in perspective but turned from left to right and vice versa. It is immaterial and inaccessible, almost as if the hereafter for only once shows itself but does not allow entrance.[118] In modern fantasy, a mirror is a central element as a location of or passageway to a foreign world, as well as an executor of the familiar turning into the unfamiliar or uncanny; earlier, it has been a device to uncover an indeterminate area where "normal" perception distorts.[119] The mirror often introduces a double or doppelganger, showing self as other, concretising the inseparability of images from duplicity and multiplicity of selves.[120] "Knowledge, comprehension, reason, are established through the power of the *look*, through the '*eye*' and the '*I*' of the human subject whose relation to objects is structured

---

[112] "Mirror" in Chetwynd, Tom. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. (London: Paladin, 1982).
[113] "Mirror" in de Vries, Ad. *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery*. (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974).
[114] Chetwynd.
[115] Melchior-Bonnet, Sabine. *Kuvastin. Peilin historiaa.* Suom. Pia Koskinen-Launonen. (Jyväskylä: Atena, 2004) 145.
[116] Melchior-Bonnet, 146.
[117] Melchior-Bonnet, 118.
[118] Melchior-Bonnet, 113–114.
[119] Jackson, 43–44.
[120] Jackson, 45. Cf. Deleuze and Guattari above, 15–16.

through his field of vision."[121]

The themes of fantasy literature aim at making the invisible visible, forming the unsaid into words and dissolving limiting categories.[122] A central problem is the relationship between self and other, the themes of the "I" and the "not-I", which Tzvetan Todorov uses to represent the two groups of the contents of fantastic literature.[123] One group of the "themes of vision" deals with the relationship between the individual and the world structured through the perception-consciousness system – in other words, it gains its importance from the significance of the senses of sight and perception.[124] According to Jackson, however, these senses most often turn out to be deceptive and untrustworthy, and the equation between the "I" and the "eye" proves to be inadequate. Mind and matter merge together and the idea of multiplicity concretises in doubles or multiple personalities. Even other persons and objects may blur together and replace each other.[125]

The other group of the "themes of discourse" is concerned with language. The themes of the "not-I", or other, centre on the relationship of the individual and his/her desire, that is, unconscious. An individual is no longer a passive observer, but in a dynamic relation with other people, and language is the structuring agent in this interaction. Desire and its numerous variations, even perversions like cruelty and violence, also represent the relationships between people in this group.[126] The fantastic seeks to unite the self and the other, to resist their separation and establish a state of undifferentiation.[127] Jackson suggests two kinds of myths in the modern fantastic, based on Todorov's groups: in the first, the threat or source of otherness is in the self – it

---

[121] Jackson, 45.
[122] Jackson, 48.
[123] Jackson, 50.
[124] Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic. A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre.* Trans. Richard Howard. (New York: Cornell University Press, 1975) 139.
[125] Jackson, 50.
[126] Todorov, 139.
[127] Jackson, 52.

originates from the subject's excessive knowledge, rationality or the misapplication of

the human will. In the second, the source of fear is external to the subject, which suffers

an attack and becomes part of the other.[128]

Otherwise, Jackson disagrees with Todorov, claiming that he inappropriately

neglects psychoanalysis in his discussion of fantastic literature.[129] In Jackson's opinion,

"only" by turning to psychoanalysis (most notably Freud and Lacan) can the issues of

the fantastic literature be adequately understood.[130] The ideal of undifferentiation is one

of the central characteristics of fantasy, and Jackson sees it as being close to Freud's

"crudely termed" fundamental drive, the death wish.[131] However, it is not just a desire

of ceasing to be, but a radical form of the pleasure principle, a longing for Nirvana, a

state of entropy.[132]

Jackson completely overlooks any explanations offered by other theories when

she criticises Todorov, although several other theorists apart from psychoanalysts have

dealt with questions of desire and the unconscious. I will attempt to prove that neither

Freud's nor Lacan's theory alone is sufficient in explaining the connection between

desire and identity, and that their accounts of nonidentities or "state of entropy" are

better replaced with Deleuze and Guattari's terms concerning multiplicity and social

identity.

3.3. Double or Doppelganger

It is problematic to establish a division between the topics of this and the

previous chapter about (mirror) reflections, doubles, others, multiple selves, "not-I" and

such. As much as possible, I have attempted to consistently separate the symbolic

---

[128] Jackson, 58.
[129] Jackson, 61.
[130] Jackson, 61–62.
[131] Jackson, 72.
[132] Jackson, 73.

doubles or others in the previous chapter, along with the obviously visible reflections, and the more concretely actual or "flesh-and-blood" doubles or others in the chapter at hand. In my opinion, the concept "doppelganger" would best describe what this chapter is about; it is more illustrative than "double" which, even though used as a translation for the original German word, appears more of a symbolic conception, perhaps because it has so many divergent meanings in English whereas "doppelganger" has been exclusively used for this phenomenon.

Todorov only makes a general comment about doppelgangers having an entirely different meaning in each and every context and structure depending on the relations the theme sets up with others.[133] McCallum continues by explaining that their significance is grounded on their being the often used device in narrative for shaping the subject's personal identity by a dialogic relation in intersubjective relationships with an other and internally fragmenting the subjectivity, resulting in the split subject. Characters also "experience temporal, cultural or psychological displacement or marginalization". This may cause an identity transformation or crisis, since notions of selfhood are often dependent on and constructed within certain social, linguistic and historical contexts. They are also always grounded in ideologies concerning the relations between individuals and societies.[134]

A double, which for psychoanalysts is an expression of unconscious desire,[135] can be manifested in several ways: double or counterpart, internal or external, as an actual twin or other or merely an imagined other, even a mirror inversion located either externally or internally. The double may also be a ghost, a memory, or an alternative self in an alternative world. Its primary task is to destabilise ideas about the subject being unified or coherent, and it is often presented as displaying characteristics of both

---

[133] Todorov, 143–144.
[134] McCallum, 68–69, 75.
[135] Jackson, 55, 62.

an other and an internalised other, an aspect of the self more or less unknown to the subject. The relationship is frequently oppositional and aims at making a moral point, especially as a symbolic representation of a character's alter ego, most notably an "evil" self.[136] In fantasy, a doppelganger functions as a crucial aspect of the developmental process, where it is not necessarily oppositional or moral but rather points out an internal separation or a possibility for the character's developmental direction, many times even threateningly.[137] McCallum illustrates this with two theories of subjectivity: those of Bakhtin and Lacan, between which she sees a connecting link of the dialogical relationship.[138] I have already presented Lacan's ideas above, so I will limit this discussion to Bakhtin's views.

The Bakhtinian concept of dialogism is often said to bring individual and society closer to each other with its recognition of individual subjectivity as intersubjective, meaning that it is constructed in a dialogic relation "with an other and with social discourses and practices". Like Lacan, Bakhtin emphasises the other and language in the forming of the subject, as well as the importance of the mirror and the gaze between self and other. Bakhtin, however, stresses the completing role of the other on the self, without which a fully conscious self is impossible.[139] He thus sees conflict as being external and social in its nature; from this follows also that for him there is always a second participant included in self-contemplation.[140]

---

[136] McCallum, 75–76.
[137] McCallum, 77.
[138] McCallum, 70.
[139] McCallum, 71.
[140] McCallum, 73.

Analysis

4. Desire as Not Lack

I will begin my analysis with a discussion of desire as lack or not lack –
Deleuze and Guattari vehemently criticise Lacan's theory of desire about being related
to lack, presenting their own opposing views with equal zeal. It is noteworthy how
rigorous they are in their views against lack, so I will attempt to find some basis for this
attitude.

In Deleuze and Guattari's opinion, it is not possible to desire something that
does not exist, but the object of desire is always something real. They claim that
psychoanalysis explains the occasions where fantasy is being produced, that is, when an
imaginary object functions as a double of reality, but in fact it should be a real object
that is extrinsically produced. It is actually the subject that is missing in desire, or desire
lacking a fixed subject.[141] Lack is rather a countereffect of desire.[142] The common
experience of desire is, indeed, to maintain or retain something that a person already
has: love, respect, reputation or valuable property, for example. It may of course be
argued that this is a fear of a potential lack in the future, but as it is, the lack is not
actualised yet.

There are many things, both concrete and abstract, which different characters
in the *Harry Potter* novels desire: parents, love, power, revenge, recognition, friendship,
immortality and the Philosopher's Stone, among others. All these at least have existed
in the novels' reality and the characters have certain mental pictures of them, perhaps
from their own earlier experience or just from observing them from afar. It is debatable
whether these personal accounts of abstract emotions and entities are just those
"fantasies" that Deleuze and Guattari blame psychoanalysis of; they are essentially

---

[141] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 26.
[142] Deleuze and Guattari, *A-O*, 27.

subjective above all else. However, several concrete objects represent abstract desires as is best shown in the Mirror of Erised, in which Harry's parents stand for his unending desire for love and togetherness or the Philosopher's Stone for a desire of immortality and riches. There is thus always a way to point out and describe desire, if not clearly in words, then through some other means of communication – it is not a myth impossible to bring concretely alive and for others' information.

It could be argued that the desiring person in question lacks something, but it is still to be emphasised that it is possible to deduce any desire from the concrete tokens that symbolise it. On one hand though it is exactly these concrete objects that might prove that lack in truth does have a role in desire, because they might not be always obtainable no matter how much they are desired. This is very clear in case of a bodily lack, specifically in relation with food or drink. If there is nothing to eat, as is the case for many people in several areas in the world, there will be no means to satisfy the desire with production since there is no raw material to begin with. On the other hand, as Goodchild reminds us from the beginning, Deleuze and Guattari separate instinct, need, want and interest from desire[143] and receive support from Albert Maslow's well-known hierarchical presentation of these human endeavours, where purely physical needs are on the very lowest level of the five in the hierarchy. However, we can ask whether their separation is acceptable in the light of Deleuze and Guattari's own generalisation of the concept of desire from adult sexuality to all areas of life.

According to Deleuze and Guattari's theory, it should not be possible to reduce the idea of desire as lack to even death, for example in such cases as Harry's parents. As Dumbledore reprimands Harry in the end of *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* (1999), the dead always stay with the people closest to them; they are not gone although

---

[143] Goodchild, 5.

they are not visible or touchable. They are not just a figment of Harry's imagination and even though the real world lacks them now it could be thought that through Harry, they still affect the world and its occurrences, as demonstrated in the episode with the Dementors described later. The fantastic literary mode adds to this, as is to be seen in *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire* (2003), where Harry's parents literally take corporeal form to distract Lord Voldemort from harming him.

Still Harry's parents can neither be brought back to life even by magical means nor freely fluctuate or travel between the worlds, which unarguably leaves them strictly speaking as lacking from the real world. In addition, they may never be seen there again after their brief appearance in *The Goblet of Fire*. It is also to be borne in mind that on the earlier occasions of their presence they have never been more than "internally produced imaginary objects" from Harry's part – reflections in *The Philosopher's Stone*, hallucination in *The Prisoner of Azkaban* – thus seemingly being merely those productions of fantasy so despised by Deleuze and Guattari. It could be asked, however, whether the presuppositions of the fantasy genre could be used here to back up their thesis: How could Harry have seen, not to mention recognise, his parents looking the same way they used to be in the Mirror of Erised, when he did not remember their faces from his childhood? This would suggest that they were not merely a product of his wishes or fantasies but something more real, given also that he recognises them as the same persons in the photographs he later receives.

Lack in Lacan's terminology also refers to the imaginary image of the other and its relationship to subjectivity: the self is constantly comparing itself to an ideal self and finds itself lacking, which causes internal alienation of the subject, especially when the subject is further split by the distance between its self and other. In Bakhtin's opinion, the other completes the self, making it fully conscious; for him the conflict is

external and social. Deleuze and Guattari object to definition by imperfection and lack, suggesting that there is no subject at all and that identity is social and multiple rather than fixed. Thus any kind of an incomplete other as Lacan assumes is impossible to them, and in a sense, Deleuze and Guattari substitute Lacan's and Bakhtin's other with their notion of multiplicity: there is no other to either fragment or complete the self, but an infinite network of multiplicities which crisscross each other so that there is already everything available.

It does not seem at a quick glance that many of the characters in the *Harry Potter* series have certain ideal selves that they pursue to become. However, stripped down to the very atomic level their desires illustrate rather similar things and are most frequently associated with social goals, hopes and ambitions. It could be said that all of them want to be respected and valued in their society and are striving for this by various means, whether it be by exerting power and spreading fear, protecting the individuals in the society, maintaining and preserving the existing institutions or surrounding themselves with impressive materia. It does not seem likely that Lacan's theory works here; it appears to rely too much on an eternal fragmentation and lack, whereas many of the characters do develop and gain insight during the course of their actions and by their consequences.

5. Reflections and Doubles

5.1. "The Most Desperate Desire of Our Hearts": The Mirror of Erised

In J. K. Rowling's novel *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* the main character Harry Potter encounters a strange mirror hidden in a disused classroom of the Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry. The mirror is the principal link in the theme of desire in the novel, which is also noted in the inscription on its frame that says *Erised stra ehru oyt ube cafru oyt on wohsi*. This has to be read backwards to be understood: *I show not your face but your heart's desire.*

The reason why the carving is written backwards is to underline the fact that the Mirror, or any mirror, only gives a reflection of reality.[144] The same point might be pronounced even further by the uneven cutting of the words – only the main word "desire" is whole, "I show" is written together, but others are not immediately discernible. This could also illustrate the arbitrariness and the downright fallaciousness of the Mirror. The text also gives a clear piece of advice for how to interpret the Mirror's content, but Harry fails to notice this and is enticed to visit the Mirror three nights in succession just to see his parents, who died long ago, and extended family in it, before the Hogwarts Headmaster, Professor Dumbledore, reveals the Mirror's secret to him.

