

# ETHICAL DILEMMA OF OFFENSIVE MAGIC IN HARRY POTTER AND THE DEADLY HOLLOWES

IFTINAN ROSE PUTRI SAFANA  
Universita Gadjah Mada

First received: February 18, 2025  
Final proof received: April 15, 2025

\*Corresponding Author: [iftinanroseputrisafana@mail.ugm.ac.id](mailto:iftinanroseputrisafana@mail.ugm.ac.id)

## Abstract

In Rowling's Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows, the employment of unforgivable curses and other offensive magic creates ethical dilemma in the context of combat and self-defense. This shows that there is a tension between ideal ethical principles and real needs in self-defense efforts which also often occurs in the real world where considerations often experience a dilemma between punishment and human rights. This study seeks to examine the moral judgment regarding the use of magic from the perspectives of Deontology and Utilitarianism, as well as its impact on the moral decisions of the main characters. This study employs qualitative methodologies and a textual analysis methodology, the theories of Deontology, which examines morality based on universal obligations and principles, and Utilitarianism, which assesses morality based on the impact and benefits for a large number of people. According to the findings, the Deontological perspective views Harry, Molly Weasley, Hermione, and Snape's usage of unforgivable curses and offensive magic as a moral deviance, regardless of the good intentions or advantages. Utilitarianism, on the other hand, defends these behaviors since they benefit the greater number of people. This ethical dilemma highlights the conflict between the moral need to not injure others and the need to defend oneself in battle situations. Furthermore, this research also identified Deontological exception which considering the alternative tool to reach goodness and Utilitarian Objection which considering long term effect.

Keywords: Individuation, Jungian Archetype, Leadership, Transformation, The Lion King

## INTRODUCTION

The Harry Potter series written by J.K. Rowling presents the fantasy life of a hidden magical world that also has its own culture, traditions and social (Zivile & Dovile, 2023). In the magical world, magic is used for various things, including self-defense and attacking opponents. Furthermore, this series tells the story of an orphan named Harry James Potter who

discovers his identity as a wizard and attends Hogwarts. In the course of the story, love, friendship, the battle between good and evil, are shown which makes it suitable for reading by anyone at any time (Coy, 2025; Metla, Devi, & Yu, 2024). Furthermore, the peak of the Harry Potter story is the outbreak of the magical war between evil and good which is told in the book Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows (Los,

2008). These events emphasize the values of mortality, sacrifice, acceptance, courage, loyalty, and the victory of good over evil (Hennequin, 2013).

In this war situation, magicians use defensive and offensive magic. Defensive magic is a spell used to protect and ward off danger (Augé, 2020; Tlusty, 2019). This type of spell is usually used by Harry Potter and members of the Order of the Phoenix, for example the *Protego* spell which is used to create a protective shield and *Expelliarmus* which is used to disarm an opponent. Meanwhile, offensive magic is a spell that is aggressive and cast to torture and defeat an opponent (Harari, 2017; Wade, 2016). This type of spell is usually used by Voldemort and the Death Eater members. An example is the *Avada Kedavra* spell which is used to kill. Furthermore, the use of defensive and offensive magic raises ethical dilemmas. Although the moral boundaries between the two seem clear, these boundaries become blurred when soldiers, in this context magicians, are faced with the need for self-defense and protection of others from potential harm that may be caused by the spells used (Schulzke, 2013). Individual values regarding this matter lead to a complicated ethical landscape regarding the use of magic. For example, Harry Potter prioritizes non-lethal spells; thus, using disarming spells more often even when facing Voldemort (Metla & Devi, 2024). Besides, Molly Weasley used offensive magic to kill Bellatrix Lestrange to protect her daughter (O'Brian, 2020). This situation might be justified by considerations of gaining a greater good (Sinclair, 2014). Similar situations also often occur in the real world, for example in efforts to fight terrorists (Caron, 2023).

This dilemmatic phenomenon can be studied more deeply using two normative ethical perspectives, namely Deontology and Utilitarianism. Deontology, according

to Immanuel Kant, is a normative ethics that assesses things based on compliance with rules, responsibilities and obligations (JA & Rodríguez-Peña, 2019; Arneson, 2018; Schmidt, 2014). This ethics views that the rightness or wrongness of an action is regardless of the consequences. In other words, actions are judged based on their alignment with established rules and responsibilities, not on what results from the action (Kearns, 2017). For example, if someone is placed in a situation where he has to save innocent people by killing them, then according to Deontological ethics this action cannot be justified and that person should not kill innocent people regardless of the consequences (Rawling, 2023). On the other hand, Utilitarianism ethics, according to Jeremy Bentham, assesses an action based on its consequences, namely the extent to which an action has an impact on human goodness and welfare (Rahman & Maulana, 2023). To put it another way, The main principle of Utilitarianism morally justifies an action based on the greatest impact for the greatest number (Remy, 2016) because achieving the intended results serves as the foundation for determining the morality of an activity since it is independent of the nature of the action itself (Ozolins, 2015). Furthermore, Studies show that utilitarian judgments in personal moral dilemmas are influenced by greater emotional salience and cognitive demands. This implies that the emotional burden that is the direct cause of loss can hinder utilitarian decision making (Kusev, Van Schaik, Alzahrani, Lonigro, Purser, 2016). For example, in the previous example, utilitarianism would justify killing innocent people if it would actually have a better impact (Rawling, 2023). Based on the explanation above, the case of using magic in the second paragraph can be justified or not.

Apart from that, an in-depth analysis of the ethical dilemmas in the use of magic is an interesting study, because it has relevance to real life cases. For example, the events of the formation of Dumbledore's Army and the Order of the Phoenix, and the resistance to corrupt ministries and Voldemort's oppressive regime can be compared to the tactics of World War II and the US Civil Rights fight for justice which invites moral dilemmas when using strategies of war and disguise (Sutton-Ramspeck, 2023). Apart from that, animal stewardship in protecting and preserving magical creatures or fantastic beasts in the wizarding world also triggers ethical anxiety due to the clash between animal conservation and the concept of monstrosity (Dendle, 2008). This phenomenon also often occurs in the real world where success and hypocrisy between human relations and nature clash.

