

The Why Story

Who is the potter, pray, and who the pot?

—Edward Fitzgerald

Ugly Duckling It Ain't

In 'The Goblin and the Huckster' Hans Christian Andersen tells a tale of books and business. A rotund goblin resides with a family of traders, who ply him with delicious plates of porridge in return for unspecified domestic services. The family also plays host to a poverty-stricken student, who rents a draughty garret and, when he can afford it, procures food, candles and similar supplies from the hucksters' store.

One bitter winter's evening, the student buys a few scraps of cheese for his supper. Lacking proper wrapping paper, the huckster places his purchase on the page of an old book that he'd accepted in part-payment from a previous customer. The student glances at the page, is instantly transfixed by the writing, and offers to buy the remnants of the book. But without the necessary wherewithal, he is forced to give up his supper in return for the scrap volume.

Amazed by this turn of events, particularly the thought of sacrificing good food for a broken-backed book, the goblin sneaks up to the garret that night. He peeks through the keyhole and sees a wondrous sight:

Out of the book shot a clear beam, expanding into a thick stem, and into a mighty tree, which grew upward and spread its branches far over the student. Each leaf was fresh, and very blossom was a beautiful girl's head, some with dark sparkling eyes, others with wonderfully clear blue orbs; every fruit was a gleaming star, and there was the glorious sound of song in the student's room.¹

Stunned by what he'd witnessed, the goblin returns night after night. He listens to the music, looks on in awe and shivers on the draughty landing while plates of porridge grow cold in the kitchen.

One night, a conflagration breaks out and, as anyone would do in such circumstances, the goblin rushes to save his most precious possession. He seizes the book, makes his escape and comes to realise that his true love lies with learning. It is better to be well read than well fed.

Luckily, the fire is extinguished. The goblin starts thinking rationally again and decides, on reflection, that he can't follow his bookish dream. He likes his creature comforts too much. 'I can't quite give up the huckster, because of the porridge!'

The Sake of the Porridge

For many sceptics, Harry Potter is the huckster's goblin of 21st century children's literature. Whatever merit the early books had – truly, they were tales of wonderment

– has been sacrificed on the altar of hype, hoopla and meretricious marketing. As we have seen, however, this argument doesn't really hold water. Harry Potter is no more a product of capitalism's spin machine than it is an infernal manifestation of the Devil himself, as many of the Bible-belted brigade seem to believe. Mephistopheles and Marketing, are just too convenient as explanations, either separately or in combination.

However, this doesn't mean that Harry Potter owes nothing to marketing or that there aren't any attendant commercial pressures. On the contrary, the boy wizard has been thoroughly marketed, expertly marketed, brilliantly marketed. Bloomsbury has won several awards for its marketing acumen – from the *Financial Times* and *Marketing Business*, among others – and they are richly deserved. The commercial pressures, furthermore, are there for all to see. The three-year gap between *Goblet* and *Phoenix* may have been due to writer's block, or Stouffer's legal action, or Rowling's family circumstances, or any number of other possibilities. But logistics also played a part. The movies had to be given time to 'catch up' with the books, since the consumer appeal of the franchise is sure to diminish somewhat when the seventh volume is finally published.² From a marketing perspective, the delay between books four and five makes eminent sense, notwithstanding the possible loss of a few teenage aficionados who outgrow their Potter fixation. Indeed, it is arguable that this hiatus is the very moment when a run-away phenomenon became a proper brand, where control, co-ordination and careful handling are paramount considerations.

Commercial matters undoubtedly affect the timing and extent of HP operations, but they aren't the root cause of them. The phenomenon can't be attributed to astute brand management. There's something else at work beside hucksters and goblins. There's no shortage of hypotheses, furthermore, as to what that something might be. The stupendous scale of Rowling's writerly triumph – the fact that consumers from countless different cultures, social classes, demographic categories and so on are reading the stories, embracing the characters and contributing to the conversation – has given rise to many and varied explanations of Pottermania. I'll confine my comments to the top ten hypotheses.