We could argue, and Professor Dumbledore actually does, that what the Mirror of Erised shows is not even a reflection of reality – it will give "neither knowledge or truth".[145] In fact, anything we see in a mirror is always a mirror image, and as such it already is to a certain extent disconnected from reality.[146] The Mirror of Erised, however, has a special power of capturing a person with its fantastic picture that he/she produces out of his/her desires, reflecting a person's inner self and feelings unbarred.

---

[144] Chetwynd.
[145] Rowling, *PS*, 157.
[146] Chetwynd.

Deleuze and Guattari's ironic comment about psychoanalysis explaining only fantasy actually seems to place it as the more valid theory here, because there is a certain contradiction between their own insistence on the realness of what is desired and the operational principle of the Mirror. Harry's parents are not real in the Mirror, but I would pass this question by establishing the previous argument of their being part of the real world earlier. However, it is disputable whether the rest of the family that Harry sees is real: so far there is proof of only the Dursley family's blood relation to him, so there might not be others at all.

In interpreting the function of the Mirror of Erised we could apply Freud's dream theory adapted to the waking state. There are some slight similarities between the dream state and that of Harry's: he could be accused of "dwell[ing] on dreams and forget[ting] to live".[147] The Mirror puts him in a trance-like state: "How long he stood there, he didn't know."[148]

Harry's underlying, mostly unconscious desire for parental love does not lack proof. He has lost his parents at the age of one: "He couldn't remember his parents at all. […] There were no photographs of them in the house."[149] He has never felt loved in his dreadful foster family, the Dursleys. In the Mirror of Erised he "was looking at his family, for the first time in his life".[150] During the day prior to his finding the Mirror a peculiar Christmas gift, an Invisibility Cloak having allegedly belonged to his father, has stirred his mind and awakened a need to get closer to his parents: "– his father's Cloak – he felt that this time – the first time – he wanted to use it alone."[151]

As both conscious activity and the unconscious desire are connected to the latent dream thought, we could argue that this is the Mirror's concrete function: it works

[147] Rowling, *PS*, 157.
[148] Rowling, *PS*, 153.
[149] Rowling, *PS*, 27.
[150] Rowling, *PS*, 153.
[151] Rowling, *PS*, 151.

as the psychological occasion for the dream, giving unconscious wishes a possibility to come into sight for the consciousness – it could even be termed as "the Mirror of the Preconscious" here. This argument gains support from a mirror's symbolic content as "the threshold between conscious and unconscious".[152]

The function of dream work, then, is to avoid anxiety by disguising desire into symbols and this way produce the manifest dream that can be remembered when awake.[153] Here, however, the viewers of the Mirror face a problem. As their desires come concretely into focus in the Mirror, there is no occasion for repression, and the (day)dream of Harry's parents being alive results in them being "alive" in the Mirror of Erised. The danger of the Mirror is that it shows "nothing more or less than the deepest, most desperate desire of our hearts" but still "will give us neither knowledge or truth", and there is not even knowing whether what it shows is "real or even possible"[154] – the person merely keeps feeding his/her unconscious desire with his/her conscious activity, not really receiving anything in return. When Harry is separated from the Mirror, he finds out that "[a]ll is counterbalanced, and extremes (even of love and calm restraint) tend to build up an opposite unconscious reaction".[155] Thus "Harry wished he could forget what he'd seen in the Mirror as easily, but he couldn't. He started having nightmares."[156] This, in its turn, raises the question whether it is good to accomplish your desires at any level, which I will discuss more in the Conclusions chapter.

The interesting thing is that the first time the Mirror makes a desire become reality is when Harry wants to find the Philosopher's Stone. Professor Dumbledore explains: "'You see, only one who wanted to *find* the Stone – find it, but not use it –

---

[152] Chetwynd.
[153] Furth, 45.
[154] Rowling, *PS*, 157.
[155] Chetwynd.
[156] Rowling, *PS*, 158.

would be able to get it'".[157] Thus a desire to be fulfilled will be one that does not bring any personal advantage with it. A person who is able to control his/her desires and keep them altruistic is fit to gain what he/she desires, because it is for the good of society. Consequently, the Freudian dream theory cannot provide us with a satisfying explanation of what happens here – firstly, because Harry's thought activity is entirely conscious, and secondly, precisely because his desire is oriented not towards his own, but the wizarding community's good. Here, Deleuze and Guattari's theory becomes more applicable.

Professor Dumbledore appears to Harry as a mentor but not a parent substitute; he is also a leading figure in the wizarding society. The society, at least the part of it that Harry is more familiar and identifies himself with, works against the evil Lord Voldemort, who wants the Philosopher's Stone only for its extraordinary qualities – its ability to restore eternal life and transform any metal into gold. The setting of Harry and Professor Quirrell's encounter with the Mirror of Erised include the conflicting forces of the wider society, which Dumbledore foremost represents, and of the narrower circle of Voldemort and his servant Quirrell. In addition, the strong bond of friendship that has just helped Harry through various tasks to reach his goal, to stop the powerful Philosopher's Stone from falling into wrong hands, and Voldemort's mocking words about his parents could be included here. These elements combined create a clash in which the social unconscious becomes prominent and can be seen in the Mirror, where Harry's reflection gives him the Stone.

Harry getting his wish also connects to the fact that he knows what the Mirror stands for and how it works. Hearing that Quirrell sees himself in the Mirror of Erised, giving the Stone to his master, and his wondering how to get at it, Harry realises: "What

---

[157] Rowling, *PS*, 217.

I want more than anything else in the world at the moment […] is to find the Stone before Quirrell does. So if I look in the Mirror, I should see myself finding it".[158] Apparently, each individual could be assumed a desiring-machine in this occasion, linked to some of the others: on one hand Harry, carrying out Hogwarts Professors' (and most of the wizarding world's inhabitants') desire, on the other hand Lord Voldemort, trying to make Professor Quirrell present the Stone to him.

As regards to the master–servant relationship between the two previously mentioned, Professor Quirrell is a good example of desiring your own slavery. His desire, as well as his commitment to support the Dark Side, originates from the mind of Lord Voldemort, judging from the self-depreciating words that sound as if issued from outside: "'I met him when I travelled around the world. A foolish young man I was then, full of ridiculous ideas about good and evil. Lord Voldemort showed me how wrong I was.'"[159] These two desiring-machines have not formed a "mutually affective relation"[160] – because their relationship is based on fear and an inferior's servitude, neither of the desiring-machines can operate effectively.

On some level Harry actually becomes conscious of the difference between his and Professor Quirrell's desires, in other words, of their being different kind of desiring-machines, even though he needs an explanation later. This is his ultimate realisation of the Mirror of Erised's power – perhaps even the beginning of a more developed wisdom concerning the nature of desire. This is what Professor Dumbledore was aiming at when telling him, "If you ever *do* run across it, you will now be prepared".[161]

It takes Dumbledore's help to break Harry's fixated conception of the relation between the Mirror and his parents, so that his future desire may be invested in the

---

[158] Rowling, *PS*, 211.
[159] Ibid.
[160] Goodchild, 73.
[161] Rowling, *PS*, 157.

social field. By explaining to Harry the way the Mirror of Erised works, Professor Dumbledore shows him the deterritorialisation inherent in the Mirror, that is, makes him see that everyone sees different things in the Mirror: "'It shows us nothing more or less than the deepest, most desperate desire of our hearts.'"[162] This information gives Harry the advantage of being able to apply his knowledge in a new situation when he faces Quirrell and Lord Voldemort in front of the Mirror and deduce from there how to use it to his advantage. This illustrates the process of deterritorialisation from another standpoint: if the Mirror can show a desire in one situation, it can show another desire in another situation, even for the same individual.

Harry himself also changes in the process, becoming more aware of where he stands and what he fights for. He will certainly continue to miss his parents, who cannot be physically brought back even by means of magic. However, even though the process of subjectification might have been fatal for social desire, in case of its dissolution it has rewarded Harry with new knowledge about his parents through which he can relate to them; as a symbol of this he receives a photo album with pictures of his parents. He has successfully faced the positive regress, going back towards infancy in order to move on towards maturity – one more of a mirror's symbolic functions.[163] The bittersweetness of his situation is relieved by the rhizomatic connections he has formed: the tight circle of friends and the wizarding society at large. His identity is slowly beginning to flourish when he knows where he belongs and who he is;[164] he already makes fun of Muggles (the non-magical people): "'*They* don't know we're not allowed to use magic at home. I'm going to have a lot of fun with Dudley this summer…'"[165]

---

[162] Rowling, *PS*, 157.
[163] Chetwynd.
[164] See McCallum's definition of identity above, 18.
[165] Rowling, *PS*, 223.

5.2. Harry Potter and Tom Riddle: The Doppelganger Dilemma

The second novel in the series, *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* (1998), portrays most notably, and quite typically, the doppelganger dilemma. Harry encounters and fights the younger personification of his archenemy, Lord Voldemort, as a memory come alive from the school years when he was still known as Tom Riddle. In a sense, Tom is thus doubly a doppelganger: firstly, a representation of Lord Voldemort, or who he was fifty years ago, and secondly, Harry's evil alter ego. Harry cannot refuse to notice, when he is so told by Tom, that "there are strange likenesses between us, Harry Potter. Even you must have noticed. Both half-bloods, orphans, raised by Muggles. Probably the only two Parselmouths to come to Hogwarts since the great Slytherin himself. We even *look* something alike".[166] For Harry, the most problematic aspect in this perception is the mention of Slytherin, because for the whole school year he has been suspected of being the heir of Salazar Slytherin, a notorious and unpopular wizard in the history of the Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry: "'There's not a single witch or wizard who went bad who wasn't in Slytherin.'"[167] Harry is already in the middle of an identity crisis described by McCallum: he has suffered such a great deal of marginalisation in the form of unfair accusations of recent disasters from other students, purely on account of being misfortunate enough to be in the wrong place at the wrong time too often, that he is having misgivings about his unknown heritage and with that about his supposed tendencies and loyalties. He also faces the problem of being different from other people, to which his first reactions somewhat childishly (after all, he is only twelve) are denial and an intense desire to be like others – it could be said that he desperately reaches back to his place in the rhizome structure that he began constructing in *The Philosopher's Stone*. Moreover, as Jackson points out, difference is

---

[166] Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. (London: Bloomsbury, 1998) 233.
[167] Rowling, *PS*, 62.

often labelled as evil or otherness, which naturally are not preferable characteristics to identify with:[168]

> 'I'm a what?' said Harry.
> *'A Parselmouth!'* said Ron. 'You can talk to snakes!'
> […]
> 'It matters,' said Hermione, speaking at last in a hushed voice, 'because being able to talk to snakes was what Salazar Slytherin was famous for. That's why the symbol of Slytherin house is a serpent.'
> Harry's mouth fell open.
> 'Exactly,' said Ron. 'And now the whole school's going to think you're his great-great-great-great-grandson or something…'
> […]
> 'But I'm in *Gryffindor*,' Harry thought. 'The Sorting Hat wouldn't have put me in here if I had Slytherin blood…'
> '*Ah*,' said a nasty little voice in his brain, 'But the Sorting Hat *wanted* to put you in Slytherin, don't you remember?'[169]

Harry is driven by the desire to find out his real heritage and his chances of influencing his involuntary condemnation to the allegedly "evil" nature of the Slytherin house primarily in order to fasten his identity on a certain point in society, the Gryffindor house, where his parents and friends also belong. His doppelganger, Tom Riddle, is quite an obvious manifestation of his darker side, the heir of Slytherin who possesses all those unwanted characteristics by which Harry fatalistically fears to have been tied down. McCallum writes about this situation: the doppelganger fragments and destabilises the character's sense of self by pointing out an unwanted direction of development. The idea of a doppelganger is often used in crime or detective fiction, where a detective needs to step inside a criminal's mind and manage to construct the logical course of action that is to follow. It is a disturbing thought that a righteous officer has to mime a possibly violent, immoral criminal and identify with such a person; it does not give a very flattering picture of the detective if he/she succeeds in the task of modelling an offender. Bakhtin's model seems to bring this thought into the doppelganger relation between Tom Riddle and Harry: Tom complements Harry by

---

[168] Jackson, 52–53.
[169] Rowling, *CoS*, 146–147.

giving him a set of personality traits that he has not acknowledged or even noticed in himself so far. There is enough similarity so that Harry begins to believe in a one-to-one matching possibility, until Dumbledore points out that not all of their common features need to be negatively seen:

> 'Voldemort put a bit of himself in *me*?' Harry said, thunderstruck. […]
> 'So I *should* be in Slytherin' […].
> 'Listen to me, Harry. You happen to have many qualities Salazar Slytherin prized in his hand-picked students. His own very rare gift, Parseltongue … resourcefulness … determination … a certain disregard for rules,' he [Dumbledore] added, his moustache quivering again. 'Yet the Sorting Hat placed you in Gryffindor. You know why that was. Think.'
> 'It only put me in Gryffindor,' said Harry in a defeated voice, 'because I asked not to go in Slytherin…'
> '*Exactly*,' said Dumbledore, beaming once more. 'Which makes you very *different* from Tom Riddle. It is our choices, Harry, that show what we truly are, far more than our abilities.'[170]

From the psychoanalytic point of view this could also be seen as evidence that so far Harry has neither been able to understand or cope with his darker side that includes the more questionable characteristics of his humanity, nor combine it to the more appreciated features. This desire to be uncompromisingly good and identify him/herself as a good person is usually typical of very small children and might even be taken as some sort of disability in Harry at the age of twelve. Neither does Harry have very developed means to deal with this conflict; however, with a little help in the end, he is able to deterritorialise aspects of his life and personality again when he realises that the same characteristics can be both good and bad. Even though Dumbledore in some measure puts even identity down to choice, Harry also learns to see the parallel nature and multiplicity of qualities that can be used in many divers ways, and at the same time realises that external signs or internal abilities, such as speaking a rare language associated with the Dark Side, cannot by themselves decide where a person is