Furthermore, there are several previous studies related to this research which are divided into several categories. The first is related to the wizarding war. Research in this category finds that there are two visions of peace, namely idealist-liberal peace driven by elites centered on war and just institutions, and gender relational peace rooted in love and non-violence (McEvoy-Levy, 2018), violations of the use of magic aimed at fighting systemic evil and related to World War II strategy and human rights in the US (Sutton-Ramspeck, 2023), and criticism of the limitation of character agency in a decision by Dumbledore to Harry Potter and more. suggests cooperative strategies and collective empowerment (Seymour, 2017). The second category is linguistic analysis in the seventh novel. Related research found that translators used paraphrase, idiomatic translation, and literal translation in translating the seventh novel (Stephanie & Hadi, 2024), there were

48 illocutionary acts, with 48% direction, 25% assertiveness, 15% expressiveness, and 13% commissive attitude (Camelia, Suastini, & Ayomi, 2023), and six types of figurative language used, namely simile 28, metaphor 27, hyperbole 20, idiom 13, personification 6, and proverb 4 (Rahmawati, Rangkuti, & Radiyanti, 2021). The third category is related to immortality, fear, and death in the world of magic. Research in this category finds that Harry Potter offers a complex depiction of death by linking the deaths of important characters to symbolic and spatial contexts and connecting modern concerns about transhumanism, death and biblical references as well as Renaissance literature (Dunne, 2023; Mackenzie, 2019; Alderete-Diez, 2019), the change in magic from Horcruxes and Hallows, which represented the conflict between good and evil, to the teachings of Albus Dumbledore, which that real power is found outside of magic (Petrina, 2022; Aristo, & Sijono, 2018). Briefly, previous studies discuss wizarding war, linguistic elements, and the complexity of life and death in the wizarding world.

Coupled with that, it can be seen that previous studies have not specifically discussed the ethical dilemma in the use of defensive and offensive magic in wizarding war. Therefore, this research will describe the ethical dilemma in the use of defensive and offensive magic during wizarding war. This research is interesting to conduct because literature's ability to depict moral circumstances, issues, and conundrums, it is a useful medium for philosophical inquiry and ethical education (Muller, 2016). Moreover, Harry Potter and The Deadly Hallows explores complex moral decisions where characters are often confronted with potentially positive moral ambiguities, each of which has its own moral justification (Bak, 2013; Gardner & Macky, 2012).

In addition, a broader understanding of the normative ethical perspective is needed to deal with ethical dilemma situations in real conflicts (Schulzke, 2013) which often also involve political factors, where choices must take into account social and legal constraints (Clark, 2017 Asal & Schulzke, 2012).

## METHOD

This research is a literary criticism research because it analyzes literary works. As Van Rees (1983) stated, literary criticism is the practice of reading literary works critically in order to comprehend, appraise, and evaluate. In addition, this study employs qualitative methodologies with textual data (Pratama & Hanum, 2019). The data source is the novel *Harry Potter and the Deadly Hallows*, written by J.K Rowling in 2007 in Portable Document Format (PDF). Moreover, because literary studies involve scientific research, theory is necessary (Ambarini, Harjito, and Umaya, 2010). Therefore, this research applied Deontology by Immanuel Kant and Utilitarianism by Jeremy Betham. These two ethical stances will be used to examine the categories of ethical dilemmas, namely, Means vs Ends, Moral Absolutism vs Moral Relativism, Intent vs Consequence.

On the top of that, to achieve the objective of this research, the data will be collected through several stages. First, researchers employ close reading strategies to comprehend the novel *Harry Potter and the Deadly Hallows*. Next, researcher identified words, phrases and sentences that demonstrated ethical dilemma. Then, researcher does a note-taking for words, phrases and sentences that showed ethical dilemma. After that, the data will be categorized based on the ethical dilemmas arose, namely, Means vs Ends, Moral Absolutism vs Moral Relativism, Intent vs Consequence.

Next, the data that has been collected will be analyzed through several stages. Researchers analyze, interpret and describe data related to ethical dilemma based on the theory used. To ensure the validity of the results, the researcher used triangulation by using various sources such as textual evidence, secondary literature, philosophical texts to verify the interpretation. In addition, the researcher also defined Deontology and Utilitarianism clearly and applied them consistently across the examples. Furthermore, to ensure reliability, the researcher uses a coding framework to categorize the quotes based on ethical dilemmas which will be analyzed based on two ethical stances. Then, the researcher made a conclusion as a summary of the discussion.

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, researchers will describe the ethical dilemma of using offensive magic. To do this, researchers will study using Deontology and Utilitarianism. Furthermore, the researcher presents five data representing the use of offensive magic which will be interpreted and studied below in three subchapters.

### Means vs Ends

This ethical category investigated whether an action was justified based on the result (Ends) or the media (means). The analysis and discussion will be explained in detail below.

“You — will — never — touch — our — children — again!” screamed Mrs Weasley....Molly’s curse soared beneath Bellatrix’s outstretched arm and hit her squarely in the chest, directly over her heart. (Rowling, 2007: 235-236)

The quote above shows the events when Molly Weasley fought Belatrix Lestrange. The context in this quote is a situation where during the war at Hogwarts, Bel-

latrix almost hit Ginny Weasley with a fatal attack. In this regard, the character Molly Weasley, who is always depicted as a loving mother throughout the story, in this quote, is described as having the courage to attack Bellatrix. The action taken reflects anger and also an attempt to protect a mother towards her children. The use of a hyphen (-) shows Molly's emotional emphasis. Furthermore, the word "Never" is a form of confirmation to Bellatrix that he will truly never be able to touch his children again. Then the use of the diction "our children" indicates that Molly not only protects Ginny Weasley but also Hogwarts students as a whole. Furthermore, the word "soared" indicates that the curse or spell that Molly directed at Bellatrix was a strong curse and shot quickly. Although it is not specifically stated what spell was used, this attack could be a symbol where Bellatrix, who fought out of loyalty to Voldemort, was defeated and killed with a mother's love.