Hypothesis HP 1: Rattling Good Read

The simplest explanation of the Harry Potter phenomenon is that they are good books, well written. They are better than good books, in fact. They are superlative works of literature. They are imaginative, engrossing, intriguing, surprising, captivating, moving, exciting et cetera. Certainly, that's the view expressed by HP devotees. A survey by Shu-Yu Chou shows that readers simply can't get enough of Hogwarts. The sheer creativity of the stories (words like 'imaginative', 'fantastic' and 'magical' recur repeatedly in her research), the heart-warming story behind the stories (i.e. Rowling's rags to riches fairy tale) and the parable of empowerment that they represent (if an orphaned, maltreated adolescent can make it...) resonate very strongly with readers of all genders, ages and ethnicities.³ As we noted in the previous chapter, even those whose hearts are set against Harry can't help falling under his compelling spell.

I myself subscribe to this viewpoint. Although, as a marketer, I'm hardly qualified to comment on literary matters, I read incessantly and can honestly say that certain passages in the books are beyond good. They are sublime. When Neville Longbottom is awarded ten extra house points in *Philosopher's* and, at the very end of *Goblet*, when Dumbledore turns to Harry and says, 'You have shown bravery beyond everything I could have expected of you', I not only felt shivers down my spine but was yanked back to my most emotional childhood reading experiences, such as the death of Umslopogaas in Rider Haggard's *Allan Quatermain*.⁴ I may be an emotional cripple, probably am. However, there are millions and millions just like me.

Adolescent atavism aside, the argument that Rowling's stories are well written – end of story – doesn't really stack up. Meritorious though they are, her books aren't uniquely meritorious. There are many other storytellers of equal merit and many much better, according to leading kid-lit authorities. We know from personal experience that the *most* brilliantly creative artists, naturally gifted athletes, supremely talented musicians and hard-working entrepreneurs often fail to shine, fulfil their potential or get their just reward. Conversely, we can all think of mediocrities that make it big, against all odds and expectations. Is Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code* really the most worthwhile novel of 2004? And, if so, is it really ten times better than its nearest rival, as sales figures suggest? Hardly.

Hypothesis HP 2: Postmodern Potter

When consumers are asked to step outside their personal reading bubble and account for Harry Potter's staggering success, they typically ascribe his popularity to two factors: 'escapism' and 'something for everyone'. Such responses should be treated with a degree of caution, since consumers may simply be parroting what others have said in newspaper articles, on television shows or while chatting among friends. There's a massive water-cooler component to the HP phenomenon. Personal opinions, accordingly, tend to get diluted and distilled. The consensus, nevertheless, is that the appeal of Rowling's writing boils down to escapism and something-for-everything. Harry Potter offers readers a wonderful parallel world – immediately adjacent to today's not-so-wonderful world – where steam trains depart from Platform 9¾, welcoming taverns sell foaming mugs of butterbeer, broomsticks circumvent the daily commute and inanimate objects do as they're bid. The books provide excitement, mystery, goodies, baddies, friendship, rivalry, bathroom humour, political satire, unforgettable characters, desperate situations and surprising twists in the tail. What's not to like?

In this regard, Harry Potter fits neatly into the notion of postmodern culture. Postmodernism is characterised by the blurring of formerly sacrosanct distinctions between high art and low, science and religion, politics and entertainment, youth and age.⁵ It is typified, moreover, by a pick 'n' mix propensity, where established artistic styles – architectural, musical, televisual, theatrical, etc. – are combined in new and unusual, often ironic or self-mocking, ways. Above all, postmodernism is associated with *hyperreality*, the creation of places, spaces and settings that are more real than reality itself. Theme parks, mega-shopping malls, Las Vegas casinos and first-person-shooter computer games are all held up as exemplars of postmodern hyperspace. The

world of Hogwarts, Hedwig, Hagrid, Hufflepuff, Honeydukes, Hermione and Harry is hyperreality writ large.

Truth to tell, things don't come much more postmodern than Harry Potter.⁶ Unfortunately, postmodernists don't subscribe to conventional notions of truth, proof and explanation. Hence, PoMo can't be considered an acceptable explanation of its own apotheosis. We have to look elsewhere.