---

[170] Rowling, *CoS*, 245.

located on the axis of good and evil. Just as a detective chooses to put his criminally dented mind into use by capturing real criminals, Harry can use his special talent for his community's advantage and soon find his identity expanding towards a higher level of flexibility and multiplicity. Realising this, Harry deepens his slowly accumulating understanding of the social effects of his actions and the society he belongs to – at first probably without even comprehending it. He goes out when it becomes an imminent threat that Hogwarts may be closed due to a basilisk attacking students, and even though it is his best friend's sister in the greatest danger, his actions are not limited only to saving her. In the end, he is rewarded by an even stronger commitment on a larger scale than before to his society:

> 'If you want proof, Harry, that you belong to Gryffindor, I suggest you look more closely at *this*.'
> Dumbledore reached across to Professor McGonagall's desk, picked up the blood-stained silver sword and handed it to Harry. Dully, Harry turned it over, the rubies blazing in the firelight. And then he saw the name engraved just below the hilt.
> *Godric Gryffindor.*
> 'Only a true Gryffindor could have pulled that out of the Hat, Harry,' said Dumbledore simply.[171]

When in *The Philosopher's Stone* the identity-defining social bonds Harry creates are mostly in relation to his (extended) family and a few close friends, in *The Chamber of Secrets* he establishes his relationship to the wizarding society on the somewhat wider level of the school environment. This development continues through each of the novels when Harry expands his social rhizome and learns more about himself on an individual level, the knowledge of which he is then able to use in varying contexts, often social ones. In *The Philosopher's Stone* the primary emphasis shifts from the Freudian parent–child relationship towards the saviour of the wizardkind thematics. In *The Chamber of Secrets* the transition is not as heavily pronounced, but

---

[171] Rowling, *CoS*, 245.

even there the point is being made that everything, the whole future of the wizarding community, depends on which of the doppelgangers and their rhizome communities and associated desires, Harry or Tom Riddle, survive.

6. Desire for Power

6.1. Tom Riddle/Lord Voldemort: The Polluting Desire for Power

Interestingly enough for Freudians, even Tom has his familial trauma that is a

little awkwardly brought out as the reason for his twisted personality:

> He [Tom] pulled Harry's wand out of his pocket and began to trace it
> through the air, writing three shimmering words:
> TOM MARVOLO RIDDLE
> Then he waved the wand once, and the letters of his name rearranged
> themselves:
> I AM LORD VOLDEMORT
> 'You see?' he whispered. 'It was a name I was already using at
> Hogwarts, to my most intimate friends only, of course. You think I was
> going to use my filthy Muggle father's name for ever? I, in whose veins
> runs the blood of Salazar Slytherin himself, through my mother's side? I,
> keep a name of a foul, common Muggle, who abandoned me even before
> I was born, just because he found out his wife was a witch? No, Harry. I
> fashioned myself a new name, a name I knew wizards everywhere would
> one day fear to speak, when I had become the greatest sorcerer in the
> world!'[172]

Tom desires to be the greatest wizard in the world and aims to reach his

destination with cruelty, ruthlessness and fear. This links to the recurring theme in *The

Chamber of Secrets*, racism from the part of pure-blood wizards against the Muggle-

born or half-bloods, and it seems as if J. K. Rowling is making an allusion to the Nazis:

as well as Hitler, Tom Riddle does not himself represent the ideal Aryan/pure-blood

society that he is calling after to take over the world; still, Tom seeks revenge against

the whole of the Muggle population that has begun to represent his father to him. Also

wizards and witches who have sympathies towards Muggles are in the line of

elimination that Voldemort is practising. Indeed, as Suman Gupta says along Deleuze

and Guattari's lines: "It gradually emerges that it is this fascist ideology that primarily

characterizes the evil of the Dark Side."[173] In conclusion, Tom Riddle, later as Lord

Voldemort, desires unrestricted power in a fascist society, which he will lead

---

[172] Rowling, *CoS*, 231.
[173] Gupta, Suman. *Re-reading Harry Potter*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) 101.

uncompromisingly. What he does not realise is that "[t]he desire for mastery and power results in destruction when it is not based on self-knowledge and self-mastery." Eugene Goodheart adds that in order to survive personal turmoil a person has to know his/her limits, that is, to know him/herself.[174] Tom is as lost as the day his mother left him.

Tom's desire has taken such a strong control of him that he has to have intertwined his identity in a crooked way to it, aiming at destruction and subjection of the dominating class: basically, he is attacking his own people when he admits he is half-blood, but he has taken the pure-blood identity so strongly to himself that it loses importance. In this connection it is remarkable that Tom has created a new identity, even a whole new person through several metamorphoses, for the powerful character he desires and aims to be; as if he needed a mythical or even a supernatural alter ego to hold him up and emphasise the characteristics he deems necessary for the leadership of the wizarding world. Even the name Lord Voldemort that Tom has chosen is a reminder of his obsession; Lord stands for his inherited aristocracy and perhaps also refers to his godlike image and reputation – most conspicuously for the many euphemisms for God, one of which being the Lord, not to mention that the wizarding population is afraid to even pronounce his name out loud, as if according to the Second Commandment. Voldemort is most often regarded as being a translation directly from the Latin or French phrase meaning "flight of death",[175] brutally descriptive of Lord Voldemort's actions for which he wants to be distinguished. His desire for power is so all-encompassing that he feels no mercy for even his supporters – servants, actually – and treats them with utmost opportunism. Another translation is "flight from death", which is also appropriate considering Voldemort's intense desire for and extreme measures to

---

[174] Goodheart, Eugene. *Desire and Its Discontents*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991) 35.
[175] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lord_Voldemort#Name_and_anagram

gain eternal life.[176] However, Voldemort has also been derived from the Old English "volde", "an obsolete version of the word will", and the originally French "mort", which more subtly brings out the connections with his desire for the "will of death" or even "will of slaughter".[177] This interpretation directs his desire towards the empowering feeling that he gains from deciding matters of life and death on the spur of a moment, bringing death along and exerting it over his subjects or enemies. It also implicitly refers to his fondness of using torture and other forms of violent force; it is not enough for him only to kill, but also to inflict as much pain as possible.

All this points further to the fact that Voldemort has lost connection to the whole of community: obviously to those who did not support his ideas of pure descent in the first place, but also to his mostly pure-blood supporters who he keeps tightly under his reign – not even all of them know who he originally is, which is probably beneficial for his cause against half-bloods, Muggle-borns and pure-blood traitors. Applying Deleuze and Guattari's rhizome theory this would lead us to the conclusion that in a wide network of rhizomes, it is enough to have one spoilt, which then contaminates the whole system. Those closest to it will naturally be the worst polluted, those slightly further may have hope of surviving longer, but the threat is that eventually the community at large will be destroyed or at least severely damaged. John Killinger's description is very fitting: "It is as if he [Voldemort] is a condition or a disease rather than a real person. He is a negative value corrupting the world […]."[178]

The question of fascism in Deleuze and Guattari's meaning still remains:

---

[176] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lord_Voldemort#Name_and_anagram
[177] http://theshitefantastic.net/fallen-angel/factual/harrypotter.pdf "The transition from old to modern English is a relatively simple one, utilising the laws of consonantal shift to soften the harsh *v* sound into a *w* and employing a vowel shift to lengthen the sound from a short *o* into an *oo*. Thus *volde* becomes *woulde* or, in a more contemporary phraseology, *would*. […] Interestingly, for the context given by the name Voldemort, the term [mort] also has a slightly wider meaning. The full Oxford English Dictionary definition is […] death, slaughter." Catherine Jack Deavel and David Paul Deavel regard Voldemort's name as meaning "will-for-death", but do not give a fuller explanation for this.
[178] Killinger, 41.

remarkably, it is the Death Eaters themselves who desire their own subjection, since they support Voldemort and do his bidding. However, they also gain, or at least hope to gain, from this alliance; many of them are equally fanatic about their ideology as their leader himself. There nevertheless exists a consistent doubt in Lord Voldemort's mind about their loyalty, which sets their dedication into new light: how much more the violence that Voldemort uses than real conviction keeps the Death Eaters in ranks? It can safely be said that most of them sincerely stand behind the idea of discrimination in the wizarding community, but are unable to question the means to gain their goal, which would result in instant punishment at Voldemort's hands. The whole problematics could be linked to Professor Dumbledore's comment about choice in a wider sense: perhaps the reason for the Death Eaters' endurance of Voldemort's tyranny is their perception of it as a strong leader's beneficial effect on society and its common desire on the whole.

6.2. Dudley Dursley: An Analogue to Lord Voldemort

Dudley Dursley is a spoilt boy, whose ambition in life is limited to beating Harry and anyone else smaller than himself into a pulp. He desires power in the circles of the school and neighbourhood and is his little gang's leader because he is "the biggest and stupidest of the lot".[179] Their spare time activities in *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* (2003) include "vandalising the play park, smoking on street corners and throwing stones at passing cars and children",[180] but Dudley's favourite pastime has always been "Harry-hunting" in its different forms.

Dudley comes close to Lord Voldemort in the means he strives to fulfil his desire: both are keen on terror and violence and like to exercise their will through other people. Dudley needs his gang behind him even when beating up ten year olds, Lord

---

[179] Rowling, *PS*, 28.
[180] Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. (London: Bloomsbury, 2003) 8.

Voldemort calls for his Death Eaters to do his bidding whether it is keeping himself alive or finding out information. There is no evidence, though, of Dudley punishing his friends if they failed him, whereas Voldemort does not have such inhibitions towards his supporters; however, Dudley orders his parents around the way he likes. He is a model example of a child who has always got what he wants and uses it at later stages of his life, most probably all through it, to have what he thinks is his.

Dudley's and Voldemort's desire springs from a deeply rooted belief that everyone else is there to serve him one way or another, willingly, forced or taken advantage of. Both have internalised this notion early in life and like to hold trophies to prove their power over those who could not stand against them:

> Dudley, meanwhile, was counting his presents. His face fell.
> 'Thirty-six,' he said, looking up at his mother and father. 'That's two less than last year.' […]
> Aunt Petunia obviously scented danger too, because she said quickly,
> 'And we'll buy you another *two* presents while we're out today. How's that, popkin? *Two* more presents. Is that all right? […]
> Uncle Vernon chuckled.
> 'Little tyke wants his money's worth, just like his father. Atta boy, Dudley!' He ruffled Dudley's hair.[181]
>
> Riddle took down the quaking box. He looked unnerved.
> 'Is there anything in that box that you ought not to have?' asked Dumbledore.
> Riddle threw Dumbledore a long, clear, calculating look.
> 'Yes, I suppose so, sir,' he said finally, in an expressionless voice.
> […]
> 'And lastly […] the young Tom Riddle liked to collect trophies. You saw the box of stolen articles he had hidden in his room. These were taken from victims of his bullying behaviour, souvenirs, if you will, of particularly unpleasant bits of magic.'[182]

Deleuze and Guattari would find reason to accuse the Dursleys of a severe case of Oedipus's enslaving effect. Dudley's parents shower him with expensive gifts without noticing they only make him want more external evidence of his power and encourage him to exert the same kind of power that he has over his parents to others as

---

[181] Rowling, *PS*, 21.
[182] Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. (London: Bloomsbury, 2005) 255, 260.

well – his first victim is Harry, later other children; much later maybe his co-workers, employees or his own family. Voldemort is already going down that path, only his souvenirs have changed to burned marks on the arms of his followers. There is no great difference; the main impact is to show power, to be able to gain it and keep it hanging above others' heads. What is more important, though, is the fact that both Dudley and Voldemort are slaves themselves: they are equally crushed under their own desire of power that takes them away from real friends, emotions and society at large by damaging their connections, the rhizome, within it. Both could be classified as victims of Oedipus by Deleuze and Guattari's theory: Dudley in his nuclear family spoiling him with all its might, Tom or Lord Voldemort in his overflowing rage against his traitorous father and the mother who dared die and leave him alone.

There are plenty of examples of situations where Voldemort uses different people to his advantage either with or without their consent. An interesting one is that of comparing Ginny Weasley in *The Chamber of Secrets* and Professor Quirrell in *The Philosopher's Stone*, both of whom are closely connected to desire and identity with many similarities and even more important differences, so much so that it is debatable if the relationship is analogic.

