

An Analysis of Harry Potter

A messy essay by Sophia Gregoire

I didn't know what I was gonna do for my final product, except for just having 7 fully annotated Harry Potter books. Each page has at least 10 marks or annotations, the average would be 20 marks or notes and the most I have is long rants that take up the entirety of the margins.

It's hard to summarize all I've learned from detecting every single word in the series, but I'll list some of my favorites/the most prominent ones:

- the inconsistency and inflation in the wizarding currency.

The amount that a Galleon or a Sickle or a Knut is worth in the wizarding world changes in every single book. For instance, in the second book, the Weasleys only have a singular Galleon in their vault. This same year the family has to buy 5 entire sets of Gilderoy Lockhart's entire collection, the collection is supposed to be very expensive, and a Galleon is the highest form of English wizarding currency. The Weasleys have one Galleon in their bank vault, they have to buy five sets of books, four after Harry gets a collection for free and gives it to Ginny. A wand, in the first book, costs seven Galleons, and then in the second book, after establishing that a wand costs seven Galleons, Ginny needs to buy a wand, but the Weasleys only have one singular Galleon in their entire vault. We don't know how much books cost in the wizarding world, in any of the books, but we know that none of the Weasleys should be able to have all those books and Ginny's wand unless there was a considerable amount of inflation. And in the fifth book, though he's rich, Harry throws his entire money bag, which we know has a great deal more than a singular Galleon, into the magical fountain in the Ministry of Magic without a second thought

Then there is the consideration of the conversion between the three levels of wizarding currency. There are seventeen Sickles in a Galleon, and twenty-nine Knuts in a Sickle, meaning there are 493 Knuts in a Galleon. Wizards are supposedly able to do this math without a second thought, even though wizards don't go to elementary or primary school and never get to learn math and science. It's unclear where they learn any basic education unless it's from their parents, who are presumably at work, but even if they did learn the basics, that would not set them up to get or give exact change or even round up or anything most people need to do with money. And if they can do that kind of advanced math, why do they have such an issue with understanding muggle money? If they can understand how to convert three Galleons into

Sickles or five Galleons into Knuts, why can't they read the numbers on muggle money? Their confusion, if they understand the basic math, can only be attributed to one thing, prejudice, and racism.

- Prejudice and racism in the wizarding world, and how it is all very problematic.

The majority of wizards, even Half-blood wizards, have trouble using/understanding/comprehending Muggle technology. Not technology in the sense of iPhones and computers, but in day-to-day things. This would be more understandable if wizards were completely separated from Muggles, and had a very different lifestyle than them, but they don't, the majority of them use muggle technology every day or have Muggle items or appliances in their own homes. In the fourth book, carpets are defined as a class two Muggle artifact, and while we aren't exposed to any class numbered Muggle artifacts again throughout the series, it goes to show how wizards take for granted their use of muggle artifacts. Hogwarts has a plumbing system and toilets, muggle inventions. Number Twelve Grimmauld Place has a troll leg umbrella stand, umbrellas, and umbrella stands are Muggle creations. Grimmauld Place is known to have inhabited the Black family for many years. This family is notoriously racist and evil, they are known to hate Muggles and all things used or created by them, and yet they exploit Muggle inventions and technology. Many wizards laugh at Muggle inventions, even if they aren't inherently racist, they still see themselves as greater than Muggles, and it cements itself in the books in clear and uncomfortable ways.

In the fifth book, a witch called Hestia Jones, a member of the Order of the Phoenix, an anti-Voldemort organization, finds a potato peeler in one of the drawers in Harry's kitchen. Harry described her laughing at it. While this isn't an act of violence or aggression towards any Muggles, she is still laughing at and making fun of a Muggle device that is used in replace of magic. Small acts like these, where wizards feel a certain superiority over Muggles, are still very problematic, even if they don't hate Muggles or want to murder them. A lot of characters in the books, who are supposed to be great and loveable characters, tend to have these same micro-aggressions towards Muggles, the two most prominent characters to come to mind are Molly Weasley and Rubeus Hagrid. In the first book, Hagrid is the one who picks Harry up from his aunt and uncle's house and takes him to Diagon Ally. Harry's aunt and uncle are not good people, they are abusive and terrible to Harry, however, what Hagrid does in this scene is not okay. He uses the word "Muggle" as an insult, implying that if you don't have magic you are less than and deserve to be insulted in such ways. He says things like "A great Muggle like you isn't gonna stop me" and "They're about the biggest muggles out there" he then also tries to turn Harry's cousin into a pig, which is illegal in so many ways I don't know how he ever got away with it. Molly Weasley on the other hand, is less aggressive and insulting and more scathing, she looks down upon Muggles as less than, just like Hagrid, but she doesn't