The phenomenon of using offensive magic above raises an ethical dilemma. From a deontological perspective which prioritizes adherence to moral values (Kearns, 2017), Molly's murder of Bellatrix Lestrange cannot be justified even though it was followed by good intentions or a greater good impact. Moreover, Molly is a witch who strictly adheres to the principles of using the unforgivable curse (Archer, 2015), which means killing a criminal like Bellatrix Lestrange is not the right action. Moreover, the wizarding world itself has established laws on the use of unforgivable curses, which means that there are actual-ly strict limits on the use of these spells. Furthermore, the dilemma deepens when this principle is faced with a war situation such as the context of the quote above. Although in war moral rules often shift and actions that deviate from morals can be considered to maintain life, the Deonto-

logical perspective is still faced with internal contradictions. Moreover, the murder of Bellatrix Lestrange by Molly Weasley was based on anger and revenge. This reflects that killing a criminal driven by emotion or desire to punish the crime cannot be justified based on Deontology. Furthermore, Kant stated that right actions are not always actions that can be made into universal laws (Rawling, 2023). If killing is permitted in extreme situations then this is the same as allowing someone to kill at any time if they feel threatened and that creates moral chaos that undermines the universal concept (Idem). In short, from a Deontological perspective, moral deviation cannot be justified regardless of the reasons and good impacts.

Meanwhile, from a Utilitarian perspective, Molly Weasley's actions might be justified. Examined again, Utilitarianism, according to Jeremy Bentham, assesses an action based on its consequences, namely the extent to which an action has an impact on human goodness and welfare (Rahman & Maulana, 2023). To put it differently, if the positive impact of an action is greater than the negative impact, then the action can be considered ethical. In this case, we must first look at the impact of Molly's actions before deciding whether these actions can be considered morally right from a utilitarian point of view. The consequences of Molly's actions can be considered to have a greater good impact, namely eliminating the threat of Bellatrix Lestrange, an evil witch who was a follower of Voldemort who tortured people who disagreed with her, to Ginny and also the Hogwarts students. In this case, considering the many people who benefited from Bellatrix's death, it could be said that Molly's actions had a greater good impact than the bad impact. Nevertheless, Utilitarianism requires a broader examination that includes the

psychological and emotional impact of such actions (Kusev, Van Schaik, Alzaharani, Lonigro, Purser, 2016). Killing Bellatrix could be seen as an act that saved the lives of many people, but it may have also caused emotional damage to Molly herself. However, if examined based on the data and interpretation above, Molly did not show any panic or trauma after killing Bellatrix Lestrange, but rather a feeling of relief at having gotten rid of the threat from Ginny Weasley and the Hogwarts students who were considered her children. Thus, Molly Weasley's actions can be justified from the perspective of Utilitarianism.

However, from the two perspectives above, it arises a possible exception in Deontology and objection in Utilitarianism. As one of norm perspective, certainly, it should consider one's life as it is also immoral to allow a loss of life. Because of that, Deontology should have an exception and be not too rigid to one parameter of moral. It aligns with the statement of Schmidt (2014) who stated that it should allow rule-breaking in extreme situation. Additionally, Bellatrix presence in the middle of Hogwarts's students is clearly dangerous as it can cause fatal outcomes. Moreover, the power of magic possessed by Bellatrix is more powerful than the students considered immoral. It is stated that in a warfare, the stronger entities are violent the humanitarian principle when they brutality attack the weak ones (Honig & Reichard, 2018). From the explanation above, it means that it is justified if Molly's action towards Bellatrix Lestrange is the only way to prevent fatal outcomes. This justification is not based on the considering of better outcomes or effect, but because the action is a part of moral duty. On the other side, there is an objection in Utilitarianism. This kind of objection is related to the psychological effect for Molly. If

she suffers trauma after killing Bellatrix or makes others feel that killing is acceptable, this action cannot be justified even-though bringing a greater good. However, the data shows that Molly doesn't experience such a situation. In short, this dilemma situation shows that Deontology is not too rigid and Utilitarianism does not always depend on a greater outcomes; thus, morality should be considered based on several aspects mentioned.

### **Moral Absolutism vs Moral Relativism**

This category studies whether moral rules are fixed and universal (moral absolutism) or can change based on circumstances (moral relativism). The analysis and discussion will be explained in detail below.

“As Amycus spun around, Harry shouted, “Crucio!” The Death Eater was lifted off his feet. He writhed through the air like a drowning man, thrashing and howling in pain,....” (Rowling, 2007: 433)

The quote above shows an incident where Harry used the Cruciatu Curse to attack Amycus Carrow who was about to attack Professor McGonagall at Hogwarts. From the type of spell he cast, Harry's emotional change and anger towards the Death Eater was visible because Harry, who usually avoided using unforgivable magic, this time attacked Amycus, a Death Eater who often punished Hogwarts students, using one of the unforgivable spells. What's more, he did it with true intentions. This quote also, indirectly, shows the blurring of moral boundaries in war because the cruciatu curse is an unforgivable magic, and of course, its effect on Amycus is also very severe, namely Amycus loses control of his body because he feels unbearable pain. This is shown by the use of

the diction “Writhed” and “Thrustung” which describe his body’s expression when he is in pain. In addition, the phrases “Like a drowning man” and “Howling in pain”, indirectly, describe the power of this curse and the suffering experienced by Amycus who was drowning in a sea of pain.

The above interpretation indicates an ethical dilemma in Harry Potter’s use of the Cruciatus Curse on Amycus Carrow. From the perspective of Kantian Ethics or Deontology which upholds universal morals without considering the context and resulting effects (Kearns, 2017). The universal moral in this context is the firm prohibition by the Ministry of Magic on the use of unforgivable curses (Archer, 2015), namely the Cruciatus Curse to torture opponents. Based on this statement, Harry’s actions cannot be justified even though he intended to help Professor McGonagall. This is because in Kant’s perspective, if someone is allowed to use magic to torture an opponent when they feel threatened, then indirectly the moral prohibition against this will collapse (Rawling, 2023). Thus, Harry’s actions can be assessed as a deviation from the moral value that torture is not justified under any circumstances. The ethical dilemma in the data above is magnified by the situation or context of the war against Death Eaters which allows universal rules to be blurred. However, any extreme condition does not justify an act of torture in Deontology. Even though Harry was in a condition to paralyze Amycus, the use of torture spells was still not permitted assuming Harry could use defensive spells to incapacitate him. In short, Harry’s actions cannot be justified from a Deontology perspective.