In *The Chamber of Secrets* Tom Riddle takes over Ginny's body and uses it to do his dirty work without her knowing or realising what happens. Karl Miller mentions amnesias' effect in forgetting crimes, when the central self cannot remember what another self did in a state of "fugue", thus resulting in lost time for the former.[183] Ginny is forced into this "split personality" when she finds Tom's diary, where she writes all her thoughts and sorrows. Tom answers her through the diary and feeds on her fears and secrets, becoming more and more alive from the memory to which he has been reduced

---

[183] Miller, Karl. *Doubles. Studies in Literary History.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985) 7.

and stored in the diary. He is able to bind Ginny to himself and take over her mind,

body and soul by pretending to be her friend, using her insecurities to his advantage – it

is to be assumed that Ginny would not be so vulnerable if she did not have that

invincible desire for friends and a feeling of unity, which makes her undeveloped

identity all the more unstable and uncertain:

> 'Ginny simply *loved* me. *No one's ever understood me like you, Tom ... I'm so glad I've got this diary to confide in ... It's like having a friend I can carry round in my pocket...*'[…]
> 'If I say it myself, Harry, I've always been able to charm the people I needed. So Ginny poured out her soul to me, and her soul happened to be exactly what I wanted. I grew stronger and stronger on a diet of her deepest fears, her darkest secrets. I grew powerful, far more powerful than little Miss Weasley. Powerful enough to start feeding Miss Weasley a few of *my* secrets, to start pouring a little of *my* soul back into her…'[…]
> 'Ginny Weasley opened the Chamber of Secrets. She strangled the school roosters and daubed threatening messages on the walls. She set the serpent of Slytherin on four Mudbloods, and the Squib's cat. […] Of course, she didn't *know* what she was doing at first.'[184]

Finally, Tom gains himself enough of her vital force to become a solid person. This plan

has been devised long ago, due to his craving for power and aim to restore or keep it,

forever if possible. Ginny's feelings of loneliness and confusion are magnified

throughout the story from their already extended state, making her all the more doubtful

of herself and possibly incapable of forming new relationships. Ginny might even be

compared to Miller's distressed figurative orphan, who becomes aware of his/her

double, and due to his/her incitation performs misdemeanours. This kind of double often

becomes an oppressor, "one who may take his [her] place in the world in which he [she]

has failed."[185]

In *The Philosopher's Stone*, the power relationship between the spirit of Lord

Voldemort and one of Hogwarts teachers, Professor Quirrell, resembles that between

Tom and Ginny. Quirrell carries Voldemort as a spirit inside him that uses his body

---

[184] Rowling, *CoS*, 228–229.
[185] Miller, 46.

through him, although separate from his mind – that is, Voldemort has a perfect

oportunity to force Quirrell to do his bidding. As Voldemort explains to Harry:

> Where there should have been a back to Quirrell's head, there was a face, the most terrible face Harry had ever seen. […]
> 'See what I have become?' the face said. 'Mere shadow and vapour … I have form only when I can share another's body … but there have always been those willing to let me into their hearts and minds … Unicorn blood has strengthened me, these past weeks … you saw faithful Quirrell drinking it for me in the Forest…'[186]

Quirrell is such a faithful servant to Voldemort that he is ready to go to any lengths to

keep him alive and well, as is to be seen at the end of the novel. He has harnessed his

desire to serving Lord Voldemort: "'I see the Stone… I'm presenting it to my master …

but where is it?'"[187] Quirrell, then, is destroyed because of his desperate desire to be led.

He can truly be said to desire his enslavement, which ends in agony and death. Even

then he does not (dare) question the orders he is receiving, proving his weakness by

acknowledging Voldemort's power.

What connects Ginny Weasley and Professor Quirrell is that they both

surrender their body to the disposal of an other, in both cases an evil one that uses it to

his own advantage. For both, the deepest reason is the same: in Quirrell's words it could

be called weakness: "'[Voldemort] is a great wizard and I am weak – '".[188] However, it

could also be seen as uncertainty and inability to keep their own opinion, a strong desire

to be approved of, which labels them so intently that their already undeveloped or

unstable identities begin to crack and fall apart. Ginny tries to fight back and in a sense

she succeeds; at last both herself and Tom are conscious of her resistance: "'So I made

Ginny write her own farewell on the wall and come down here to wait. She struggled

and cried and became *very* boring. But there isn't much life in her: she put too much

---

[186] Rowling, *PS*, 212–213.
[187] Rowling, *PS*, 210.
[188] Rowling, *PS*, 211.

into the diary, into me. Enough to let me leave its pages at last.'"[189]

Ginny's desiring-machines clash with those of Tom's in her body that they share, and it might be speculated that due to their permanently weakened and broken state, added to the pressure from stronger and more efficient machines, she is not able to make them function properly anymore. She could nevertheless be seen as forming her identity in the very process by contradicting the person she has previously desired to be her friend and confidant; she resists being used by evil forces, perhaps even wants to save other people from the danger of confronting Tom in the real world. What is the most central moral in Ginny's experience of desire and identity is perhaps that it is not advisable to get carried away by her desire in such a strong level that she prefers staying out of the real society with an immaterial friend to forming rhizomatic connections with it – in other words, dwelling in dreams and forgetting to live.

---

[189] Rowling, *CoS*, 231.

7. Social Desire

7.1. The Dursleys: Communal Values Directing Desire and Identity

Harry's foster family, the Dursleys, are "proud to say that they were perfectly normal, thank you very much. They were the last people you'd expect to be involved in anything strange or mysterious, because they just didn't hold with such nonsense."[190] But as so many others, they have their own shameful secret: Mrs Dursley's sister was a fully trained witch married to a fully trained wizard.

The Dursleys go to all extremities in their frantic attempts to assure themselves of the fact that the world is a rational, causally explicable place. They lose their peace of mind at the slightest implication that it could be otherwise and rather pretend to be blind if there is a chance of seeing something out of ordinary:

> He'd [Mr Dursley] forgotten all about the people in cloaks until he passed a group of them next to the baker's. He eyed them angrily as he passed. He didn't know why, but they made him uneasy. […] [H]e caught a few words of what they were saying. […]
> He put the receiver back down and stroked his moustache, thinking … no, he was being stupid. Potter wasn't such an unusual name. He was sure there were lots of people called Potter who had a son called Harry. Come to think of it, he wasn't even sure his nephew *was* called Harry.[191]

The Dursleys' desire to live in a logical, "normal" world also comes out as an intense fear and anxiety of all things inexplicable or extraordinary, and Gupta sees this as a consequence of their knowledge that magic in fact does exist: "their beliefs are unpleasant and oppressive because they patently don't fit into the Muggle world that they are made to inhabit."[192] Thus even though the Dursleys start from the assumption that Harry is abnormal due to his magical abilities and must be forced into a mould of normality, the more abnormal thing in the Muggle world is to believe in magic at all, as is often inversely stated in the wizarding community: "'[N]o Muggle would admit their

---

[190] Rowling, *PS*, 7.
[191] Rowling, *PS*, 9.
[192] Gupta, 87.

key keeps shrinking – they'll insist they just keep losing it. Bless them, they'll go to any lengths to ignore magic, even if it's staring them in the face…'"[193] Despite all their trying, the Dursleys cannot avoid this contradiction and live in constant fear that someone will find out about their "freak" relatives, building their life on lies, secrecy and fakeness in order to not be labelled odd themselves: "The Dursleys shuddered to think what the neighbours would say if the Potters arrived in the street."[194] "…[the Dursleys] now lived in terror of anyone finding out that Harry had spent most of the last two years at Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry."[195]

The greatest desire of the Dursley family is to be a respected full member of the society surrounding them, preferably on a slightly higher level of hierarchy than most of the others, and to be on good terms with those that undeniably surpass them in that hierarchy. They considerably value the outward material signs of success and wealth, such as a new car or a huge pile of birthday presents. They feel the need to mix into the conservative, wealthy community and on the surface they succeed very well: "Magnolia Road, like Privet Drive [the Dursleys' street], was full of large, square houses with perfectly manicured lawns, all owned by large, square owners who drove very clean cars similar to Uncle Vernon's."[196] Additionally, in the pursuit of status especially important to him, Mr Dursley aims at success at work, seeing it as the most effective means to reach the common goal of the family as well. Fully concentrating on this becomes possible in part with the self-deceiving methods he employs, in part with deluding his colleagues or customers as well as relatives and neighbours about Harry. It is interesting how Mr Dursley's fear of and repulsion for magic and everything it includes, represented through Harry, thoroughly dictate his life:

---

[193] Rowling, *CoS*, 34.
[194] Rowling, *PS*, 7.
[195] Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. (London: Bloomsbury, 1999) 8.
[196] Rowling, *OotP*, 16.

'This could well be the day I make the biggest deal of my career,' said Uncle Vernon. […]
'Petunia, you will be – ?'
'In the lounge,' said Aunt Petunia promptly, 'waiting to welcome them graciously to our home.'
'Good, good. And Dudley?'
'I'll be waiting to open the door.' Dudley put on a foul, simpering smile. 'May I take your coats, Mr and Mrs Mason?'
'They'll *love* him!' cried Aunt Petunia rapturously.
'Excellent, Dudley,' said Uncle Vernon. Then he rounded on Harry. 'And *you*?'
'I'll be in my bedroom, making no noise and pretending I'm not there,' said Harry tonelessly. […]
'Too right you will,' said Uncle Vernon forcefully. 'The Masons don't know anything about you and it's going to stay that way.'[197]

The Dursleys' identities depend on the society, on other people's opinion of them, and the most important thing for them is to keep the façade of an honourable, typical family flawless. Still their commitment and attitude towards society is not of the rhizomatic type but, rather, hierarchical, as said previously; their whole immediate environment is characterised by competition and envy, and applying Deleuze and Guattari's terms it could be said that different desiring-machines do not meet a single time so that they could interact and produce, that is, the community is improperly de-individualised. The largest uniform unit in this community is the psychoanalytic nuclear family, inside which identities are inflexible and fossilised – at least the Dursleys strive for that preferable condition. The point is thus that they do not even want to understand the multiple and changing nature of things, but find the feeling of security in stability.

Only in the fifth book of the series, *The Order of the Phoenix*, do the Dursleys admit the existence of the magical world as much as to discuss it with Harry:

The arrival of the Dementors in Little Whinging seemed to have breached the great, invisible wall that divided the relentlessly non-magical world of Privet Drive and the world beyond. Harry's two lives had somehow become fused and everything had been turned upside-down […].[198]

---

[197] Rowling, *CoS*, 10–11.
[198] Rowling, *OotP*, 39.

This is clearly in line with the former argument of the nuclear family: the Dursleys' son Dudley has been attacked on the way home with Harry, and his parents are beside themselves questioning the reasons and explanations for this. As Gupta puts it: "magic is apparent as magic because it defeats the desires and sharpens the explanatory failures of Muggles";[199] when compelled against the threat of the total shattering of the familial idyll inside a larger society, even the most hard-boiled Muggles give in and listen to the one that can give them answers, wizard or not. Their desire is indeed defeated, at least momentarily, in the sense that they cannot explain the incident away with anything "normal" – moreover, when Mrs Dursley lets it slip that she knows crucial details about the wizarding world, they are obliged to accept the least credible explanation they have ever hoped to hear. However, when they are able to restore the familial trichotomy and balance their identities are soon back to where they were; indicatively, Mr Dursley informs Harry: "'We – that is to say, your aunt, Dudley and I – are going out.'"[200] They are ready again to mingle with the society to prove their normality.

The Dursleys as characters appear as detestable and unpleasant as possible to underline the fact that they only want to assert themselves even if there is necessarily no justification for that – a prolepsis of the ambitious characters I will discuss later: Percy Weasley, Bartemius Crouch, Cornelius Fudge and Dolores Umbridge, whose aspirations come surprisingly close though directed somewhat differently. The Dursleys' attitude against magic bordering on hysteric as well as their material ambitions are continuously being ridiculed, and the latter put into contrast with the not-as-selfish desires of other characters, such as Dumbledore answering Harry's inquiry of what he sees in the Mirror of Erised: "'I? I see myself holding a pair of thick, woollen socks.'"[201] The main point is perhaps that the Dursleys never consider the ways in which they could be of use to their

---

[199] Gupta, 87; original italics removed.
[200] Rowling, *OotP*, 45.
[201] Rowling, *PS*, 157.

society, but merely the other way round. They will never be happy with only what they are or have, but constantly need affirmation and accumulation. It creates an interesting discord, though: the more they pursue the identity consolidating material in the attempts to define their identity, the weaker that identity becomes and consequently needs even more cementing.

7.2. Hermione and Ron: Great Expectations

There are many kinds of social motives and desires in the Harry Potter novels, but in order to give a sufficient account of them I think it is beneficial to introduce Ron's and Hermione's desires, portrayed in *The Philosopher's Stone*, after the Dursleys'. The general idea is in a way the same with all of them, in the sense that they want to be acknowledged or approved as part of their separate Muggle or wizarding communities, but their ways of acquiring their goals and the attitude they take towards the society are very different.

One of them besides Harry, Ron, does look in the Mirror of Erised and see his desire: "'[…] I'm Head Boy! […] I'm holding the House Cup and the Quidditch Cup – I'm Quidditch captain, too!'"[202] Ron's successful older brothers have always overshadowed him and he desperately wants to be acknowledged over, or at least among, them. Yet it is Ron who gets "a bad feeling" about the Mirror. It is possible that he understands the Mirror's function when Harry rejects his suggestion that it shows the future: "'How can it? All my family are dead'",[203] Harry notes. Ron's bad feeling could thus be a consequence of the realisation that he, after all, may never shine as bright as his brothers – that the Mirror is simply lying or maliciously teasing its viewers. Perhaps Ron also notices from Harry's obstinacy to continue looking into the Mirror, which

---

[202] Rowling, *PS*, 155.
[203] Ibid.

goes as far as to disparage his best friend's desire, that there is something dangerous about the Mirror of Erised.