treat them any differently. Molly's husband, Arthur, is known to be fascinated with Muggle items and artifacts, and he likes to study how Muggles create and use them. Molly does not like that he does this. She thinks that it's a waste of time and he is better and smarter than this. She often looks down on Muggle practices and inventions as something not good enough for her, a waste of time. Again, this is not blatant racism, but it does show a bias that most wizards say they don't have, it shows that as much as they don't think Muggles should be persecuted or executed, they still don't think they're as "worthy" as Wizards. Then comes the common use of the word "Mudblood" which is supposed to be the most offensive slur that can be used towards Muggleborn Witches and Wizards. It is supposed to be seen as the Wizard N-Word but it's used so often, that either the author doesn't understand the severity of what she created with the word or that the characters aren't as Muggle-loving and supportive as they say they are. Characters like Ron, Ginny, Harry, Hagrid, and more all say the word, never as an insult directed at anybody, but they still say it. They'll say "Don't call Hermione Mudblood " and they should be defending their friend, but they should not be saying one of the most offensive words known to wizards. It's not for them to say.

Mudblood is meant to say dirty blood because if a Witch or Wizard is born from a Muggle, their blood isn't pure wizard, it's dirty with the stain of Muggle blood. There are three possible wizard blood types, Pure-blood Half-blood and Muggleborn. And each of these is supposed to represent a different race we have in today's society and culture. Pure-blooded wizards are supposed to represent white people, Half-bloods were written to represent mixed people, and Muggleborns are supposed to represent black people. In terms of what they represent race-wise, J.K Rowling did not write one in, but that will be mentioned in a moment. Death eaters are supposed to represent white supremacists and Nazis as the majority of them are Pure-Bloods who hate muggles and Muggleborns. Voldemort, the leader of the Death eaters, is supposed to represent Hitler, he is a half-blood with pure blood ideals, supposed to represent how Hitler only liked people with blue eyes and blond hair while he had neither. An issue that comes out of this though, is circumstantial in the way in which Jo wrote it. If Pure-bloods are white and Muggleborns are black and Death eaters are Nazis, who are the Jews? Jo never wrote any, or never intentionally wrote any. While there is no group of magical beings that were intended to represent Jewish people, the Harry Potter Goblins were written with an insurmountable amount of Jewish stereotypes. This goes more into the Anti-Semitism of the Author more so than the discrimination written in the books, but her thoughts and ideas are represented in the ways that she writes and implement themselves into the story, even if it is unintentional. Jo wrote the goblins as having big noses, being obsessed with money, and running/controlling the banks, all of which are Jewish stereotypes. Continuing to focus on the author's prejudice rather than prejudice that is written into the Harry Potter universe, the character Cho Chang is

can be used as an explicit example of Jo's xenophobia. First off, the name Cho Chang. Cho's name is derived from two Korean surnames, Cho and Chang. This is already a problem, an overuse of stereotypical Asian names to let the readers know that this character is Asian. Maybe Jo could get away with this if Cho was written to be Korean, but JK Rowling explicitly said that Cho Chang is Chinese. And even if Jo wanted to convey Cho's racial identity through her name, she could've named Cho 'Jennifer' and have that effect. Then there are the Asian stereotypes attributed to Cho's character, like how she is in the 'smart house' and how she fits the racist standard that Asian women or girls are weak, fragile, and virtuous. Also, one of the only black characters in the series, has the last name Shackbolt. Shackles were used to bind and transport enslaved Africans throughout history, and one of the very few black characters in her books has it in his name.