Hypothesis HP 3: Dumb and Dumbledore

The blurring of boundaries between high brow and low goes by another name besides postmodernism. It's also known, rather more pejoratively, as dumbing down.⁷ Evidence of this reprehensible condition, according to the guardians of western culture, is all around and growing ever more evident: declining literacy rates, exam grade inflation, the politics of spin and soundbite, the lionisation of cretinous sports stars, the abominations of reality television, the worship of worthless celebrities, the art of unmade beds and pickled sharks, the metamorphosis of museums into shopping malls and, cue stricken expressions, the internet campaign to nominate Jo Rowling for a Nobel Prize. The barbarians are not only at the gate, but wearing commemorative T-shirts and buying tie-in merchandise.

It is easy to be dismissive of the dumbing down doom mongers. The idea that the world is going to hell in a hand-basket has been around since the invention of the wheel, if not beforehand.⁸ From Seneca to Spengler, from St John's Apocalypse to Henry and Brook Adams, from Thomas Muntzer to Meinhard Miegel, Germany's current gloom seller, it seems that the end is always nigh, nearly nigh, as good as nigh. Nigh nigh, no less.

There is, nonetheless, substantial evidence of consumer infantilisation, whereby adults are becoming increasingly childlike in their behaviour, attitudes, opinions etc, and children are becoming more adult more quickly. Much printer's ink has been spilled on 'tweenagers', 'kidults', 'middle youth', 'age compression', KGOY (kids getting older younger) and all manner of newfangled neologisms. Harry Potter is emblematic of this regressive propensity, since he is loved by adults and children equally. If anything, adults are even more entranced by the boy wizard than their Xbox-besotted offspring. Harry Potter, for Harold Bloom, William Safire, A.H. Pennington, Howard Jacobson and the rest of today's lamenting literati, is the nadir of dumbing down, the absolute zero of infantilisation.

Regardless of the evidence for this argument, it hardly qualifies as an *explanation* of Harry Potter. As our brand warrior is posited as both a cause and effect of infantilised dumbing down, the circular reasoning of high culture's spokespersons is evident. It also presupposes that infantilisation is a VERY BAD THING. But, as Pat Kane cogently argues in *The Play Ethic*, a childlike outlook is more appropriate to the demands of today's entertainment economy than the Calvinist work ethic that underpinned the extractive economy of yesteryear.⁹ Play pays. The *Nuts* Economy needs nutters. The Generation Gap has been replaced by The Gap Generation.

Hypothesis HP 4: Fizzing Whizbees

The doom and Bloom merchants are as one in their dumbing down diagnosis. The bibliobonic plague is among us. Bring out your dead, dude. But what does the infection agent think of it? What does the lassa fever of literature have to say for herself?

J.K. Rowling has been understandably reluctant to analyse the HP phenomenon, if only because of creative artists' belief that it doesn't pay to explore one's imaginative headwaters too closely. Analysis paralysis and all that. She has, however, hypothesised that the books' success is due to consumer buzz, word of mouth, good old-fashioned recommendations from friends. Interestingly, this is the explanation preferred by marketing professionals, though in light of Rowling's innate marketing acumen, this shouldn't really surprise us. Whereas many non-marketers regard Harry Potter as a marketing-driven phenomenon, within the industry it is regarded as an exemplar of marketing authenticity, a grass-roots occurrence that began with schoolyard chatter, generated consumer enthusiasm and burgeoned rapidly from there. It is a paradigm of New Age marketing, the kind of marketing that doesn't rely on big budget advertising campaigns, money-no-object sales promotions and generally ramming stuff down consumers' throats in the harder than hard sell tradition. As brand authority Matt Haig recently observed: Harry Potter is 'one of the greatest examples of word-of-mouth marketing ever'.¹⁰

So popular is this chatter strategy explanation that it has become something of an industry truism. It is a parable, complete with moral, of the brand new, socially responsible world of anti-marketing marketing. However, careful examination of Harry Potter, *The Early Years*, reveals that matters are rather more complex. Chamber of Secrets was published in June 1997 and *within a month* the US rights had been sold to Scholastic for an unprecedented six-figure sum. It was the sale of the rights that triggered the buzz, not schoolyard chatter, since there wasn't sufficient time for playground Potter patter to start the Rowling ball rolling, especially as only 500 copies of the book had been printed. The initial groundswell is as attributable to media interest in the rights sale – to say nothing of the Fourth Estate's discovery of Rowling's 'fairy story' – as it is to mad-keen kids boasting about the boy wizard to their friends. This doesn't mean that schoolyard buzz had nothing to do with Harry's remarkable ascent. It just means that there's more to it than word-of-mouth.