It would be oversimplified to claim Hermione only wants to succeed at school; indeed she says herself: "'Books! And cleverness! There are more important things – friendship and bravery […]'",[204] and it is precisely friendship that she desires, being the self-conceited know-it-all that does not have a single friend:

> 'You're saying it wrong,' Harry heard Hermione snap [to Ron]. […]
> 'It's no wonder no one can stand her,' [Ron] said to Harry […].
> Someone knocked into Harry as they hurried past him. It was Hermione.
> Harry caught a glimpse of her face – and was startled to see that she was in tears.
> 'I think she heard you.'
> 'So? […] She must've noticed she's got no friends.'[205]

When Hermione wins Harry and Ron over to be her friends, she does everything she can to help in their common quest of the Philosopher's Stone even though she does have doubts from time to time. For once she does not do something to excel over others but acts out of a social motive. She values friendship extremely high and even throws some of her previous high principles over in the face of emergency:

> 'I'm going out of here tonight and I'm going to try and get to the Stone first.' […]
> 'You can't!' said Hermione. 'After what McGonagall and Snape have said? You'll be expelled!' […]
> 'Oh, come off it, you don't think we'd let you go alone?'
> 'Of course not,' said Hermione briskly. 'How do you think you'd get to the Stone without us? I'd better go and look through my books, there might be something useful…'
> 'But if we get caught, you two will be expelled, too.'
> 'Not if I can help it,' said Hermione grimly.[206]

Ron and Hermione could be named as the ones getting the closest to the fulfilment of their desires. Ron finally receives special attention within his family and additionally (not to mention unexpectedly) among schoolmates; he is not recognised

---

[204] Rowling, *PS*, 208.
[205] Rowling, *PS*, 127.
[206] Rowling, *PS*, 196–197.

only as "Harry Potter's sidekick" or "the youngest Weasley brother" anymore but as the boy who earned Gryffindor fifty points "'for the best-played game of chess Hogwarts has seen in many years'". One of his brothers boasts about belonging to the same family: "'My brother, you know! My youngest brother!'"[207] It is not Ron who rides on his brothers' fame anymore, but the other way round, and his recognition rests on his own special skill.

For Hermione, too, the gain is social above everything else. Not only has she made two best friends, but also won the other students' respect. Earlier she has been fastidious about Harry and Ron breaking the rules lest they would "'lose all the points I got from Professor McGonagall for knowing about Switching Spells'".[208] Being in the winning team has always been the most important thing for her, but only for her own sake, not for others'. When she earns Gryffindor fifty points "'for the use of cool logic in the face of fire'",[209] it is for successfully using her own special talents for everyone's good, and that way she learns the importance of being able to work as part of a group.

Ron and Hermione build their identity through these incidents both on personal and social levels. They take their places as members of the community and also gain personal confidence in their own skills, which they can use not only for themselves but also for others. They begin to form the rhizome of which they will be equal parts, and this rhizome will be seen to widen and deepen throughout the *Harry Potter* series much along the same lines as Harry's. Compared to the Dursleys, Ron and Hermione's means to achieve their desire is deemed more acceptable because it is for the benefit of the whole society, whereas the Dursleys only strive for their own profit. As Harry, Ron and Hermione gradually become able to connect their desiring-machines to a larger construction and understand their own part and meaning in it, they become more de-

---

[207] Rowling, *PS*, 221.
[208] Rowling, *PS*, 116.
[209] Rowling, *PS*, 221.

individualised and at the same time more flexible in their endeavours so that all their

desiring-machines can be directed towards social desiring-production.

8. Oedipus Gaining Ground

8.1. The Dementors: The Return of Oedipus?

In the third book in the series, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, the most relevant illustration of desire and identity comes through the Dementors, the guards of the wizard prison Azkaban, and the incidents they take part in. Harry learns of their effects on people early on in the story:

> An intense cold swept over them all. Harry felt his own breath catch in his chest. The cold went deeper than his skin. It was inside his chest, it was inside his very heart… […]
> And then, from far away, he heard screaming, terrible, terrified, pleading screams. He wanted to help whoever it was, he tried to move his arms, but couldn't … a thick white fog was swirling around him, inside him –[210]

The most important piece of information, an exhaustive description of Dementors, comes from his new teacher, Professor Lupin:

> '[T]hey glory in decay and despair, they drain peace, hope and happiness out of the air around them. […] Get too near a Dementor and every good feeling, every happy memory, will be sucked out of you. If it can, the Dementor will feed on you long enough to reduce you to something like itself – soulless and evil. You'll be left with nothing but the worst experiences of your life.'[211]

The Dementors cause Harry to hear the last moments of his parents twelve years earlier, when they were murdered by Lord Voldemort, trying to plead for and save Harry's life. His urgent desire becomes first to avoid passing out and being mocked for it, then to fight back those memories, to fight back the fear that incapacitates him when confronting a Dementor, but he soon realises he might not be all that eager to get rid of his memories:

> Terrible though it was to hear his parents' last moments replayed inside his head, these were the only times Harry had heard their voices since he was a very small child. But he'd never be able to produce a proper Patronus if he half wanted to hear his parents again…
> 'They're dead,' he told himself sternly. 'They're dead, and listening to

---

[210] Rowling, *PoA*, 66.
[211] Rowling, *PoA*, 140.

> echoes of them won't bring them back. You'd better get a grip on yourself if you want that Quidditch Cup.'[212]

Harry is captured by the voices of his parents in *The Prisoner of Azkaban* just as effectively as he was by their reflections in the Mirror of Erised in *The Philosopher's Stone*. His underlying desire has not thus changed as much as could have been thought after the incidents in *The Philosopher's Stone* but is as continuous a flow as ever, and despite his socially acceptable reason (of winning a team sport cup) for wanting to abolish his parents from his mind, he still has very personal reasons for wanting to both keep them in and banish them from there. Harry is again enslaved by his desire, again even desiring his enslavement, and this time he has several desires clashing with each other, which altogether makes it considerably more difficult to continue practising the method with which he could resist the influence of the Dementors. René Girard points out that although enslavement is at first distant and unnoticed, it is always the final result of desire.[213] Linda Ruth Williams maintains that a key channel for desire is pleasure in pain, which may culminate in the destruction of the ego where masochism takes over,[214] but Girard intensifies this with the opinion that metaphysical desire naturally tends towards masochism.[215] Chetwynd explains the conflict between wish and fear by their being the positive and negative sides of the same impulse.[216] Despite the realisation that his desire and fear originate from the same source, which according to Chetwynd should facilitate the rationalisation of the trauma,[217] Harry finds it increasingly hard to produce a magical Patronus, which would protect him from the Dementors, and feels angry and guilty of his secret in front of Professor Lupin.

---

[212] Rowling, *PoA*, 180.

[213] Girard, René. *Deceit, Desire and the Novel. Self and Other in Literary Structure.* Trans. Yvonne Freccero. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961) 180.

[214] Williams, Linda Ruth. *Critical Desire. Psychoanalysis and the Literary Subject.* (London: Edward Arnold, 1995) 172.

[215] Girard, 180.

[216] Chetwynd.

[217] Ibid.

The ultimate threat that the Dementors place on people is popularly called the Dementor's Kiss, which destroys an individual completely:

> '[T]hey clamp their jaws upon the mouth of the victim and – and suck out his soul.' […]
> 'You can exist without your soul, you know, as long as your brain and heart are still working. But you'll have no sense of self any more, no memory, no … anything. There's no chance at all of recovery. You'll just – exist. As an empty shell. And your soul is gone for ever … lost.'[218]

Remarkably, it is the sense of self that the Dementors take, in other words, a person's identity. The Patronus featured in the Harry Potter novels is a magically conjured protector, which changes its form according to its owner and chases the Dementors away. The name is Latin for "a guardian" and is of the same origin than the Latin *pater*, "father".[219]

There are several other interesting things about Harry's Patronus to a psychoanalyst especially. In *The Prisoner of Azkaban*, Harry and his newly found godfather Sirius Black are confronted with a desperate situation against a horde of Dementors, where his Patronus charm does not work sufficiently. As he is about to receive a Dementor's Kiss in attempt to save Sirius from one, he indistinctly notices a Patronus coming to his rescue and thinks he sees his father sending it from some distance. Its form is that of a stag's, which coincidentally was also Harry's father's Animagus (animal) form, his nickname at school correspondingly being Prongs. In the end Harry finds out that it was himself, not his father, that sent out the Patronus saving him and Sirius, and despite the original joy of being able to produce a fully capable Patronus, he feels sorely disappointed. Once again only Dumbledore's words can enlighten him on the matter:

> 'I expect you're tired of hearing it, but you do look *extraordinarily* like James. Except for your eyes … you have your mother's eyes.'

---

[218] Rowling, *PoA*, 183.
[219] Colbert, David. *The Magical Worlds of Harry Potter. A Treasury of Myths, Legends and Fascinating Facts*. (London: Penguin Books, 2001) 125–126.

> Harry shook his head.
> 'It was stupid, thinking it was him,' he muttered. 'I mean, I knew he was dead.'
> 'You think the dead we have loved ever truly leave us? You think that we don't recall them more clearly than ever in times of great trouble? Your father is alive in you, Harry, and shows himself most plainly when you have need of him. How else could you produce that *particular* Patronus? […] So you did see your father last night, Harry … you found him inside yourself.'[220]

Harry is again faced with the fact that his parents are dead and not coming back, but this time he forms a deeper connection to his father, whereas in *The Philosopher's Stone* it was his mother that he learned more about. It is surely not a coincidence that Harry is saved from losing his identity by his father, whatever shape he has taken – he features, indeed, in two different forms, one being Harry's outward appearance, the other his Patronus. Once again it is a case of reflection, but this time Harry himself is the surface that reflects his father outwards. At first sight it appears that exactly the "inflating of the father with myth and phylogenesis" is at work here, the thing that Deleuze and Guattari so criticise about Freud. They would probably be of the opinion that Harry's parents, or rather his longing for his parents, is obstructing his desiring-machines and along with them the continuous flow of his desire. Adding to that his attachment to Sirius – a father figure or parent substitute – Deleuze and Guattari might consider Harry a lost case for Oedipus.

However, it could also be argued that Harry gains more knowledge both about himself and his father and is able to gradually assimilate it to his existing scenario. The realisation, when it hits him that he is to save both himself and Sirius from the Dementor's Kiss, is a jubilant one: "And then it hit him – he understood. He hadn't seen his father – he had seen *himself* – […] 'I knew I could do it this time,' said Harry, 'because I'd already done it…'"[221] Harry is finally able to put some distance between

---

[220] Rowling, *PoA*, 312.
[221] Rowling, *PoA*, 300–301.

himself and his father at the same time as coming closer to him; they become one and multiple at the same time, clearly separate but sharing common features, the smallest unit for a rhizome, two connected, so to speak.

Another view of this comes, however, in *The Order of the Phoenix*, where Harry's likeness to his father is first questioned, after which he finds out characteristics about his father that he would rather not find in himself – that is, the reflection becomes unwanted and inaccurate, causing Harry another individual identity crisis. In the first stage Sirius remarks: "'You're less like your father than I thought'"[222], which at the time is a source of personal distress for Harry, although later he is obliged to wonder whether he even wants to be like his father. I will handle this theme more in a later chapter in connection with Professor Snape.

All Harry's actions during the course of *The Prisoner of Azkaban* are determined by the all-conquering need to call his parents' traitor to account for turning them in to Lord Voldemort, and he partly succeeds in this mission, gaining a vaster knowledge of his parents and their social network in the process. This is again a new way to relate to them and also the wizarding society at large as Harry learns things about that society he did not know before:

> 'You have sent Voldemort a deputy who is in your debt. When one wizard saves another wizard's life, it creates a certain bond between them … and I'm much mistaken if Voldemort wants his servant in the debt of Harry Potter. […] … the time may come when you will be very glad you saved Pettigrew's life.'[223]

Harry can slowly begin to identify himself in the closer circle of his parents' friends, although he does not yet have full information about it, which would make it possible to see the greater picture and the many connections that crisscross the society, first in smaller entities and then linking them to each other in different ways and for different

---

[222] Rowling, *OotP*, 273.
[223] Rowling, *PoA*, 311.

purposes. Still, in Deleuze and Guattari's words, Harry is in the continuing process of building his own rhizome, making a network of connections that may one day be of use or a source of happiness to him, one way or another.

An interesting detail about the Dementors for Harry is in the way he learns to confront them: Professor Lupin finds him a peculiar creature in the magical world, a Boggart, that changes its appearance according to whatever the person it is facing fears the most. For Harry it takes the form of a Dementor. This is one more example of a mirror reflection, where an outer object shows the viewer his or her inner thoughts and feelings; once again Harry is portrayed with a picture of his mental life, even though Professor Lupin realises its more profound meaning before him: "'Well, well … I'm impressed. […] That suggests that what you fear most of all is – fear. Very wise, Harry.'"[224]

The whole setting in *The Prisoner of Azkaban* is an important implication that there can also be desire mixed with fear: something that with rational thinking appears to be solely fatal does have its appeal and consequently an ability to lure the desiring person into a confusing approach–avoidance conflict. In this situation the desirer does not know which he/she wants more, to turn towards or away from the desired and feared object. Harry is able to gain more insight into his individual identity through seeing his worst fear materialise in front of him and deciding how to cope with his past and come to terms with his fears. Perhaps Professor Lupin's comment also serves to bring out the fact that it is more beneficial to fear abstract things as far more dangerous than concrete fears of spiders or monsters displayed by Harry's peers, because they can gain a hold of a person's sense of self, and learn to resist them even though they might seem desirable, probably even to reach a higher level of understanding in the process. It is thus as much

---

[224] Rowling, *PoA*, 117.

a question of being able to stand against one's own desire as being able to strive to reach it, which Harry learns from both his parents in two different novels.

8.2. Ambition Boosted by Desire

Several characters in the Harry Potter novels show more or less ruthless ambition, outright opportunism and inflexibly strict holding to rules, which makes them overlook or ignore things that are either visible or expectable, or rely on their own intuition despite better knowledge from some other character's part. These law-abiding characters include Percy Weasley, Bartemius Crouch, Cornelius Fudge and Dolores Umbridge, all most probably on the "good" side but too self-assertive and rigidly disposed to give credit or attention to anyone bringing different, usually contradicting, opinions into the open. They fail to see the all-encompassing nature of the rhizome; in fact, their sense of society is more arborescent than anything else in its logical, hierarchical and systematic structure, which they aspire to use to their advantage in the most extensive way possible. The difference I wish to argue for between the sort of desire for power these four characters on one hand and Lord Voldemort on the other hand display is that the former are not necessarily prone to evilness and Voldemort's principles, but their weakness is an over fondness of rules, regulations and the minor power (or rather just bossing other people around) and its outward signs possibly gained through enforcing them. It is a central question where this fondness leads them, also in connection with desire and identity.