There are many other examples of Joannes racism written into her writing, but instead, I want to bring it back to intentional discrimination in Wizarding World. I've written about Wizards vs Muggles/Muggleborns being a Nazi allegory or an allegory for racism, but Muggle's view on Wizards is written entirely differently.

While Wizarding ideas and treatment of Muggles replicate racism, Non-Magic people's views on Wizards replicate homophobia. Not all Muggles have this view of Wizards, but the most prominent muggles in the book, Harry's aunt and uncle, Petunia, and Vernon Dursley, do have this view of wizards. When Harry's parents died, Dumbledore sent Harry to live with his last remaining relatives, who hate everything to do with Magic. They described Harry and his parents as strange and abnormal, things homophobes say in reference to people in the LGBTQ+ community. They also abusive him because he is different, and he was bullied in primary school for being different, as many queer children are. The biggest reason I see the Dursleys' views of Wizards as a mirror to Homophobia is that they wanted to "squash the magic out of him" as many people use the same terminology trying to turn their LGBTQ+ children straight. Queer kids often face the same abuse that Harry faces, in which their parents will use force or verbal abuse in attempts to try and "un-gay" their kids.

- LGBTQ+ themes, homophobia, and transphobia.

In terms of magical comparisons, JK Rowling didn't just do this with the wizard race, but magical ailments as well. The Prisoner of Azkaban is when werewolves are properly introduced into the Harry Potter series, they were mentioned in previous books but in reference to threats and with no accuracy in the things said about them. What we know about werewolves is that they are looked down upon in the wizarding world and its communities. They are seen as dirty and dangerous to "normal wizards" if

somebody wanted to insult a werewolf they would probably call them a "half-breed" People who suffer from lycanthropy (being a werewolf) are very rarely given jobs in the wizarding world, people are afraid of them as well as look down on them. Wizards also call people who suffer from lycanthropy werewolves, even though the actual werewolf only shows itself twelve times in a year, Wizards use the condition to define the people who suffer from it, unable to separate the wolf from the person. Officials in the Ministry of Magic actively fight against werewolf rights, keeping them from work and isolating them further from the wizarding world. This was all written to be a magical comparison to HIV or AIDS, you catch it from someone (a predator as many people see/saw gay people) it's incurable, and when people suffer from Lycanthropy, they are isolated and distanced from the magical world because they're seen as dirty. JK Rowling wrote this connection, admitting that it was indeed a magical mirror for AIDS, and then got upset when Harry Potter readers starting saying that Remus Lupin, the character she created specifically to imitate someone with HIV/AIDS was gay.

JK Rowling has a habit of creating characters with stories that reflect queer trauma and then denying the fact that the characters, are themselves, queer. Continuing on with Remus Lupin, the majority of the Harry Potter fans believe that he was in a romantic relationship with Sirius Black, whose childhood could also be compared, in sorts, to queer trauma. To describe the two's interaction, she would use words like 'embrace', which after closely examining all the books, is only used in a less platonic sense. In the fifth book, when Harry travels back in Snape's memory, one of the first things that appears in the memory is Sirius, and how he is described to look at lupin. In the memory, a very pretty girl was sitting next to him, staring at him and trying to catch his attention. Jo writes that he is not interested and then moves on the say that the person Sirius was looking at was Remus. Its the use of transitions and easy implications that leads to fans thinking the characters are in a gay relationship. Earlier in the same book, the author implies that the two are living together in Grimmauld place, Sirius' childhood home. She again slips in words and hints that bait the queer readers into thinking that they get some representation. In the fifth book, we learn that there are only so many bedrooms in the house, and after doing the math and taking into account the relationships within the people staying there, that Black and Lupin share a bedroom. After coming to this conclusion in the Order of the Phoenix, the next time Sirius' bedroom is brought up is in the seventh book. Harry is looking around the bedroom in Grimmauld place early in the morning, and the room is described to the reader. There is no mention of a second bed, and since the day Sirius died, he left the house in an instant, Harry found the room the way Sirius had left it. Queer coding/queer bating in Harry Potter is strange in the fact that she creates scenarios that profit off of characters with queer trauma and putting them in relationships that could very easily be seen as romantic, and then gets angry at the mention of any of those characters possibly being gay. It's not that she keeps the idea open-ended and ominous, she flat

out denies it. It's unclear whether the queer aspects of these relationships were intentional or not, because some can be induced from the intent of the writing, and other assumed queer relationships can come from plot holes in the story, that could only be filled in if some of the characters were queer. This may seem confusing, but I will give my primary example.