Furthermore, in the Utilitarianism perspective according to Jeremy Bentham, actions are assessed based on the good impact they produce, not like Deontology

which bases it on universal morals (Rahman & Maulana, 2023). In other words, actions that are considered correct by the Utilitarian perspective are actions that bring great impacts or benefits to as many people as possible. Based on this statement, Harry’s use of the Cruciatus Curse spell is morally defensible provided that this action provides greater benefits than the harm. If examined more deeply, the target of Harry’s spell was Amycus Carrow, a Death Eater who had tortured many Hogwarts students, who at that time threatened the safety of Professor McGonagall. In this context, Harry paralyzes Amycus Carrow using the Cruciatus Curse spell to protect the professor and the people around him. Based on this explanation, Harry’s actions brought great benefits, namely saving the lives of the Master and his other friends and it is considered that these benefits are greater than the suffering of one individual. Additionally, the use of the Cruciatus Curse is considered more effective in emergencies considering that Harry did not find a more moral way to incapacitate Amycus. Moreover, Utilitarianism also considers long-term psychological consequences (Kusev, Van Schaik, Alzahrani, Lonigro, Purser, 2016). If examined further, this action has saved the lives of many people which will certainly bring relief to the parents of these Hogwarts students as well as relief to Harry and the other students over the safety of Professor McGonagall. Moreover, in this quote or in the novel there is no explanation regarding the negative psychological effects experienced by Harry after using the spell; So, this action can be justified. In short, from the perspective of Utilitarianism, Harry’s actions towards Amycus can be justified by considering the physical and psychological benefits.

However, from the two perspective above, it arises a possible exception in

Deontology and objection in Utilitarianism. As one of norm perspective, certainly, it should consider one's life as it is also immoral to allow a loss of life. Because of that, Deontology should has an exception and be not too rigid to one parameter of moral. It aligns with the statement of Schmidt (2014) who stated that it should allow rule-breaking in extreme situation. In the beginning, Harry believes that it is wrong to use the unforgivable curse, but he adjusted his moral stance for self-defence in a desperate situation. If Harry refuses to use Crucio, it can be considered immoral as it means allowing the death eaters to cause harm or kill them and causes a fatal outcomes in Hogwarts. It means that the Amycus' presence in the middle of Hogwart's students is clearly dangerous as it can cause fatal outcomes. Moreover, the power of magic possessed by Amycus is more powerful than the students. This battle is considered immoral. It is stated that in a warfare, the stronger entities are violent the humanitarian prinsip when they brutality attack the weak ones (Honig & Reichard, 2018). From the explanation above, it means that it is justified if Harry's action towards Amycus is the only way to prevent fatal outcomes. This justification is not based on the considering of better outcomes or effect, but because the action is a part of moral duty. In other words, moraliy is the primary intent while harm is a secondary effect. On the other side, there is an objection in Utilitarianism. This kind of objection is related to the psychological effect for Harr. If she suffers trauma after applying Imperius Curse or makes others feel that harming is acceptable, this action cannot be justified even-though bringing a greater good. However, the data shows that Harry doesn't experience such a situation. In short, this dilemma situation shows that Deontology is not always strict to the

rules and Utilitarianism does not always prioritize a greater outcomes; thus, morality should be considered based on several aspects mentioned.

Harry pointed his wand at Travers. "Imperio!" The wizard turned and set off along the dark track at a smart pace. "What are you making him do?" (Rowling, 2007: 390)

The quote above shows an event that occurred when Harry, Ron, and Hermione were at Gringotts Bank, where the wizards' wealth was stored, to sneak into Bellatrix Lestrange's vault to find Horcruxes. At that time, it turned out that Travers, a Death Eater, was also there, which meant that his presence threatened Harry, Ron, and Hermione because he might alert other Death Eaters. To prevent this, Harry, who usually refuses to use the unforgivable curse, now uses it as a self-defense strategy. The phrase "Pointed his wand" shows that Harry really intended and was in full consciousness to use the unforgivable curse magic, Imperius Curse. Imperio is dark magic used to control a target's mind and body. As a result of this magic, the Travels became obedient to Harry's orders and wishes and guided them through "The dark track" in "Smart pace". In this situation, literally, 'The Dark Track' can be interpreted as a dark passage or path to Bellatrix Lestrange's vault. However, this can also be interpreted as Harry Potter's moral journey becoming increasingly gray in the use of the unforgivable curse. Furthermore, the sentence "What are you making him do?" which Harry's friend raises, indirectly, also shows moral doubts that can still be questioned even in the situation of surviving the Death Eaters. In other words, the use of an unforgivable curse can still be ethically questionable even in defensive conditions.

The incident above, indirectly, shows the existence of an ethical dilemma. Based on the Deontology perspective by Immanuel Kant, the morality of an action is determined by its conformity to existing universal moral principles (Kearns, 2017). In this context, the Imperius Curse is an unforgivable curse, which means dark magic that cannot be used because it is considered deviant from morals under any circumstances in accordance with Ministry of Magic regulations (Archer, 2015). Harry Potter's use of Imperius, according to this perspective, is considered immoral because it violates the principle of individual freedom, namely eliminating the freedom to act based on one's own wishes. Kant argues that humans must be given the freedom to act according to their wishes. In other words, humans are the end, not the means. By using the Imperius Curse on Travers, Harry Potter has manipulated Travers' mind and body and made her a tool to achieve his own goals, which are contrary to Deontological morals. An ethical dilemma also arises because in this quote, Harry is in a threatened condition. However, morality in this perspective cannot be compromised and strictly speaking the use of the Imperius Curse is considered to violate ethics. This is because according to Kant, if its use is permitted in one situation, it will break down the moral barriers to the use of magic in various other situations. Apart from that, the rules against the Imperius Curse spell will lose their meaning. Unlike utilitarianism, Deontology assumes that the consequences of an action have nothing to do with morality. So, even though Harry used this forbidden spell to help his friends and as a form of self-defense, it was still considered a wrong and moral violation. In short, the act of using the Imperius Curse is unacceptable in the view of Deontology.