In the first three *Harry Potter* novels, Percy Weasley appears only to be a humorous character that gets laughed at for his insistence on following rules and his overly neat exterior with the shining Prefect or Head Boy badge he is inordinately proud of. From the first book on, the adjective mostly used in connection with Percy is

"pompous". He does not leave a single chance of self-emphasising unutilised, neither does he feel awkward about borrowed authority exerted through someone else's orders or fawning upon any influential person who might be able to help or facilitate his ascent to his goal. He has a tendency to make himself appear more important than he really is by appealing to his superiors and underlining his influence to them, often without basis. In short, he is extremely ambitious and even power-hungry, but believes that the better way to climb up the hierarchy is to know the right people rather than to make his own future for himself with his talent:

> 'I don't reckon he'd [Percy] come home [from work] if Dad didn't make him. He's obsessed. Just don't get him onto the subject of his boss. *According to Mr Crouch ... as I was saying to Mr Crouch ... Mr Crouch is of the opinion ... Mr Crouch was telling me ...* They'll be announcing their engagement any day now.'[225]

Percy is several times described as "ambitious". He is frequently scantily portrayed, featuring as a side character, but the little details reveal much about his desire and disposition, that are directed in one narrow way:

> [I]n a tiny junk shop [...] they found Percy, deeply immersed in a small and deeply boring book called *Prefects Who Gained Power*. [...] 'Course, he's very ambitious, Percy, he's got it all planned out ... he wants to be Minister of Magic ...' Ron told Harry and Hermione in an undertone, as they left Percy to it.[226]

It is hardly a coincidence that in the same novel where the above extract is taken from Harry, Hermione and Ron learn about a former Hogwarts Prefect, Tom Riddle, who later became the terror-spreading Lord Voldemort; it is yet to be seen how Percy's desire will develop in the last, coming book, given this perhaps even deliberate parallel. This is already hinted at in the fourth book, *The Goblet of Fire*, but radically brought out in the fifth, *The Order of the Phoenix*, where Percy's attitude towards his family suffers a drastic change when he puts his surprisingly flourishing career before family relations:

---

[225] Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. (London: Bloomsbury, 2000) 54.
[226] Rowling, *CoS*, 48.

'He [Percy] came home really pleased with himself […] and told Dad he'd been offered a position in Fudge's own office. A really good one for someone only a year out of Hogwarts: Junior Assistant to the Minister.' […]
'Dad reckons Fudge only wants Percy in his office because he wants to use him to spy on the family – and Dumbledore.'
[…]
'He [Percy] said he's been having to struggle against Dad's lousy reputation ever since he joined the Ministry [of Magic] and that Dad's got no ambition and that's why we've always been – you know – not had a lot of money, I mean –' […] 'And if Mum and Dad were going to become traitors to the Ministry he was going to make sure everyone knew he didn't belong to our family any more.'[227]

Percy's desire to be acknowledged and respected professionally in the official institution he highly esteems overcomes his loyalty for his family and takes him several steps further in an attempt to fulfil his desire for power, although at the Ministry of Magic he is still a minor official clearly under the Minister's orders. Percy's identity has throughout the series been centred on his success at school and at work and he considers himself an excellent role model: "'Ginny's got other brothers to set her an example, Mother.'"[228] With these values Percy is much closer than the other Weasleys to the Dursley family, whose first and foremost inclination is towards wealth and status perceivable in outer appearances.

It is noteworthy that Percy works for two of the other characters that fit more or less in the same general description as himself: Bartemius Crouch and Cornelius Fudge. Both work for the Ministry but their actions might be said to reach the far ends of the same continuum: the former takes extreme measures to fight the wizards on the Dark Side; the latter is a puppet on the strings held by the Death Eaters' leading figures. Crouch's attitude strongly begins to resemble tyranny although he does not realise that himself; he "'fought violence with violence, and […] became as ruthless and cruel as

---

[227] Rowling, *OotP*, 68–69.
[228] Rowling, *PoA*, 51.

many on the Dark Side'",[229] Fudge does not accept advice from a wizard – Professor

Dumbledore – who he fears covets his position as the Minister of Magic.

Their desire for power is almost as destructive and harmful as that of Lord

Voldemort's, only in a different way – they hurt their society indirectly by giving the

Dark Side the upper hand or descending to their level when it might be better to search

for more civilised solutions. Their individual identity could be thought very strong in

the sense that they do not see or admit their mistakes, but the preference to close their

eyes from what they perceive as illogical or contrary to their own beliefs gives a

completely opposite outlook on this. The question may be posed between the good of

the society and an individual: these three characters are only concerned with their own

good, whereas Dumbledore, for only one example, aims at uniting the society against a

common enemy. There is no unified rhizome they could be part of because their

identities are so rocklike and they consider a strong leader with authority more central

than united mass effect; they do not possess a smallest chance for de-individualisation

or deterritorialisation any more than Lord Voldemort does. Percy, Crouch and Fudge

illustrate the status craving want-to-be-leaders: they are in the game because of their

society, but they want to be above that society in hierarchy and be acknowledged as its

benefactors and saviours. In Freudian terms they strive for the place of the father in all

his "mythical phylogenesis" in a somewhat wider context.

Dolores Umbridge comes to Hogwarts as a new professor authorised and

directed by the Ministry and in due time substitutes Dumbledore as the Headmistress of

Hogwarts. She uses the power of the Ministry of Magic in abundance and more than

anything appears as a satire of an over-enthusiastic school mistress, who can cause

personal vexation for the students but still remains essentially a puppet (not unlike

---

[229] Rowling, *GoF*, 457.

Percy) and scapegoat for the Ministry, which successfully guides her desire for power to its own uses:

> 'Now, where is it? Cornelius just sent it … I mean,' she gave a false little laugh as she rummaged in her handbag, 'the *Minister* just sent it … ah yes … […] As a matter of fact, Minerva, it was you who made me see that we *needed* a further amendment … you remember how you overrode me, when I was unwilling to allow the Gryffindor Quidditch team to re-form? […] Well, now, I couldn't have that. I contacted the Minister at once, and he quite agreed with me that the High Inquisitor has to have the power to strip pupils of privileges, or she – that is to say, I – would have less authority than common teachers!'[230]

Dolores Umbridge attempts to gain a foothold at Hogwarts by many methods, some of the most important ones being punishment, threats and denigration of Professor Dumbledore. She tries to infiltrate the spirit and launch a hierarchical system of control and supervision by recruiting students of her own kind and favour. However, the rhizome inside Hogwarts is such a dense one that it manages to close her almost totally off and single-mindedly thwarts the revolution she is campaigning for. In the end, it might be said that she falls victim to her black and white belief and naïve trust in hierarchy and the narrow-minded conception of the world as structured according to some logical or self-evident laws. She fails to comprehend the connections between different desiring-machines that are more powerful together in producing the endless flow of desire that encompasses everything. Umbridge loves power so much that she is unable to realise that her craving for it entirely undermines her chances of defeating the nomadic, general, unstoppable flow of desire of the de-individualised group expanding over almost the whole populace of Hogwarts. Her strong individual identity solely enforces her belief that she is the only one doing anything to make things better there.

---

[230] Rowling, *OotP*, 368.

9. Divided Halves

9.1. Sirius Black: Useful or Harmful Desire?

The Prisoner of Azkaban presents a completely new way of looking at the relation between desire and identity. Sirius Black has spent several years in the Azkaban prison with the Dementors and survived perfectly sane, which is unheard of. His own opinion is:

> 'I think the only reason I never lost my mind is that I knew I was innocent. That wasn't a happy thought, so the Dementors couldn't suck it out of me … but it kept me sane and knowing who I am … helped me keep my powers … so when it all became … too much … I could transform in my cell … become a dog. Dementors can't see, you know…' He swallowed. 'They feel their way towards people by sensing their emotions … they could tell that my feelings were less – less human, less complex when I was a dog … but they thought, of course, that I was losing my mind like everyone else in there, so it didn't trouble them.'[231]

It is crucial that Sirius has kept himself alive with the force of the fact of "knowing who I am". His is such a strong identity that cannot be squashed down even by the most devastating creatures that inhabit the wizarding world, and as a consequence he is able to keep to some extent the capability to function rationally, and even more importantly, maintain his magical powers so central to any witch's or wizard's identity. Another element, closely connected to the former, is Sirius' ability of transforming into a dog, which plays an essential role in his escape from Azkaban. However, what is the triggering factor of the escape is a suddenly flamed obsessive desire:

> 'But then I saw Peter in that picture … […] … ready to strike the moment he could be sure of allies … to deliver the last Potter to them [the Dark Side]. If he gave them Harry, who'd dare say he'd betrayed Lord Voldemort? He'd be welcomed back with honours …
> So you see, I had to do something. I was the only one who knew Peter was still alive… […]
> It was as if someone had lit a fire in my head, and the Dementors couldn't destroy it … it wasn't a happy feeling … it was an obsession …

---

[231] Rowling, *PoA*, 272.

but it gave me strength, it cleared my mind.'[232]

It is of lesser significance where the desire aims at or whether it is, so to speak, a positive or a negative force, than the fact that it is the last one in a chain of events that constructs Sirius' feeling of responsibility and independence yet again. He becomes a fully acting agent again; taking the shape of a dog is no longer a passive way of escaping the unbearable conditions but an active means to run away from them. The compelled deprivation of human relationships with the outer world is exchanged to a limited but voluntarily controlled freedom, the reduction of thought and content to the capacity of deliberate thought and action; in McCallum's terms it could be said that Sirius regains full subjectivity, having at least a slight chance of interaction with the environment, along with the full scope of human psychological states. In this case, then, desire could be seen as a positive force, contrary to the examples in the previous novels.

Sirius' contact to the social world, though, needs a specifying concept of transgression or resistance that McCallum has also dealt with.[233] He is still in conflict with the society and is going to violate its rules by killing Peter; thus his desire is more powerful than the fear of the consequences. This, once again, presents the question whether it is necessary or even healthy to achieve all your desires: even though Sirius may feel he has nothing to lose even if he received the Dementor's Kiss, the loss of his identity would still be due to an all-encompassing desire that led him to full conflict with the society and transgression of its norms in the first place.

9.2. Professor Snape: Double Identity

One of Hogwarts' professors, Severus Snape, is originally a Death Eater, but has allegedly switched sides, working from *The Goblet of Fire* onwards as a double

---

[232] Rowling, *PoA*, 272–273.
[233] Above, 19.

agent for Professor Dumbledore and the Order of the Phoenix. He is exaggeratedly repulsive with greasy hair and sallow skin with a character to match: prejudiced against the Muggle-born, favouring pupils in his own house, Slytherin, degrading everyone else and hating Harry with particular force.

It is difficult to decipher which is Snape's heart's desire: on one hand, he has always wanted to teach Defence Against the Dark Arts, but Dumbledore has not trusted him enough for that for fourteen years; however, in the sixth book *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince* (2005) Snape gets the post he has dreamed of. Harry immediately forms an opinion consistent with his earlier picture of Snape just waiting to betray Dumbledore in favour of Voldemort, based on the way Snape speaks about the Dark Arts "with a loving caress in his voice".[234] He is, however, left with no argument when Hermione points out the similarity in his own approach: "'You said it wasn't just memorising a bunch of spells, you said it was just you and your brains and your guts – well, wasn't that what Snape was saying?'"[235] It is probably remarkable as well that Harry receives indispensable help from Snape's old Potions book, although this happens without him knowing whose it has been.

On the other hand, Snape has a long history of unsuccessful experiences in the social environment. He has not received social acceptance in his schooldays, for which Harry's father and Sirius were partly responsible, and this has probably been part of the reason for his turning to Voldemort, with whom he gained power instead of acceptance. Snape still is keen on power; he likes to have his own house admiring him and in a way even woos some of the students such as Draco Malfoy by treating students from other houses unfairly. He is also bent on making Harry's life as difficult and miserable as possible using his authority as a teacher; preferably, he would have Harry expelled from

---

[234] Rowling, *HBP*, 169.
[235] Rowling, *HBP*, 172.

Hogwarts. Snape's antipathy stems from his original hate against Harry's father, and his desire of being socially accepted is linked with Harry's sudden loss of trust in his father in *The Order of the Phoenix*, due to his catching a flashback glimpse of Professor Snape as an unclean and sulky youth ridiculed by other teenagers, his father in the lead:

> What was making Harry feel so horrified and unhappy was not being shouted at or having jars thrown at him; it was that he knew how it felt to be humiliated in the middle of a circle of onlookers, knew exactly how Snape had felt as his father had taunted him, and that judging from what he had just seen, his father had been every bit as arrogant as Snape had always told him.[236]

It seems, however, that the greater cause for Harry's discomfort is that his father proved to be someone else than the person he had idolised for so long, rather than the fact that he realises how wrongly Snape has been treated and feels sorry for him. This would be easily explained with yet another identity crisis triggered in him: he can no longer feel unconditional pride in being compared to his father, which has until that moment been an important backup for his identity. The worst thing is probably that the person who puts him in this compromising situation is the one he dislikes the most. What he does not perhaps realise is that it is the same way around for Snape.