The first queer coded relationship that comes to mind in this case, is the one presumed between Harry Potter and Cedric Diggory. Most fans do not think that Harry and Cedric had a romantic relationship, but what they do believe is that Harry was in love with, or crushing on, Cedric. There are many reasons for people thinking this, the first one being the way Harry talks/thinks about Cedric, every single time Diggory is brought up in the fourth book, Harry is always sure to comment on the boy's handsome appearance. Harry also is a lot more forgiving towards Cedric than he is with other people, Cedric beat Harry in a game of quidditch in the third book, catching the snitch before Harry. Fred and George and the majority of Gryffindor house, resent Cedric for winning that game, but Harry never says a word against Cedric, helping him in the triwizard tournament. He doesn't say a word against Cedric until he asks out Cho Chang. Once Cedric is taken he is immediately prone to draw away from Cedric, talking about how stupid he is, insulting him, and saying Cho only likes him because he's handsome. Harry also had a crush on Cho Chang at this time, but that's the thing about someone being queer, they can like multiple people of different genders. I'm not saying Harry didn't like Cho, but I am saying that his feelings for Cedric were the same as his feelings for Cho, if not more so. This leads to my second piece of evidence, Thestrals. The Thestrals are what bring the plot holes into play for this potential queer romance to be believable. Thestrals are a sort of magical, reptilian, horse that wizards can only see if they've watched someone die. Some people believe it could be anyone dying, but others believe it has to be someone you love that dies in front of you. It is only said a couple times in the books that in order to see thestrals, you need to watch someone die, and love is never specified, however... Within the first chapter of the first book, we learn that James and Lily Potter have died, and Lily died from using herself as a shield for her son. Harry watched her die but didn't see the thestrals when he first came to Hogwarts. This can be explained away by the fact that Harry was an infant when his mother was killed in front of him, so he was too young to comprehend what happened. Later on in the first book, however, Harry watches Professor Quirrel die in front of him, yet he does not see the thestrals. Some people argue that it's because Harry passed out before he saw the actual death, and that is why he cannot see the thestrals; but that is up for debate as the moment when the professor dies is not explicitly said in the book. In the second book Harry watches the embodied memory of Tom Riddle die, again it can be argued that it wasn't a real death because he was only half alive, but in the books, it is literally described by Harry as a death. And then, of course, the third death that Harry is forced to witness is Cedric's. But due to JK Rowling's lack of

preparation, Harry doesn't see the thestrals at the end of the fifth book. My explanation for that is that mentally, Harry was still processing what happened when he went back to the Hogwarts Express in the carriages. When he returns to the school in the fifth book, after a summer of living inside his brain and watching Cedric die on repeat. He was able to see the thestrals then. All the other characters in the fifth book, who could see the thestrals, had seen a loved one die. Luna saw her mother die in front of her when she was ten, Neville and the unnamed Slytherin boy saw their grandfathers die, and Hagrid saw his own father die. Putting the deaths together and the circumstances, it would make more sense for the sake of the story for Harry to have loved Cedric. You could also argue that Ginny, Ron, and Hermione couldn't see the thestrals until they saw Sirius die, and they didn't love Sirius. But Ron and Hermione were almost as close with Sirius as Harry was, and Ginny had gotten to know him well after living with him for months, you could argue that they did all in fact, love him.

There are more "ships" in Harry Potter, that have substantial reasons as to why it would make sense with the way that they're written for them to be or had been a couple. But some of the couples that JK Rowling created, in the form to reject the LGBTQ+ community's want for representation, made zero sense, in the terms of the characters she had pre. Bringing back Remus Lupin, in response to the LGBTQ+ readers saying that Lupin and Sirius were in a relationship, Jo killed off Sirius and placed Lupin in a relationship with Sirius' cousin to retaliate and prove that Remus is not, in fact, queer. Sirius' cousin, Nymphadora Tonks, was another character that a lot of queer readers identified, and through that they imagined her to be queer. I counted the amount of interactions that Lupin and Tonks have in the fifth Harry Potter book, the book where she supposedly fell in love with him, and he her; they only interacted a total of seven times. Half of those times they didn't even talk to each other, they were just doing a task together. There was no chemistry between the two of them, and the only reason they were even put together at all, was because of a homophobic response to queer fans wanting representation.