In contrast to the Deontology

perspective, Utilitarianism, according to Betham, considers morality based on the resulting consequences (Rahman & Maulana, 2023). If the benefits are greater than the losses experienced, then the action can be considered a moral action. In this situation, Harry's use of the Imperius Curse can be studied more deeply. From the data above it can be seen that using this forbidden spell is a form of prevention and self-defense from Travers, a Death Eater who has the possibility of informing other Death Eaters about their whereabouts, which would result in the failure of the horcrux search mission and even death for the three of them. By using this spell, Harry can ensure that his mission to destroy the Horcruxes can be carried out properly, which is an important step in defeating Lord Voldemort and saving the wizarding world. If we look at this case, the benefits obtained from using this spell are greater than the losses experienced by one individual, namely Travers. What's more, Imperius Curse does not have an extreme physical impact on its target but only makes the victim lose control of himself without feeling the slightest pain or physical trauma. Therefore, the Utilitarianism perspective can still justify these smaller negative effects. Furthermore, in connection with Utilitarianism which also considers the psychological impact (Kusev, Van Schaik, Alzaharani, Lonigro, Purser, 2016), it is necessary to study the psychological impact on both Harry and Travers. It is not explained in the data above or the explanation in the novel that Harry had a bad psychological impact in the long term, as did Travers. Overall, Harry's actions using Imperio magic can be justified from a Utilitarianism perspective.

However, from the two perspective above, it arises a possible exception in Deontology and objection in Utilitarianism. As one of norm perspective, certainly, its

should consider one's life as it is also immoral to allow a loss of life. Because of that, Deontology should have an exception and be not too rigid to one parameter of moral. It aligns with the statement of Schmidt (2014) who stated that it should allow rule-breaking in extreme situation. In the beginning, Harry believes that it is wrong to use the unforgivable curse, but he adjusted his moral stance for self-defence in a desperate situation. If Harry refuses to use Imperius Curse, it can be considered immoral as it means allowing the death eaters to kill them and causes a fatal outcomes in Hogwarts. It means that the death eaters' presence in the middle of Hogwarts students is clearly dangerous as it can cause fatal outcomes. Moreover, the power of magic possessed by them is more powerful than the students. This battle is considered immoral. It is stated that in a warfare, the stronger entities are violent the humanitarian principle when they brutally attack the weak ones (Honig & Reichard, 2018). From the explanation above, it means that it is justified if Harry's action towards Travers is the only way to prevent fatal outcomes. This justification is not based on the considering of better outcomes or effect, but because the action is a part of moral duty. In other words, morality is the primary intent while harm is a secondary effect. On the other side, there is an objection in Utilitarianism. This kind of objection is related to the psychological effect for Harry suffers trauma after applying Imperius Curse or makes others feel that killing is acceptable, this action cannot be justified even-though bringing a greater good. However, the data shows that Harry doesn't experience such a situation. In short, this dilemma situation shows that Deontology is not always strict to the rules and Utilitarianism does not always prioritize a greater outcomes; therefore, morality should be considered based on

several aspects mentioned.

"...and yelled, "Confringo!" He knew a dreadful, gut-wrenching pang for Hedwig as it exploded; the Death Eater nearest it was blasted off his broom and fell from sight; his companion fell back and vanished. (Rowling, 2007: 47)

"The snake lunged as he took a running leap, dragging Hermione with him; as it struck, Hermione screamed, "Confringo!" and her spell flew around the room, exploding the wardrobe mirror and ricocheting back at them, bouncing from floor to ceiling;..." (Rowling, 2007: 252)

The first quote above shows the incident when Harry and members of the Order of the Phoenix escaped from the private drive to the Burrow. At that time, Harry and Hagrid flew using Sirius Black's motorbike as one of the seven Potter strategies to trick the Death Eaters. This threatening condition prompted Harry to launch an attack on the Death Eaters by casting the "Confringo" spell. This is a spell to explode the target object. This is confirmed by the phrases "As it exploded", "blasted off his broom", "fell from sight" and "vanished", which can reflect how objects explode when hit by the "Confringo" spell and the effectiveness of this spell in eliminating opponents in battle. Furthermore, the word "Yelled" shows that Harry's actions contain an impulsive nature driven by emotional stress due to the death of Hedwig, his pet owl, who was killed by the Death Eaters. This event can not only be interpreted literally but also symbolically, namely the end of Harry's childhood which was destroyed along with Hedwig's death. Moreover, the phrase "...a dreadful, gut-wrenching pang..." truly reflects the emotional pain of losing her pet. Then, the

use of conflict in the situation shows that Harry is not only protecting himself but actually attacking the Death Eaters.

The second quote above tells of an event where Harry and Hermione went to Godric's Hollow to look for information about the sword of Gryffindor and horcruxes. At that place, they met Bathilda Bagshot. However, what they met was not Bathilda's true self because her body and mind had been controlled by Voldemort and had hidden Nagini in his body. When Harry and Hermione were off guard, Nagini, Voldemort's horcrux snake, immediately attacked aggressively. Furthermore, in this quote it is also seen that the sudden attack caused panic, especially in Harry who was completely unprepared for such a situation; Thus, he didn't have time to think and could only take Hermione away with him quickly. In this panicked atmosphere, Hermione reflexively used the magic "Confringo", which is a magic that causes a large explosion. The effect of this spell can be seen by a large explosion from "the wardrobe mirror", which is very dangerous if used carelessly. The use of this magic shows Hermione's defensive or survival instincts. Apart from that, this also shows Hermione's dexterity and intelligence to survive even under pressure due to a direct Horcrux attack, even though her reflexes made her unable to successfully attack Nagini's Horcrux.