Hypothesis HP 5: In Medias Res

The relationship between medium and message is something that exercises numerous academics, especially those 'tenured radicals' who read Karl Marx in their formative years and still consider his 1867 comments on commodity fetishism to be the cutting edge of critical thinking on consumer society. Marx's labour theory of value may have gone west, and he may have been outed as a marketing man *avant la lettre*, but the first chapter of *Capital* remains the last word in certain crenellated turrets of the ivory tower.

Harry Potter, for many contemporary critical theorists – aptly described by Tom Wolfe as "bitter old Marxist academics with wire hair sprouting out of their ears"¹¹ –

is a media conspiracy. The books' success has nothing to do with literary merit, or escapism or something for everyone, or dumbing down or consumer enthusiasm. It's part of a plot hatched by power crazed media czars, the false consciousness-inculcating, bread and circuses-disbursing, multi-mediated, synergy-seeking, cross-platformed potentates, who control our lives, determine our fates and keep us under constant surveillance. Rupert Murdoch, Michael Eisner, Barry Diller, Jerry Levin, Sumner Redstone, Michael Bloomberg, Ted Turner, Arthur Sulzberger. They're all in it together and Harry Potter is their stalking horse:

When Warner Brothers' studios makes an investment, as it did by purchasing the movie rights for *Harry Potter*, it can then turn to its sister companies within the same organisation to help ensure the movie's profitability. They can make a short story run in the widely respected periodical *Time* magazine describing the "phenomenon" of Harry Potter and how children in the United Kingdom are wildly enthusiastic about the books. Then, AOL's CNN news subsidiary begins making headlines about the "phenomenon." Shortly after the "phenomenon" makes headlines, Pottermania is scheduled for a special interest segment in primetime news on CNN and also on CNN Classroom, bringing the "phenomenon" directly to children in schools. Perhaps AOL's *People* magazine concurrently runs a biography of J.K. Rowling. *Fortune* and *Money* magazines could also be called on for support as they are all controlled by the same megacorporation, AOL Time Warner. Once the "phenomenon" takes root, AOL Time Warner has vast advertising capabilities within its own reach. Commercial advertising begins on its own TBS Superstation, TNT, and The Cartoon Network. In all, AOL Time Warner boasts access in one form or another to over 100 million US households. It creates and then supports the phenomenon of Pottermania.¹²

Harry, Harry, Harry. You should be ashamed of yourself. Detention is called for. Write 100 lines, 'I must not sell my soul to Lord Viacom'. And learn the following by heart: 'Hi diddle-de-de, Karl Marx's the man for me'.

Hypothesis HP 6: King of the World

Actually, I'm being very unfair to my colleagues in the liberal arts. There's no doubt that the HP phenomenon owes much to media convergence. Granted, this doesn't explain why the boy wizard is the principal beneficiary rather than any of the other able authors on Bloomsbury's children's list, but it helps account for the rapidity of Potter's advance. That said, he owes just as much to the Internet. It is surely no accident that Pottermania coincided with the casting of the net. According to Borah, one of Harry's earliest and most ardent fans was the son of an AOL executive, who persuaded his father to establish a dedicated discussion group on the portal.¹³ As AOL was the ISP that did much to domesticate cyberspace, in the United States at least, the boy wizard was a web wizard from the outset. America, remember, accounts for 55% of total HP sales. It's the fat boy in the canoe, as Dean Rusk famously put it.