Tonks, was a character a lot of nonbinary and trans people connected with, as she could literally change her appearance into anything she wants at will. Loki, in the Marvel universe, can do the same thing, and in the new Loki tv show, was confirmed to identify as gender fluid. JK Rowling, however, is notoriously transphobic. She actively supports anti-trans organizations, so even if she unintentionally wrote a trans or gender fluid or nonbinary character, she wouldn't admit to it and do everything in her power to disprove Tonx's queerness.

There aren't many characters in the series that trans people identify with, but there are characters with traits similar to trans stereotypes and are vilified. Rita Skeeter is a character that Jo uses as a vassal for her transphobia. Rita Skeeter is a woman described to have a man-ish face. She is also known for lying to

draw more attention to her stories, a trait commonly applied to trans people by transphobes, saying that they're just doing it for attention. Rita Skeeter isn't exactly predatory towards Harry, but her treatment towards him is far from acceptable. She describes her close relationship with him to others, talking about their nonexistent deep bond. She would also pull him into tight corners to interview him or ask him uncomfortably personal questions. She also flirted with both Harry and Cedric, this is all relevant because she's feeding into the stigma that trans women are predatory. I don't think Joanne meant to transcode Rita, but she did, and she used microaggressions to associate women with masculine features as people who are predatory and malevolent.

After the series was fully published, Jo was being called out for racism and homophobia (and more) in the books, because of the lack of representation in her books. In response to that, she said in a tweet that Dumbledore was gay, to show that her characters could be gay, and she was not homophobic. Never, throughout the entire series, is Dumbledore ever suggested to be gay or have any intentional or unintentional queer coding in his character. She had so many characters that had traits or trauma that mirrored those of the LGBTQ+ community, but she chose Dumbledore, after the books had come out, to be gay. And then, when she had the opportunity to show him being gay, as she had said that he and Grindelwald were in love, in *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*, she did no such thing. The only hint in the two movies that could've lead to them being lovers was "we were closer than brothers," and if that's what qualifies two characters as queer, then Lupin and Sirius were definitely so. Even though she had not given Dumbledore an outlet to express his sexuality in the Harry Potter books, she had the opportunity to do so in the *Fantastic Beasts* movies, but she did not. This shows that she only said that Dumbledore was gay to get representation points, without actually providing queer representation.

- Albus Dumbledore being a hero when he is actually a terrible person

Albus Dumbledore used to be one of my favorite characters when I was a kid, I thought he was the coolest. Now looking back on the books, annotating and knowing everything, it's easy to tell that Dumbledore is not the quirky old man JK Rowling likes to pretend he is. This has less to do with the overarching themes of the book, but more so my personal complaints about the character and how horribly he treats Harry and countless others.

In his youth, Dumbledore's little sister was raped and attacked by muggle boys when she was just eight years old. This source of trauma caused his sister, Arianna, to repress her magic creating a dark and uncontrollable magical parasite inside of her. What Arianna turned into is called an Obscurial, a young Wizard or Witch who tries to repress their magic and creates something inside of them called an