The ethical dilemma in the quote above can be explored through the perspective of Deontology and Utilitarianism. In a Deontological perspective, good impacts are not considered as justification for an action (Kearns, 2017). In the first data, Confringo, an explosive spell, was used by Harry Potter not only as a form of self-defense, but also as a form of attack with the aim of injuring an opponent due to emotional impulses over the loss of Hedwig. This can

be interpreted as a moral deviation because the attack was not based on clear ethical principles, but rather a desire for revenge. Moreover, the sanctity of life is the main priority in the Deontology perspective, even in the context of war. Thus, the use of Confringo which can injure opponents and cause death cannot be justified. Furthermore, the second data illustrates that Hermione used the Confringo spell purely for self-protection without being driven by anger or the intention to harm others. This allows his actions to be accepted by Deontology. However, uncontrolled use can lead to greater consequences and severe destruction. This causes a dilemma whether it can be justified deontologically or not because in this perspective good intentions alone are not enough but must be accompanied by actions that stick to the universal norm. In short, from a Deontological perspective, actions are evaluated based on strict ethical standards, meaning that violence can only be justified if it fully adheres to universal moral principles. Harry violates this principle because of his emotional impulses and offensive motives, whereas Hermione occupies a gray area: her actions are defensive, but still pose a great risk.

In contrast, in Utilitarianism, the morality of an action is determined by the end result, namely how much benefit it produces compared to the losses (Rahman & Maulana, 2023). In the first quote Harry casts a conflict spell with the aim of getting rid of the Death Eater which has the potential to threaten his and Hagrid's lives. In this case, the rescue action can be justified because the number of lives saved compared to the lives threatened by the explosion is greater. Moreover, death and Eater are very commensurate with the amount that must be saved, even the loss of death is not greater than the benefit. Furthermore, Harry did not suffer

any significant psychological impact so the emotional consequences do not need to be considered. Furthermore, in the second quote, the Confringo spell is used by Hermione to save lives or survive. In this case it can be interpreted that the benefits are far greater than the resulting losses. In this situation, opting for Confringo was not solely a defensive tactic; it was also a calculated decision that took into account the long-term effects on their safety. If magic was not used, Harry and Hermione could have been killed by Nagini. After all, Hermione hadn't directly endangered anyone's life. The spell mentioned does produce an explosion, but does not target specific humans. So, from a utilitarian perspective, the use of the Confringo mantra can be justified. Additionally, ethical Utilitarianism evaluates moral choices not only by their short-term consequences but also by their long-term ramifications (Rawling, 2023). Harry and Hermione, by successfully evading Nagini's threat, were able to persist in their quest for the Horcruxes, which played a role in Voldemort's demise. Seen from this perspective, Hermione's actions saved both herself and Harry, while also yielding broader advantages for the entire wizarding world. Thus, from the standpoint of Utilitarianism, employing the Confringo mantra in this situation can be deemed morally acceptable, as its beneficial effects far exceed the associated risks. In short, Harry and Hermione's use of Confringo is justified by the perspective of Utilitarianism.

However, from the two perspectives above, it arises a possible exception in Deontology and objection in Utilitarianism. As one of norm perspective, certainly, it should consider one's life as it is also immoral to allow a loss of life. Because of that, Deontology should have an exception and be not too rigid to one parameter of moral. It aligns with the statement of

Schmidt (2014) who stated that it should allow rule-breaking in extreme situation. In the beginning, Harry and Hermione believes that it is wrong to use the unforgivable curse, but he adjusted his moral stance for self-defence in a desperate situation. If Harry and Hermione refuses to use Confringo, it can be considered immoral as it means allowing the death eaters and Nagini to kill them and causes a fatal outcomes. It means that the death eaters' presence in the middle of them is clearly dangerous as it can cause fatal outcomes. Moreover, the power of magic possessed by the death eater and Nagini is more powerful than them. This battle is considered immoral. It is stated that in a warfare, the stronger entities are violent the humanitarian principles when they brutality attack the weak ones (Honig & Reichard, 2018). From the explanation above, it means that it is justified if Harry and Hermione's action towards the death eater and Nagini is the only way to prevent fatal outcomes. This justification is not based on the considering of better outcomes or effect, but because the action is a part of moral duty. In other words, morality is the primary intent while harm is a secondary effect. On the other side, there is an objection in Utilitarianism. This kind of objection is related to the psychological effect for Harry and Hermione. If they suffer trauma after applying the spell or makes others feel that harming is acceptable, this action cannot be justified even though bringing a greater good. However, the data shows that Harry and Hermione don't experience such a situation. In short, this dilemma situation shows that Deontology is not always strict to the rules and Utilitarianism does not always prioritize a greater outcomes; thus, morality should be considered based on several aspects mentioned.

### Intent vs Consequence

This category investigates whether an action should be judged based on the moral intent behind it (intention) or on its actual results (consequences). The analysis and discussion will be explained in detail below.

“A Death Eater moved ahead of Snape and raised his wand, pointing it directly at Lupin’s back — “Sectumsempra!” shouted Snape. But the spell, intended for the Death Eater’s wand hand, missed and hit George instead” (Rowling, 2007: 501)

The quote above explains the event when Harry saw the memory of the deceased Severus Snape in the Pensieve. In these memories, Harry saw that Snape was actually only pretending to work for Voldemort and remained loyal to Professor Dumbledore. His loyalty was shown when Snape saw that when members of the Death Eaters were targeting Remus Lupin, he tried to stop him by attacking them using the “Sectumsempra” spell. This is a spell created by Snape himself which functions to cut down opponents. However, unfortunately, the spell missed and hit George Wesley and caused him to lose one ear. This shows that even though Snape acted in the shadow of Voldemort’s followers, his intentions remained clear, namely to protect the members of the Order of the Phoenix. In other words, this phenomenon shows that in times of war, actions carried out with good intentions can still have unexpected impacts. Snape’s mistake in initiating the attack not only shows the complexity of the battle, but also shows the ethical dilemmas he continues to face as a double agent.

Furthermore, the ethical dilemma in the quote above can be described through Deontology and Utilitarianism. Deontolo-

gy assesses morality from its adherence to universal morality, regardless of the impact resulting from an action (Kearns, 2017). In this perspective, Snape’s use of Sectumsempra becomes a moral question because even though it was accompanied by good intentions, the use of magic was very dangerous and had fatal consequences. Moreover, good intentions are not enough to justify an action because this perspective is very focused on compliance with applicable moral principles. Sectumsempra in this case can be categorized as a spell that has the potential to hurt other people. This can be seen from the error in using Sectumsempra which caused George to lose one ear, which of course was undesirable and was a direct result of his actions. This makes it contrary to moral principles to use violence to achieve goals. In short, according to Deontological ethics, this mistake is a moral deviation by Snape and of course cannot be justified.