Central characteristics and skills of Snape's, even his desires, are revealed throughout the series to the readers, but *The Half-Blood Prince* makes a specific point about his identity. It turns out that a script in an old book, "This Book is the Property of the Half-Blood Prince" refers to Snape, whose mother's maiden name was Prince; interestingly, Snape's father was a Muggle and his mother pure-blood. He followed Voldemort's lead and took himself a new name – an example of Voldemort's polluting influence on the rhizome – emphasising his high descent from both a pure-blood family and the "royalty" in it. Snape has most probably had much the same reasons to adopt a new name than Lord Voldemort: the desire to be respected and feared as a member of

---

[236] Rowling, *OotP*, 573.

the close inner circle of the Dark Lord, but also to get rid of his former connection with Muggles and the distressing events associated with his former self. It could nevertheless be speculated why he has chosen to bring out his exact descent, when it in a way diminishes him; on the Dark Side being a half-blood is almost as dishonourable as being a "Mudblood". It could of course be only a reminder of the fact that his father was not one of the pure-blood Prince family whereas Snape was at least half of it, as Hermione says, "'Snape must have been proud of being "half a Prince", you see?'"[237] It could still be asked whether there is some irony behind Snape's chosen name or if it is even some kind of self-hatred or self-depreciation. Snape has perhaps thought that with Voldemort, he will at least have people of the same general ideas around him, even though he has felt some contempt against their fanaticism. In general, childhood and youth tend to be stressed as the shapers of character, and this is true in Snape's case as well: in his memory there is a shouting man, a cowering woman and a crying little boy. When he later signs his book as the Half-Blood Prince, it is at least implied that this is in part because of his abusive father alongside the uncompassionate schoolmates. Freud's theory would suggest that Snape is classically fixated on the Oedipal conflict and as a sign for that stresses his connection with his mother's side.

Snape's loyalty is a matter of suspicion and further underlines his at least seemingly mixed sense of identity presented above: employed as a double agent there seems not to be a way of knowing whose side he is on, and both the Dark Side and the Order of the Phoenix have only his word to believe. He is a very skilled wizard and would be usable to both sides; it is disconcerting that in *The Order of the Phoenix*, although faithful to his nasty character, he is portrayed to work for the "good" side but in *The Half-Blood Prince* he is associated with the Dark Side from the beginning – he

---

[237] Rowling, *HBP*, 594.

even boasts of giving Lord Voldemort the tips that have resulted in some previously introduced Order of the Phoenix members' murders. Professor Snape is perhaps the most divided character in the series and the tension is deliberately built when he kills Dumbledore in *The Half-Blood Prince* – probably at the latter's own request, but he will not likely be able to prove it.

Snape has experienced rhizomes at both ends of the extremity, moving between the poisoned one of Voldemort's society to the healthy, loyal atmosphere of Hogwarts' rhizome under Professor Dumbledore's time as the Headmaster, and features as a full member of both of them. It is remarkable that he does not seem to like either – his attitude towards fellow teachers and most students is mostly featured as deep disdain and scorn, even outright aggressiveness and revulsion; it is also described how he treats some of the other high-ranking Death Eaters the same way. It is not shown, though, how he acts towards Voldemort, but his renowned talent for Legilimency and Occlumency enables him to blatantly mislead him – as well as Dumbledore, it is to be assumed, although Snape always shows respect to him. It is thus not entirely clear whether he will emerge as supportive of Voldemort or Dumbledore in the end; by killing Dumbledore he has become a fugitive and has no choice of returning, if he even wants to do that for anyone else's sake besides Dumbledore's.

Snape's identity actually appears to be the most multiple and flexible in the series. He fluently acts for two opposite sides, equally efficiently and seemingly loyally, respecting the highest authorities but no one else, which leads to the suspicion that his highest aim is opportunistically to be as close as possible to whoever has the leading position and share his power, or at least to gain protection against threatening forces. This, on its part, receives support from psychoanalysis: even though the father is the object of fear and hate, the child wants to be as close to him as possible to gain his

acceptance. It is, however, a valid question whether Snape's flexible identity is a result of the Oedipus complex – Deleuze and Guattari claim that the complex is effectively overcome when a person has no fixed or solid identity. It is true that Snape has learned to accommodate himself like a chameleon to the circumstances at hand and redirect his desire for social solidarity, but does this mean he is free of the trauma of his past or only that he has managed to repress it? His reaction to finding his secrets uncovered might suggest the latter:

> 'So,' said Snape, gripping Harry's arm so tightly Harry's hand was starting to feel numb. '*So* … been enjoying yourself, Potter?'
> 'N-no,' said Harry, trying to free his arm.
> It was scary: Snape's lips were shaking, his face was white, his teeth were bared.
> 'Amusing man, your father, wasn't he?' said Snape, shaking Harry so hard his glasses slipped down his nose.
> 'I – didn't –'
> Snape threw Harry from him with all his might. Harry fell hard on to the dungeon floor.
> 'You will not repeat what you saw to anybody!' Snape bellowed.
> 'No,' said Harry, getting on to his feet as far from Snape as he could. 'No, of course I w–'
> 'Get out, get out, I don't want to see you in this office ever again!'
> And as Harry hurtled towards the door, a jar of dead cockroaches exploded over his head.[238]

9.3. Sirius Black and Severus Snape: Conflict in a Rhizome

The Order of the Phoenix is an example of individuals forming a rhizome. One detail about the biological rhizome is that its parts are identical: this seems quite an unfair demand for humans, but can again be loosely applied to inward appearances. In the Order, different people are working to reach the same target; they are separate people with different life experiences but support the same ideology and share the same desires to a certain extent. The rhizome of the Order, however, is not entirely without ruptures; the most prominent one is presented through the relationship

---

[238] Rowling, *OotP*, 572–573.

between Sirius Black and Severus Snape, an enmity since long ago.

The fundamental problem between these two characters seems to be on Sirius' part that he does not recognise Snape as a member of the Order; on Snape's part it might be that he does not sufficiently invest into behaving as a typical member of the Order does. In other words these are deficiencies occurring in deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, previously illustrated with the example of the wasp and the orchid: Sirius fails to reterritorialise Snape in his unexpected "imitation" of a member of the Order of the Phoenix, or Snape fails to deterritorialise from his alleged image of a Death Eater in hiding into one of the members of the Order. Most probably both shortcomings in equal measure consolidate each other cyclically: Snape does not act to please anyone in either the Order or the Death Eaters, whom he also deals with. Especially his attitude towards Sirius, springing from earlier events, leaves much to be desired: "'[…] I am sure you must feel – ah – frustrated by the fact that you can do nothing *useful*,' Snape laid a delicate stress on the word, 'for the Order.'"[239] Sirius, also from previous experience, is sceptical about Snape's role in the Order: "'I don't care if Dumbledore thinks you've reformed, I know better –'".[240]

Here the rhizome is not so much fracturing as being left completely unformed. The flow of desire is blocked when neither "branch" is willing to allow the desire, that is the very same circulating in and through both of them, stream free between them. A certain degree of concretisation is appropriate in my study although Deleuze and Guattari probably never meant their theory to be used that way; still, in a human rhizome it is essential that the capacity of thought be taken into account. In Sirius and Snape's case, the conflict arises from the past which they cannot put behind themselves; if briefly considered from the point of view of desire and identity, it could be said that

---

[239] Rowling, *OotP*, 458.
[240] Rowling, *OotP*, 459.

both miss the universal nature of desire as a continuous flow and attempt to chain it for themselves to use for their own purposes. Sirius does this by excluding Snape from the rhizome he feels is similar to himself but not to Snape, Snape by jealously blocking his desire out of Sirius' reach, perhaps even so as not to be forced to relive the trials he has gone through in the past. Both their individual identities push to the fore, leaving unfulfilled the demand of de-individualisation and making them vulnerable to attacks of Oedipus:

> 'Oh, but why don't you tell him so?' whispered Snape. 'Or are you afraid he might not take very seriously the advice of a man who has been hiding inside his mother's house for six months?'
> 'Tell me, how is Lucius Malfoy these days? I expect he's delighted his lapdog's working at Hogwarts, isn't he?'[…]
> 'Are you calling me a coward?' roared Sirius […].[241]

This makes more of an impression of two little boys arguing about the favour of the father than two adult men working for the same cause. They are doing that, however, to the extent that in the end one does everything he can to save the other, despite old grudges. Perhaps then, in the end, it is the rhizome that overcomes Oedipus.

---

[241] Rowling, *OotP*, 459–460.

10. Albus Dumbledore: Wisdom Rising Above Desire

Professor Dumbledore is somewhat detached from the ordinary life of the wizarding world; he has risen above many, if not all, of the desires that are represented in this thesis for other characters. The desires to do with ambition and status are completely alien to him; he understands Voldemort's desire for power very well but observes it objectively and emphasises systematically the counter-power that is forever unreachable and incomprehensible to Voldemort: love. From his detached plane he is able to see clearly what Voldemort's desire has done to him: it is lonely at the top of the hierarchy, even when people pretend to be close to you; a damaged rhizome will not function appropriately – although I have already wakened discussion of whether the concept of rhizome is applicable to Voldemort's net of connections or if it is just a type of a fascistic tyranny.

Dumbledore seems to apply the objectively analytical thinking even to his own desires, which has enabled him to collect further knowledge about the phenomenon. The psychological concept of distancing quite adequately describes his attitude towards the world, its enticements and favours offered to him. Dumbledore has seen what desire can do to a human being and realises its dangers; he has profound understanding of the ways desire bends people away from, instead of towards, their ideal life, as is deducible from his words about the Mirror of Erised: "'Men have wasted away before it, entranced by what they have seen, or been driven mad, not knowing if what it shows is real or even possible.'"[242] He even gives an entirely opposite opinion of the Philosopher's Stone as would be customary:

> 'You know, the Stone was really not such a wonderful thing. As much money and life as you could want! The two things most human beings would choose above all – the trouble is, humans do have a knack of choosing precisely those things which are worst for them.'[243]

---

[242] Rowling, *PS*, 157.
[243] Rowling, *PS*, 215.

This is perhaps Dumbledore's most illuminating remark about himself, showing in all its extent the selflessness that he has reached and also seeks in Harry. Dumbledore points out that the young take time for granted; he has himself adapted to the thought of mortality and the limitations of time, and enjoys his life as it is. It is impossible to detect any strive for personal significance or solitariness: Dumbledore does not desire political power, but turns down the post of the Minister of Magic when he is proposed to it; he does not aspire for greatness in hierarchy but accepts the demand of de-individualisation inherent in the rhizome. Even his position at Hogwarts serves the same end: although being the Headmaster, Dumbledore wears funny hats and bright colours, participates in the Christmas celebrations, gives unintelligible speeches – in other words, is not afraid to look ridiculous or odd in the eyes of others. Spending his life at Hogwarts also means living in conditions close to those of a monastery: as all the teachers, Dumbledore is unmarried with no family or romantic or sexual relationships. Despite these restrictions on desires concerning personal life, he is content to be a Professor at Hogwarts and returns there every time he is banished for one reason or another.

As Dumbledore's example shows, wisdom is dependent on the acceptance of the insignificance of the self and the fact of mortality. He has gained a vast knowledge of every aspect of life and given up desires attaching him to the material world where complexities abound and tie people to constricting ideas about the necessity of self-serving, which permits him to enjoy pleasures at their simplest: warm socks, jokes or sweets.

Dumbledore has spent his life creating a strong, wide, healthy network of rhizomes, better known as the Order of the Phoenix, which would protect the wizarding world from falling into the clutches of Lord Voldemort with its unanimity. He is the only wizard Voldemort has ever feared and thus the unofficial leader in the struggle

against him. Dumbledore has a wide amount of ancient but timeless wisdom that he chooses to use for the benefit of the society he wants to preserve; it does not seem he has a strong personal identity outside the community but is perhaps the perfectly de-individualised individual. His personal desire includes that of raising Harry to be strong and wise enough to defeat Voldemort, and even that aims indirectly at saving the wizardkind.

In this objective Dumbledore tries to pass on his knowledge and wisdom to Harry, who unfortunately yet remains too much the prisoner of his own prejudices and subjective opinions that he could make truly objective perceptions – he does seem to show some understanding at times, but after Dumbledore's death in the sixth novel there is no telling how, or indeed if, Harry will survive. It is after all Dumbledore who summarises the lesson in every novel of the series so far to Harry. When he is gone Harry will be forced to take the initiative and make the best with what he has got. His desire and identity have already been bent towards defeating Lord Voldemort and he has got the rhizome built especially for that purpose to back him up – both results of Dumbledore's more or less implicit effect. What Harry has got in common with Professor Dumbledore is the desire to work for the good of the wizarding society, which Dumbledore unobtrusively tests already in *The Philosopher's Stone*. It is remarkable how Dumbledore is himself the living epitome of choosing what he is, in addition to keeping his personal desires deeply linked to that of the general benefit of the society. Everything about him suggests a wise, well-adjusted person who has been able to put his desires into perspective and thus to enjoy serving only the community, the rhizome.

11. Conclusions

In this thesis I have attempted to assimilate the different theories concerning desire by on one hand the psychoanalysts Freud and Lacan and on the other hand by the poststructuralists Deleuze and Guattari. My main idea was to prove the latter theory of desire more applicable to the *Harry Potter* series, but in the end it was evident that Deleuze and Guattari alone could not explain every aspect of desire that the novels contained. They do give a more suitable account of social desire and its effects on groups formed of de-individualised members, that is, rhizomes, which I have also used in context with separate individuals, but I soon realised that their theory is too abstract to be employed as such. I have taken some shortcuts especially as regards Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of desire and desiring-machines by applying them to individual persons and things as their subjects and objects, which Deleuze and Guattari specifically condemn in their writings, but I feel this slightly more traditional approach has been essential in the attempt for an adequate description of the development in different characters' inner and outer lives and personal traits. Many seemingly different desires in the novels repeat the same underlying current, which may be called the flow of desire; as I have earlier remarked, this often has to do with social motivations and aspirations.