Harry's global reach is partly attributable to the weaving of the world wide web. However, it is also due to his quintessential Englishness. Global culture, despite frequent predictions to the contrary, is not especially homogenised. The goods that sell best globally are often profoundly local, stereotypically national. Coca Cola exudes American-ness, as do Marlboro, McDonald's and Disney. Audi extrudes German engineering, Gucci models Italian style, Nokia communicates Finland, Sony transmits Japan, Guinness bottles Ireland, Ikea is Sweden in a flat-pack. Ness-ness sells and Harry Potter sells English-ness. All the qualities associated with England in the abstract – stoicism, bravery, fair play, determination, good humour, irreverence,

etc. – are embodied in the boy wizard. The great British bulldog may be neutered and muzzled, but it hasn't forgotten how to wag its tale. As Alison Lurie points out in the *New York Review of Books*, J.K. Rowling is part of a great British tradition of fantasy novelists: Lewis Carroll, J.M. Barrie, E.E. Nesbit, C.S. Lewis, J.R.R. Tolkien, Philip Pullman and many more.¹⁴ Tradition is not to be sneezed at.

Hypothesis HP 7: Yo, Retro

Tradition underpins yet another explanation of the Harry Potter phenomenon, one predicated on nostalgia. Or, to be more precise, retro. The merest glance across the contemporary cultural landscape reveals that we are living in retrospective times.¹⁵ Retro motors like the VW Beetle or P.T. Cruiser sit outside our mock-Tudor or neo-geo-Georgian houses, which boast faux-Victorian or Utility-chic kitchens, are furnished with replica Eames recliners or Barcelona chairs, come complete with reproduction knick-knacks purchased from Past Times or Restoration Hardware, and are equipped with retro Roberts radios or Art Deco television sets, on which we watch *I Love 1970* or *Fawlty Towers* reruns before going out to our Friendsreunited reunion followed by a 1980s-night disco in a First World War theme pub that's also hosting a meeting of the Sealed Knot Society. In the almost-Edwardian annex.

Harry Potter is part and parcel of this retroquake. The books are brand new old-fashioned fairy tales. They are full of ye olde touches, from ancient steam trains to venerable educational institutions lit by candles, heated by log fires, kitted out with four poster beds and all the accoutrements associated with traditional boarding schools of the Tom Brown, Billy Bunter, St. Trinian's archetype. Beastly teachers, boring lessons, jolly japes, interfering minions, midnight feasts, fusty uniforms, house allegiances, personal loyalties, sporting heroics, examination pressures, sumptuous tuck shops, Hardy Boys escapades and on-going battles between good and evil, are all present and correct.

Yet for all their reliance on the *Bildungsroman* tradition, the Harry Potter books are bang up to date. The stories are firmly set in the present day. Harry's godparents not only live in suburban splendour, but take pride in parading their keep-up-with-the-Joneses possessions. Dudley Dursley, Harry's obnoxious stepbrother, is surrounded by the detritus of 21st century consumer culture, everything from abandoned model aircraft to broken colour televisions. When he's not bullying Harry, what's more, he spends most of his time scoffing junk food and playing Mega Mutilation II on his spanking new computer console. Hogwarts school itself is fashionably co-educational, gratifyingly multi-ethnic, scrupulously non-denominational and makes special provision for disadvantaged students. Its pupils suffer from the torments of 21st century adolescence – acne, awkwardness, libidinal urges, occasional outbreaks of teenage idealism and a sophomoric sense of gross-out humour. Indeed, the very patois they employ is totally *au courant*. 'Totally', 'cool', 'supercool', 'bummer', 'wotcher', 'toerag', 'mazing', 'he knows, man', 'what are you on about?', and the Estuary English equivalent of Valley-speak,¹⁶ 'tell me about it', are all part of the Hogwarts argot. Like really.

Hypothesis HP 8: Zeitgeist Follies

Retro, for many people, is a defining feature of our millennial epoch. People look back during transitions from one century to the next, in eras of rapid technological or political change, and at fateful demographic moments, such as the onset of middle age. For Baby Boomers and the Greatest Generation, Harry Potter represents a throwback to more innocent times when the world was slower, simpler, sunnier, stress-less, and reading was the pre-eminent pastime of the masses.