Obscurus. The Obscurial will transform into an Obscurus at either random moments or moments of intense feelings like agitation or anger. Young Albus Dumbledore was forced to watch the Obscurus destroy his sister, causing her to have to be locked inside during the daytime so that if there was an accident involving the parasite, it wouldn't cause havoc on the streets. In his summer after graduation from Hogwarts, his mother was accidentally killed in one of Arianna's outbursts, leaving Dumbledore to take care of his little sister instead of traveling the world with his friends. The responsibility of taking care of his sister, amongst other things, caused him to believe in the supremacy of the Wizard race. He was being forced to stop the pursuit of his dreams because of his sister's outbursts and the danger they caused, and he was introduced to Gellert Grindelwald at the same time, who was his lover but also the most profound dark wizard in all of Europe until Voldemort came to power. Together, Dumbledore and Grindelwald put together a plan for Wizards to come into power over Muggles so that Wizards did not have to fear Muggle persecution. Dumbledore spent three months of his youth planning the magical overtaking of the world, mostly for his own self-benefit, because the only reason he was sparked to believe in Wizard supremacy was that he had to deal with the 'burden' of his little sister. And it was only when it directly affected him, again, that he stopped pushing forward that Wizards were greater than Muggles, and Wizarding control was for the greater good of the world. Albus was preparing to leave with Grindelwald, to spread their message throughout Europe; it was his plan to take his sister with him, despite her fragile state and her being prone to violent uncontrollable outbursts of destructive magic. Albus' brother, Aberforth, stepped in to confront his brother. Grindelwald got involved too and before he knew it there was a duel and Grindelwald was torturing Albus' brother. The bangs and the Magic are what drew Arianna out of the house to try and help, but then she was being tortured and so was Aberforth and spells were being thrown everywhere, and somebody hit Arianna with a killing curse, and that was when Dumbledore stopped believing in Wizard Supremacy, because he had to find out the hard way the damage a mindset like that can cause.

Dumbledore shows that he's prone to act selfishly at a very young age, and that doesn't stop throughout the rest of his life. While Dumbledore is not a 'bad guy' he is still a bad guy, in the sense that he has done good things but it doesn't make him a good person; not in the slightest. Dumbledore became headmaster of Hogwarts in 1964, when Voldemort was already turning more evil by the day. In light of this ever-growing power, Dumbledore utilized his relationships with people who owed him favors, bringing them into an anti-Voldemort defense league that would eventually cost them their lives. He spent his time at Hogwarts picking his favorites and training them for war, plucking them out of school and encouraging them to join the Order of the Phoenix. A lot of them did too, because Dumbledore was incredibly powerful and manipulative, allowing himself to come across as a martyr. He recruited James, Sirius, Lily,

Marlene, Dorcas, Peter, Remus, and more to join his army the moment they left school. He trained them to fight for him since they were eleven years old, and he continued doing this throughout the years, building confidence and providing favors that would be traded for lives. Lily and James Potter both died when they were twenty-one years old, that is just barely an adult in America, still barely an adult in England, even wizard England. They were just kids and they, among the majority of the Order, died as a part of Dumbledore's child army. James and Lily died because of a prophecy about Voldemort that was given to Dumbledore and overheard by Severus Snape.

Snape was a lifelong racist, who very similar to Dumbledore, only changed his side in the war when it personally affected him. When a girl who he'd been obsessed with since his childhood was in danger. In return for Lily to be kept alive, Snape was ready to let James and Harry die. And Snape didn't even change his beliefs as Dumbledore did, he changed his side but still stayed as racist and bigoted as ever. And Dumbledore used this man as his personal spy, as Peter was Voldemort's. Snape was one of Voldemort's right-hand men, he definitely knew that Peter was a spy, but said nothing about it to Dumbledore, or if he did, then Dumbledore did nothing about it. Dumbledore also knew that Sirius would never betray James and Lily, but did nothing to stop Sirius from going to prison, unlike how he kept Snape out of prison when Snape was literally a terrorist and killed a lot of people. If Dumbledore was such a genius would've put two and two together and figured out Peter was a spy if Snape had not already told him, or figured out he was a spy even after the fact. Because once Lily and James were dead, he jumped straight into a new plan of manipulation. He knew Harry was a Horcrux the minute Lily died for him, and he knew that meant that one day Harry would need to be murdered by Voldemort.