In contrast to Deontology, Utilitarianism considers morality based on consequences and efforts to provide the greatest benefits to as many people as possible (Rahman & Maulana, 2023). In this perspective Snape’s actions can still be justified because of his intention to protect Lupine, an important person in the Order of the Phoenix and who had a big role in defeating Voldemort. Moreover, quick and correct decisions must be taken in war situations. If Snape had not acted in this way, Lupine would most likely have been killed by the Death Eater and of course this would have had a negative impact on the resistance to Voldemort. In short, from this explanation, what Snape did had a greater impact than losses. Furthermore, Utilitarianism also considers negative impacts regardless of the good provided. If examined, it cannot be denied that Snape’s actions also resulted in serious injury to George Wesley’s ear. However,

this also needs to be compared with larger impacts. From this quote it can be seen that losing George Wesley's ear had a smaller impact than losing Lupin. Therefore, this, from the perspective of Utilitarianism, can be justified.

However, from the two perspective above, it arises a possible exception in Deontology and objection in Utilitarianism. As one of norm perspective, certainly, it should consider one's safety as it is also immoral to allow a harmful action toward others. Because of that, Deontology should has an exception and be not too rigid to one parameter of moral. It aligns with the statement of Schmidt (2014) who stated that it should allow rule-breaking in extreme situation. In the beginning, Snape believes that it is wrong to use the harmful spell like *Sectumsempra*, but he adjusted his moral stance for self-defence in a desperate situation. If he refuses to use *Sectumsempra*, it can be considered immoral as it means allowing the death eaters to kill them and causes a fatal outcomes. It means that the death eaters' presence in the middle of them is clearly dangerous as it can cause unavoidable death. Moreover, the power of magic possessed by the death eater is more powerful than them and has a big possibility to harm them. This battle is considered immoral. It is stated that in a warfare, the stronger entities are violent the humanitarian prinsip when they brutality attack the weak ones (Honig & Reichard, 2018). Additionally, the harmful effect towards Lupin is a kind of unintended action. From the explanation above, it means that it is justified if Snape's action towards the death eater is the only way to prevent fatal outcomes and it's effect on Lupin is no more than a unintended mistake. This justification is not based on the considering of better outcomes or effect, but because the action is a part of moral duty and unin-

tended action. In other words, morality is the primary intent while harm is a secondary effect. On the other side, there is an objection in Utilitarianism. This kind of objection is related to the psychological effect for Snape and Lupin. If they suffer trauma after applying or effected by the spell or makes others feel that harming is acceptable, this action cannot be justified even though bringing a greater good. However, the data shows that Snape and Lupin don't experience such a situation. In short, this dilemma situation shows that Deontology is not always strict to the rules and Utilitarianism does not always prioritize a greater outcomes; thus, morality should be considered based on several aspects mentioned.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that in the novel *Harry Potter and the Deadly Hallows* there is an ethical dilemma regarding the use of offensive magic in the context of warfare and self-defense. In studying this matter, the perspectives of Deontology and Utilitarianism have opposing views on the use of unforgivable curses and also dangerous magic. Based on the Deontological perspective, morality is determined based on adherence to universal ethical principles. Thus, the use of the *Cruciatu*s Curse, *Imperiu*s Curse, *Sectumsempra* spells, is categorized as a moral deviation without considering the good intentions or positive impacts produced. In the context of their use, the actions taken by Harry, Snape, and Hermione cannot be justified even in the context of self-defense because these offensive spells can injure other people. In contrast to Deontology, Utilitarianism relies on morality on the consequences and benefits for many people. This perspective is quite flexible than Deontology. Thus, the actions taken by Harry, Snape, and Hermi-

one can be categorized as moral actions. This is because these actions are carried out on the basis of self-defense which of course brings greater benefits than harm. Furthermore, from both Deontology and Utilitarianism's perspective arises a possible exception and objection. The Deontological exception includes the consideration of the primary intend in using spell to maintain morality by not allowing killing and harming, brutality of battle, and using only for alternative if there's no other ways. Meanwhile, the objection of Utilitarianism Perspective includes the consideration of long term effect after the use of the harmful spell.

## REFERENCES

- Alderete-Diez, P. (2019). Death and how to deal with it in the Harry Potter series. In *Cultural Politics in Harry Potter* (pp. 147-162). Routledge.
- Ambarini, A. S., Harjito, I. K. I. P., & Uma-ya, N. M. (2010). Pelatihan Kajian Analisis Sastra Membangun Keterampilan Diri dengan Kemampuan Menganalisis Imajinasi Sastra Bagi Mahasiswa IKIP PGRI Semarang. *E-Dimas: Jurnal Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat*, 1(2), 80-92: 2528-5041,
- Ann Tlusty, B. (2019). Bravado, martial magic, and masculine performance in early modern Germany. *Daphnis*, 48(1). [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004401921\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004401921_003)
- Archer, D. (2015). Harry Potter and Control : An Inherent Power Narrative in the Wizarding World. *Conversations*, 2(1).
- Aristo, T. J. V., & Sijono, S. (2019). The Characteristics Of Albus Dumbledore In Harry Potter And Deathly Hollow By Jk. Rowling. *JEES: Journal of English Educational Study*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v1i2.327>
- Arneson, R. (2018). Deontology's Travaux. In *Moral Puzzles and Legal Perplexities: Essays on the Influence of Larry Alexander*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108227025.021>
- Asal, V., & Schulzke, M. (2012). A Shot Not Taken: Teaching About the Ethics of Political Violence. *International Studies Perspectives*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-3585.2012.00487.x>
- Augé, C. R. (2020). The Hoodoo that You Do: The Material Culture of Gendered Magic as Risk Management Mechanisms. In *Live Evil: Of Magic and Men*. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9781848880726\\_016](https://doi.org/10.1163/9781848880726_016)
- Camelia, M., Suastini, N. W., & Ayomi, P. N. (2023). Illocutionary Acts on Harry Potter And The Deathly Hallows Movie. *Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 204-212. <https://doi.org/10.22334/traverse.v4i2.227>
- Caron, J. F. (2023). The Moral Dilemmas of Fighting Terrorism and Guerilla Groups. In *The Moral Dilemmas of Fighting Terrorism and Guerrilla Groups*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110757569>
- Clark, I. (2017). Taking 'justness' seriously in just war: who are the 'miserable comforters' now? *International Affairs*, 93(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix003>
- Coy, C. (2025). The Last Enemy: Reading Harry Potter as an Extended Grief Narrative. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 48(3). <https://doi.org/10.1353/chq.2023.a921311>
- Dendle, P. (2008). Monsters, Creatures, and Pets at Hogwarts Animal Stewardship in the World of Harry Potter. In *Critical Perspectives on Har-*