Viewed from this angle, Harry Potter is a monument to the *zeitgeist*, the retrotastic temper of our tumultuous age. There's more to our epoch than retro, however, and the Harry Potter phenomenon has been explained in many zeitgeistian ways, all equally plausible.¹⁷ Is Harry, for example, a reflection of humankind's need for heroes in our singularly unheroic times? Is he a fable for our fissiparous world, where axes of equal oppose coalitions of the willing, hostages to fortune pay with their innocent lives, and weapons of mass destruction apparate and disapparate at 45-minutes notice? Is he a commentary on the state of Tony Blair's Britain where old customs, practices and encrusted privileges are being swept away by the New Labour broomstick and Cool Britannics generally? Are the books emblematic of EC enlargement, football hooliganism, teenage angst, social exclusion, the bureaucratisation of education or, as the UK-US 'translation' controversy implies, American imperialism? Are they, at bottom, a critique of western capitalism, a reflexive reflection on the very processes of globalisation, commodification and hyperconsumption that Harry Potter exemplifies?

As is evident, the problem with zeitgeistian explanations, retro included, is that they are vague at best and waffle at worst. Just about every occurrence on the social, political, cultural or economic stage can be pressed into service, depending on the personal predilections of the commentator concerned. It hardly explains Potter's popularity in countries as diverse as Australia and Azerbaijan, Brazil and Bulgaria, or China and Croatia, unless of course there's some kind of overarching, planet-encompassing *zeitgeist*. Besides branding, naturally.

Hypothesis HP 9: Boffins Ho!

Lazy hazy explanations of the zeitgeistian stripe are obviously inadequate. An injection of scientific rigour is required. After thousands of double-blind experiments on carefully screened samples in secret laboratories controlled by the executors of Robert Ludlum's estate, the white-coated wonders have reported their findings. As have their colleagues in Laboratoires Fredrick Forsythe, Andy McNab, Michael Crichton and William Gibson. Sadly, there is no scientific consensus on the causes of the apprentice wizard's popularity.

For some, Harry Potter is a statistical outlier, a manifestation of "critical mass", where the law of large numbers takes over and power law probability distributions hold sway. For others, Harry Potter is an example of "emergence", a side-effect of our increasingly networked world where one thing leads to another, some things suddenly erupt out of nowhere and promptly scoop the pool. For yet others, Harry Potter is a meme, a literary version of Richard Dawkins' gene-like, self-replicating socio-cultural fragments, such as pop songs, hair styles or advertising slogans, that spread

rapidly throughout society and drive everyone to distraction. For yet others, Harry Potter is a monument to the 'wisdom of crowds', the fact that the many are smarter than the few, that the collective intelligence of crowds of people – millions of JKR readers – is greater than that of any single individual. Even Harold Bloom. For yet others, Harry Potter typifies Malcolm Gladwell's much-discussed Tipping Point thesis (an intellectual meme if ever there was one) which maintains that there is a moment of inflection, when a trend or idea or epidemic or product makes the leap from minority interest to majority concern.¹⁸

For the psychologically inclined, furthermore, Harry Potter is a literary form of 'hysterical contagion', sudden, almost inexplicable outbreaks of quasi-phantom clinical conditions like chronic fatigue syndrome, Gulf War syndrome, recovered memory syndrome, multiple personality syndrome or *koro*, a particularly frightening affliction that affects young men in south-east Asia and India (don't ask, impressionable adolescents might be reading this book).¹⁹

Koro's an eye-watering condition, no question, but the basic shortcoming of Harry Potter and most other scientific explanations of the phenomenon is that they don't account for the apprentice wizard. They help us understand the spread and world-wide uptake of Rowling's creation, but don't explain why her books, and only her books, were plucked from obscurity so dramatically, so suddenly, so stupendously.

Hypothesis HP 10: All of the Above

Stuff and nonsense, I say. You don't actually believe any of the above, do you? Take it from me, Harry Potter's success has nothing to do with good writing or kidult culture or retro marketing or complexity theory or, for Fawkes sake, postmodernism. It is simply a matter of competitive strategy. Namely, doing what your opponents don't do. They zig, you zag. They dodge, you weave. They trade up, you cut prices. They stretch the brand, you prune your portfolio. They reduce the salesforce, you increase and incentivise yours. They stampede in one direction, you gallop in the other. Hi ho, Silver.