Dumbledore spent years setting up Harry to feel vulnerable and alone, making sure he had nobody and everybody that he did have, died. Dumbledore sent Harry to live with the Dursleys, knowing full well how horribly they were going to treat him. Even if he didn't he sat by for ten years as Harry was abused both physically and verbally, and had never experienced a happy day in his life. He brought Harry to Hogwarts, the first place Harry ever saw as his home, and treated him with mass amounts of favoritism. He did this to make Harry think he owed him something, when Dumbledore was the one who'd placed him in the abusive home in the first place. When Harry was let into the Wizarding world, he was giving no memories of his family. The Potters were excessively rich, they owned multiple properties and many other estates, but Harry never got to see any evidence of any of them. Even the pictures of his parents were given to him all by other people because Dumbledore was doing his best to make Harry feel sad and out of place. Because of Dumbledore, Harry didn't know what his parents looked like until he was eleven years old. And, when Harry was eleven, Dumbledore willingly let a giant three-headed dog live in his school full of underqualified magical children, as well as Voldemort on the back of a teacher's head, all

for the point of allowing Harry to prove himself. He continued doing this throughout the books, in the second book it somehow got past him that the monster in the school was a basilisk, even though three twelve-year-olds were able to figure it out over the course of two or three months, and he had now dealt with this monster twice in his career. Notice how again, it was Harry who saved Ginny from Voldemort, Harry and his friends doing all the work for the 'smartest and greatest wizard the world had ever seen'. Themes like this continue throughout the books, Dumbledore allowing Harry and his friends, as well as every other student that attends Hogwarts, to be in mortal danger every year. He also continues digging into Harry, he could've prevented many deaths if he'd wanted to, Sirius' especially, but he didn't because Sirius was one of the few things tying Harry to life. And bringing back the theme of selfish acts, Dumbledore could have protected all the people in the order who died, but he didn't. He was fine with the Dementors haunting the grounds, but not if they were near him because then he would have to be reminded of his past selfish acts, and by doing this for the sake of himself he's preventing the memory of one selfish act create another.

Dumbledore was abusive and manipulative and he knows it. He apologized to Harry for it at the train station after Voldemort performed the killing curse on Harry. Harry didn't believe Dumbledore had done anything wrong, no matter how much he apologized, because that's how good he was. He manipulated everyone and everything to work in his own way. And yes, Voldemort was defeated in the end due to Dumbledore's scheming, but at what cost?

- Plot holes and my conclusion

JK Rowling left many plot holes in her books, some of them can be overlooked, filled with assumptions or inferences that could fit into the story, but some, don't fit with the story at all. This final paragraph will be a lot less formal, and will merely list some of the larger plot holes in the books, and then will end with my final feelings and my conclusion

1. The twenty-four-hour time gap in the time that it took to get baby Harry from Godric's Hollow to Privet Drive.
2. Hagrid's use of magic and how it affects the Trace
3. How wizards know basic math/English when they don't believe in muggle practices or studies
4. Casual racism, death threats, and bullying at Hogwarts
5. How Snape got away with bullying and abusing children for years
6. Student schedules
7. The fact that Hogwarts always starts on September First and it's always a Monday

8. Dumbledore's ignorance
9. Teachers ignorance
10. Hogwarts' horrible education system
11. Lack of Democracy in the government (no elections)
12. Joanne forgetting other grades exist besides Harry's and each of the grades should be studying different things
13. Student count/students per house in a grade
14. Quidditch games and when they take place
15. The time turner
16. The fidelius charm
17. Holidays and religions
18. Harry's blatant obliviousness

and more.

I could talk about so many more issues with the books and the author and the writing. I could talk about Joanne's horrible misogyny portrayed in her female protagonists, or how she made Umbridge get raped by a herd of angry centaurs, I could go on about that for hours, but for this essay, I wrote about more things that I'd noticed in this re-reading of the series, and even since I was younger I was able to recognize JK Rowling's internal hatred for femininity.

This project made me certain that there are probably very few people who know more about the series than I do, and I think I not only improved my knowledge of the books but also my ability to annotate or notice deeper hidden themes in writing. Doing this has taught me what to do and what not to do in my own writing, mostly from the mistakes made by JK Rowling, but some of the more beautiful aspects of her writing as well.

Harry Potter is still my favorite series, I know it better than almost everything else. I do not think that they are good, or well written in terms of story development, character development and representation, but I do think that they are a childhood classic and that everyone should read them. It also says something about a person's growth and maturity to see their opinions change as they begin to understand the issues with the books more and more.

This project is something that I've wanted to do for a very long time, and I'm happy I finally got to do it. Even more so that I get some form of credit for it.