- ry Potter: 2nd edition. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203892817-16>
- Dunne, J. A. (2023). Harry Potter and the Aims of Transhumanism: A Magical Critique of Technological Immortality. *Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, 35(2). <https://doi.org/10.3138/jrpc.2021-0048>
- Gardner, D., & Macky, K. (2012). Generational differences: Something old, something new. In *Work and Quality of Life: Ethical Practices in Organizations*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4_22)
- Harari, Y. (2017). Three Charms for Killing Adolf Hitler. *Aries*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700593-01702002>
- Hennequin, M. W. (2013). Harry Potter and the legends of saints. *Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.3138/jrpc.25.1.67>
- Honig, O., & Reichard, A. (2018). Evidence-fabricating in asymmetric conflicts: How weak actors prove false propaganda narratives. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 41(4), 297-318.
- JA, D. F., & Rodríguez-Peña, F. M. (2019). Proposal of a deontological framework for spanish biologists. *Cuadernos de Bioetica: Revista Oficial de la Asociacion Espanola de Bioetica y Etica Medica*, 30(100), 277-287.
- Kearns, A. J. (2017). A duty-based approach for nursing ethics & practice. In *Key Concepts and Issues in Nursing Ethics*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49250-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49250-6_2)
- Kusev, P., van Schaik, P., Alzahrani, S., Lonigro, S., & Purser, H. (2016). Judging the morality of utilitarian actions: How poor utilitarian accessibility makes judges irrational. *Psychonom-ic Bulletin and Review*, 23(6). <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-016-1029-2>
- Los, F. (2008). Harry potter and the nature of death. *Alternatives Journal*, 34(1).
- Mackenzie, A. (2019). "A Story About how Humans are Frightened of Death": Harry Potter, Death and the Cultural Imagination. In *Cultural Politics in Harry Potter* (pp. 87-97). Routledge.
- Metla, S., & Devi, Y. V. S. (2024). Meaningful miracles: Unraveling eucatastrophe in the select fantasy fiction of JK Rowling. *RUDN Journal of Studies in Literature and Journalism*, 29(4), 673-684. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9220-2024-29-4-673-684>
- Müller, W. G. (2016). A journey through the realms of good and evil: Ethics in philosophy and literature. In *Forum for World Literature Studies* (Vol. 8, Issue 1).
- Nemickienė, Ž., & Vengalienė, D. (2023). Secondary World in Fantasy Tradition after J. K. Rowling. *Respectus Philologicus*, 43(48). <https://doi.org/10.15388/RESPECTUS.2023.43.48.111>
- O'Brien, G. (2020). Witches or Bitches? An Examination of Two 'Bitch' Female Characters in the Harry Potter Series. In *The Evil Body*. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9781848880740\\_013](https://doi.org/10.1163/9781848880740_013)
- Petrina, A. (2022). Horcrux or Hallow? Magical projections of the psyche in Harry Potter. *Prospero*, 27, 83-101. <https://dx.doi.org/10.13137/2283-6438/34213>
- Pratama, D.H., & Hanum, I.S. (2019). Analisis Novel Ibuku Tidak Gila Karya Anggie D. Widowati: Tinjauan Sosiologi Sastra. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 3(4), 8.
- Rahman, A., & Maulana, M. F. R. (2023). Analisis Kritis Terhadap Pemiki-

- ran Utilitarianisme Jeremy Bentham dalam Perspektif Etika dan Filsafat Manusia. *Journal of Society and Development*, 3(2), 53-64. <https://doi.org/10.57032/jsd.v4i1.207>
- Rahmawati, W. T., Rangkuti, L. A., & Radianyanti, K. (2021). Figurative Language In Harry Potter And Deathly Hallows Part 2 Movie. *EXCELLENCE: Journal of English and English Education*, 1(2), 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.47662/ejee.v1i2.270>
- Rawling, P. (2023). *Deontology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Remy, D. (2016). Utilitarianism, a fundamental ethical theory in our society, especially for doctors and veterinarians. *Point Vétérinaire*, 47(363), 44-4.
- Schmidt, J. A. (2014). Changing the Paradigm for Engineering Ethics. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 20(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-013-9491-y>
- Schulzke, M. (2013). Ethically Insoluble Dilemmas In War. *Journal of Military Ethics*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2013.818406>
- Seymour, J. (2017). Hunting the stag in harry potter's games. *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.5325/intelitestud.19.4.0441>
- Sinclair, I. (2014). War magic and just war in Indian tantric Buddhism. *Social Analysis*, 58(1). <https://doi.org/10.3167/sa.2014.580108>
- Stephanie, B., & Hadi, M. Z. P. (2024). Analysis of Translation Method of the Idiomatic Phrases in JK Rowling's Novel "Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows". *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 3(2), 137-146. <https://doi.org/10.57248/jishum.v3i2.489>
- Sutton-Ramspeck, B. (2023). Harry Potter and Resistance. In *Harry Potter and Resistance*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003312260>
- Van Rees, C. J. (1983). How a literacy work becomes a masterpiece: On the threefold selection practised by literary criticism. *Poetics*, 12(4-5), 397-417:0304- 422X.
- Wade, J. (2016). Going berserk: Battle trance and ecstatic holy warriors in the European war magic tradition. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.24972/ijts.2016.35.1.21>