In the mid-1990s, before the boy wonder burst on to the scene, kid-lit was a backwater.²⁰ Books were short, realist tales ruled the roost and the very notion of a boarding school story was so unfashionable that it made flared trousers look cool. Cue Harry Potter. Rowling's was a very long book, comparatively speaking. It eschewed social realism for enchantment and witchcraft. And it reinvented the boarding school story just as flares were, miraculously, coming back into fashion. Ka-ching! Rowling in it, or what?

Okay, okay, there's more to it than that. Can I interest you in a combination theory, containing all of the above? Harry Potter is a well-written story that is a perfect postmodern melange of genres, appeals to our infantilised inclinations, inspires readers to talk it up, affronts anti-capitalism and mass media-haters (which is always good for aspiring global businesses), taps into the spirit of our retrotastic, technophobic, terrorist-traumatised epoch and triggers a tipping pointed, power law

laden cultural chemical reaction of some kind, as luck would have it. Easy when you know how.

No, don't thank me, it's a gift.

References

1. Hans Christian Andersen, 'The Goblin and the Huckster', *The Complete Fairy Tales* (Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 1997, p. 459).
2. By its very nature Hollywood can't crank things out as quickly as creative writers, not even the most niggardly. The scribbling hare is thus shackled to a particularly slow-moving tortoise – a crippled tortoise with chronic fatigue syndrome, dragging an anchor of ancillaries – and this poses unavoidable logistical problems.
3. Shu-Yu Chou, *The Role of Character Merchandising in Brand Extensions: A Case Study of Harry Potter Phenomenon* (de Montfort University: unpublished Masters dissertation, 2002).
4. I think he died in *Allan Quatermain*. It might have been *Nada the Lily*. I can't quite recall and, in order to preserve my rose-tinted memories, I'd prefer not to check.
5. Stephen Brown, *Postmodern Marketing* (London: Routledge, 1995).
6. Philip Nel, *J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Novels: A Reader's Guide* (New York: Continuum, 2002).
7. See for example: Ivo Mosley (ed), *Dumbing Down: Culture, Politics and the Mass Media* (Thorverton: Imprint Academic, 2000); Katharine Washburn and John Thornton (eds), *Dumbing Down: Essays on the Strip-Mining of American Culture* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1996).
8. Oliver Bennett, *Cultural Pessimism: Narratives of Decline in the Postmodern World* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2001).
9. Pat Kane, *The Play Ethic: A Manifesto for a Different Way of Living* (London: Macmillan, 2004).
10. Matt Haig, *Brand Royalty* (London: Kogan Page, 2004, p. 55).
11. Tom Wolfe, *Hooking Up* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2000, p. 3).
12. Tammy Turner-Vorbeck, 'Pottermania: Good, Clean Fun or Cultural Hegemony?' in Elizabeth E. Heilman (ed), *Harry Potter's World: Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives* (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003, pp. 17-18).
13. Rebecca Sutherland Borah, 'Apprentice Wizards Welcome: Fan Communities and the Culture of Harry Potter', in Lana A. Whited (ed), *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter* (Columbia: Missouri University Press, 2002, pp. 343-364).
14. Alison Lurie, *Boys and Girls Forever: Reflections on Children's Classics* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2003).
15. Stephen Brown, *Marketing – The Retro Revolution* (London: Sage, 2001).
16. Thames Valley speak, so to speak.
17. Andrew Blake, *The Irresistible Rise of Harry Potter* (London: Verso, 2002).
18. Philip Ball, *Critical Mass* (London: Heinemann, 2004); Duncan J. Watts, *Six Degrees: The Science of a Connected Age* (London: Heinemann, 2003); Richard Brodie, *Virus of the Mind: The New Science*

of the Meme (Seattle: Integral Press, 1996); James Surowiecki, *The Wisdom of Crowds* (London: Little, Brown, 2004); Malcolm Gladwell, *The Tipping Point* (London: Little, Brown, 2000).

19. Antonio Melechi, *Fugitive Minds: On Madness, Sleep and Other Twilight Afflictions* (London: Arrow, 2004).

20. Connie Ann Kirk, *J.K. Rowling: A Biography* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood, 2003).