I have also used the theories selectively, choosing applicable parts to highlight certain points I have deemed important in connection to the central plot and leaving other parts completely between the leaves of the books. Perhaps the most important and used contradiction in my thesis has been the one between the Oedipus complex and its critique – it is to be seen throughout the series that especially the main character Harry Potter's whole existence revolves around and centres on his dead parents and later the wizarding community that in a way comes to represent them for him. It is of course debatable whether I have entirely misused the complex and multi-faceted philosophy,

rather than theoretical structure, of Deleuze and Guattari's, as their disciples would undoubtedly think; however, it seems to me that their rabid attack on Oedipus and the consequent fireworks of multiplicity and non-individuality comes all the closer to the classical, ironically received Freudian argument of using denial as defence than they would like to admit. Even though I have found many uses for their concepts, maybe there is some truth in Ronald Bogue's opinion:

> It is at the level of critical theory rather than practical criticism, I would argue, that Deleuze and Guattari have the most to offer students of literature. […] Their treatment of minor languages and literatures suggests intriguing, if problematic, possibilities for exploring the interrelationship of social and artistic marginality and evaluating the political implications of literary modernism and postmodernism.[244]

A so far scarcely treated question arises from the general view on all the desires presented: is it good or beneficial in the long run to achieve the heart's desire? The *Harry Potter* series does not give an explicit answer but tactically brings out many details that appear to discourage the aspiration to strive for a goal of an irrational, even irrelevant desire. This tactics is the most pronounced as regards Professor Dumbledore, who is almost completely detached from personal desires or at least keeps them tightly under control. It is of course remarkable that not many of the characters are able to conquer their desires – throughout the novels it is to be seen that even the more healthy-appearing desires enchain and restrict personal life. The matter is exceedingly simple concerning the more materialistic and selfish desires such as those of the Dursleys': there is quite a gap between their race for riches and Dumbledore's woollen socks, the former being obviously the one receiving heavy critique in both the description of the desirers and their conquest. However, even Harry's understandable desire for parental love leads him first into delirium and then nightmares; Sirius is ready to lose his life over a desire without a second thought; ambition and desire intertwine together blurring

---

[244] Bogue, 162–163.

the borders between civilised behaviour and brutality, humanity and calculation.

There is no strict moral separating "good" desires from "bad" ones although there are sides for the "good" and the "evil" as in every fantasy story – even though not every character is clearly confinable in either compartment. Most desires are more or less thwarted one way or another, not depending on the intentions or aims of the desirer. Nevertheless it seems that social desires are more accepted if they aspire towards a greater good, as is the case in *The Philosopher's Stone* and *The Chamber of Secrets* – it is interesting though that Ron and Hermione reach their social desires that could be labelled as selfish even though generally harmless. The reason is likely that in straining towards them, their main attempt is for the benefit of the society. It could be argued that after the same principle, Harry receives his parents as memories in a photo album as a prize for forfeiting his individual (not to mention unhealthy) desire and turning it over for the preservation of his society. In his hopes of overcoming Voldemort, Harry's principal aim is to free the wizarding community from a selfish tyrant whose desire is not directed towards the communal well-being but seeking personal advantage.

There is also desire on the grey area of morality, such as that of the ambitious characters in the novels. They claim to and often do make sincere attempts to shield their community from the fatal effect of Voldemort's party, without succeeding however – either because of complete ignorance or pure arrogance. It is strongly hinted that as long as Harry retains his anxious desire for personal revenge and fails to put his own special strength into use for the whole society little by little, he will not be able to defeat Voldemort. It is no surprise that this suggestion is always made by Dumbledore:

> 'Harry, suffering like this proves you are still a man! This pain is part of being human –'
> 'THEN – I – DON'T – WANT – TO – BE – HUMAN!' […] 'I DON'T CARE!'

'You do care,' said Dumbledore. […][245]

'I haven't any powers he hasn't got, I couldn't fight the way he did tonight, I can't possess people or – or kill them –' […]
'It is the power held within that room that you possess in such quantities and which Voldemort has not at all. That power took you to save Sirius tonight. That power also saved you from possession by Voldemort, because he could not bear to reside in a body so full of the force he detests. In the end, it mattered not that you could not close your mind. It was your heart that saved you.'[246]

Harry's special ability goes far beyond Voldemort's because the latter is not able to handle it in any way; he does neither understand nor tolerate it, which gives Harry the upper hand even though he is not on the same level with Voldemort in magical skills. Individual suffering makes way for a vaster experience of solidarity in Harry, a superior level of thought that enables him to redirect his individual desire for the sake of his society. In a sense both Freud and Deleuze and Guattari lose the battle over Harry's identity or the lack of it, the former because Harry comes to terms with his parents by spreading the feeling for them to include the whole wizarding community, the latters because it is clear Harry does this inspired by Dumbledore's continuous encouraging and cleverly profited insight into his deepest emotions, which he suddenly recognises:

'[D]espite your privileged insight into Voldemort's world […] you have never been seduced by the Dark Arts, never, even for a second, shown the slightest desire to become one of Voldemort's followers!'
'Of course I haven't!' said Harry indignantly. 'He killed my mum and dad!'
'You are protected, in short, by your ability to love!' said Dumbledore loudly. 'The only protection that can possibly work against the lure of power like Voldemort's! In spite of all the temptation you have endured, all the suffering, you remain pure of heart, just as pure as you were at the age of eleven, when you stared into a mirror that reflected your heart's desire, and it showed you only the way to thwart Lord Voldemort, and not immortality or riches. Harry, have you any idea how few wizards could have seen what you saw in that mirror?' […]
He [Harry] thought of his mother, his father and Sirius. He thought of

---

[245] Rowling, *OotP*, 726.
[246] Rowling, *OotP*, 743.

> Cedric Diggory. He thought of all the terrible deeds he knew Lord
> Voldemort had done. A flame seemed to leap inside his chest, searing his
> throat.
> 'I'd want him finished,' said Harry quietly. 'And I'd want to do it.' […]
> It was, he [Harry] thought, the difference between being dragged into the
> arena with to face a battle to the death and walking into the arena with
> your head held high.[247]

Desire for social unity takes many forms and conclusions. Deleuze and Guattari's concept of rhizomes has been extremely utilisable in this discussion, and has lent itself to several contexts. The first beginning of a rhizome is to be seen in Harry's and his father's relationship in *The Prisoner of Azkaban*, but a much more important basic rhizome throughout the series is the one formed by Harry, Ron and Hermione. Where most[248] might and do see an inseparable circle of three friends quite ordinary for a boarding school setting, there is an invisible system of roots and rhizomes between these three units. The difference is that even though they outwardly seem different, at times even discordant, there is a deep inward connection and identicalness to their thoughts that guides their actions. Later, this rhizome expands towards the vaster social environment of the Order of the Phoenix and the resistance minded part of the community. I have earlier dealt with the infiltrated organisation of Voldemort and the Death Eaters so suffice it to point out once again how a selfish desire can pollute a much wider social network, even in an attempt to create a unified, single-minded society. This, however, can be argued to be the result of confusing a hierarchical system of authority, popular in psychoanalysis, with a rhizome.

During the progress of this thesis I also began to think about a possibility of joining at least some of the competing views in regard to identity. It does not seem rational to reduce an individual's identity to the level of a social rhizome alone; instead, I thought of intertwining them. As already established by McCallum and Erikson, a

---

[247] Rowling, *HBP*, 477–479.
[248] Zipes and Killinger, for example; see also above, 2.

person's identity develops closely in connection to society, which lends it naturally as part of a rhizome, in case of a suitable one being at hand and available. After all, Deleuze and Guattari do not take much into account the special nature of an individual identity, and somewhat depreciatively reduce it to an irrelevant feature. I do not feel their abstract approach entirely as rich as it could be with a little more concretising, so I would suggest a merge between the rhizome and individual identities. This slightly extended view of identity will not shut out the idea of multiplicity; it is after all distinctly demonstrated through the various doubles and doppelgangers in several of the novels that the sense of individuality might easily be at least partially an illusion. Thus it could be considered that each individual possesses an identity, but unlike in most theories, it is not stable after a certain stage or crisis in life, but a flexible, varying one that keeps changing and moulding according to the impact of the society and less of the individual. I would rather not, however, include Freud's and Lacan's theories of the development of identity in this mix; they seem to be old-fashioned in their rigid assumptions of the overpowering effect of the nuclear family. Instead, in conclusion I would again prefer to emphasise the intimate intertwining of the concepts of desire and identity that I originally set out to study, in Professor Dumbledore's words: "'It is our choices, Harry, that show what we truly are, far more than our abilities.'"[249] Modified as I would rather understand it in the light of my schema, a desire to identify as a righteous and unified part of a rhizome may conduct actions, and in this instance, constitute the "we" of Dumbledore's advice.

---

[249] Rowling, *CoS*, 245.

Works Cited

Rowling, J. K. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury, 1997.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. London: Bloomsbury, 1998.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. London: Bloomsbury, 1999.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. London: Bloomsbury, 2000.

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

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

Felluga, Dino. "Introduction on Psychoanalysis." *Introductory Guide to Critical Theory*.
        28th Nov 2003.

<http://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/theory/psychoanalysis/freudmainframe.html

>,<http://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/theory/psychoanalysis/lacanstructure.html

>, <http://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/theory/psychoanalysis/lacandesire.html>

Oxford University Press. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 7th ed. 9th Oct 2006.
        <http://www.oup.com/oald-bin/web_getald7index1a.pl>

Morris, Robert Michael John. "The Function and Etymology of Proper Nouns in the
        Work of J.K. Rowling." 19th Oct 2006.
        <http://theshitefantastic.net/fallen-angel/factual/harrypotter.pdf>

Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia. 19th Oct 2006.
        <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lord_Voldemort#Name_and_anagram>

Acocella, Joan. "Under the Spell: Harry Potter Explained." *The New Yorker* 31st Jul
        2000: 74–78.

Deavel, Catherine Jack and David Paul Deavel. "Character, Choice, and Harry Potter."
        Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture 5.4 (2002): 49–64.

Pennington, John. "From Elfland to Hogwarts, or the Aesthetic Trouble with Harry
Potter." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 26.1 (2002): 78–97.

Abanes, Richard. *Harry Potter and the Bible. The Menace behind the Magick*. Camp
Hill: Christian Publishing-Horizon Books, 2001.

Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze and Guattari*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Bradford, Clare. "Possessed by the Beast: Subjectivity and Agency in *Pictures in the
Dark* and *Foxspell*." *Mystery in Children's Literature: From the Rational to
the Supernatural*. Ed. Adrienne E. Gavin and Christopher Routledge. New
York: Palgrave, 2001.

Bridger, Francis. *A Charmed Life. The Spirituality of Potterworld*. New York:
Doubleday-Image Books, 2002.

Chetwynd, Tom. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. London: Paladin, 1982.

Colbert, David. *The Magical Worlds of Harry Potter. A Treasury of Myths, Legends and
Fascinating Facts*. London: Penguin Books, 2001.

Collins Cobuild English Dictionary. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995.

Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology. Ed. Raymond J. Corsini and Alan J. Auerbach.
New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1996, 1998.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans.
Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. London: The Athlone Press,
1984.

----------. *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi.
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

de Vries, Ad. *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery*. Amsterdam: North-Holland
Publishing Company, 1974.

Erikson, Erik H. *Identity. Youth and Crisis*. London: Faber and Faber, 1968.

Foucault, Michel. Preface to Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus.*
Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen
R. Lane. London: The Athlone Press, 1984.

Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. Trans. James Strachey. Ed.
by James Strachey and Angela Richards. London: Penguin Books, 1973/1991.

Furth, Hans G. *Knowledge As Desire. An Essay on Freud and Piaget*. New York:
Columbia University Press, 1987.

Girard, René. *Deceit, Desire and the Novel. Self and Other in Literary Structure.* Trans.
Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961.

Goodchild, Philip. *Deleuze and Guattari. An Introduction to the Politics of Desire.*
London: Sage Publications, 1996.

Goodheart, Eugene. *Desire and Its Discontents*. New York: Columbia University Press,
1991.

Grosz, Elizabeth A. *Jacques Lacan. A Feminist Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Gupta, Suman. *Re-reading Harry Potter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Heilman, Elizabeth E. "Blue Wizards and Pink Witches. Representations of Gender
Identity and Power." *Harry Potter's World. Multidisciplinary Critical*
Perspectives. Ed. Elizabeth E. Heilman. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Jackson, Rosemary. *Fantasy. The Literature of Subversion*. London: Routledge, 1981.

Killinger, John. *God, the Devil, and Harry Potter. A Christian Minister's Defence of the*
Beloved Novels. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2002.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in
Psychoanalytic Experience." *Écrits. A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan.
London: Tavistock Publications, 1966/1977.

Massumi, Brian. Foreword to Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Capitalism and Schizophrenia. A Thousand Plateaus.* Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

McCallum, Robyn. *Ideologies of Identity in Adolescent Fiction. The Dialogic Construction of Subjectivity.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1999.

Melchior-Bonnet, Sabine. *Kuvastin. Peilin historiaa.* Suom. Pia Koskinen-Launonen. Jyväskylä: Atena, 2004.

Miller, Karl. *Doubles. Studies in Literary History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Neal, Connie. *What's a Christian to Do with Harry Potter?* Colorado Springs: WaterBook Press, 2001.

Seem, Mark. Introduction to Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. London: The Athlone Press, 1984.

Smith, Karen Manners. "Harry Potter's Schooldays. J. K. Rowling and the British Boarding School Novel." *Reading Harry Potter. Critical Essays.* Ed. Giselle Liza Anatol. Westport: Praeger, 2003.

The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter. Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon. Ed. Lana Whited. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2002.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic. A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre.* Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Williams, Linda Ruth. *Critical Desire. Psychoanalysis and the Literary Subject.* London: Edward Arnold, 1995.

Wolfreys, Julian. *Critical Keywords in Literary and Cultural Theory.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.