



200002921

Lion Kings, Peasant Ducks and Worker Ants: Allegories of Government for Children

Lucy Hamilton

'Strange women lying in ponds distributing swords is no basis for a system of government. Supreme executive power derives from a mandate from the masses, not from a farcical aquatic ceremony.'

(From Monty Python and the Holy Grail, 1975).

All children's books are produced within cultural formations, and either promote or contest dominant ideologies. It is relatively rare, however, for the lessons integral to children's texts to turn on the nature of government and the basis upon which 'supreme executive power' rests. Within adult literature, exploration of this subject in the form of animal tales follows a tradition thousands of years old. Two picture books offer a critique based on not-unrelated political ideologies: Martin Waddell and Helen Oxenbury's *Farmer Duck* (1991) and Marcus Pfister's *How Leo Learned to be King* (1998) contain lessons on illegitimate rule. The mode of production for the cinema differs considerably and Disney's animated film *The Lion King* (1994) and its sequel, *The Lion King II: Simba's Pride* (1998) approach the issue from a capitalist (not to mention Shakespearean) perspective. Disney's *A Bug's Life* (1998) and Dream Works' *Antz* (1998) examine the organisation of society from the perspective of the insect-like worker.

In *Farmer Duck*, Waddell and Oxenbury recreate *Animal Farm* for pre-schoolers. The picture-book follows the mould set by Aesop and the animal folk-tales of the British tradition such as 'The Little Red Hen'. This tale, which endorses self-sufficiency and the dignity of labour, characterises the poor little entrepreneur in a most unassuming form. Female, rural and apparently subsistence farming, the figure could hardly be less likely to induce resentment. After the hen has worked steadily to lay in stores of necessary foodstuffs, the ne'er-do-wells around expect to bleed away the hen's just rewards. 'Taxation' becomes, in this representation, an unreasonable demand on the diligent by the feckless.

Farmer Duck emulates 'The Little Red Hen' in its related view of the dignity of labour and its resentment of laziness profiting from others' labour, as much as in its choice of a barnyard fowl as protagonist, but is informed

by a very different ideological underpinning. The hope provided by Orwell's revolutionary vision of an egalitarian society, where the workers control the means of production, is not overturned, as in *Animal Farm*: this version believes in socialism. The capitalist oppressor is represented by the 'lazy old farmer' (p.2) who delivers the farm's orders from his bed. In Oxenbury's illustrations he permanently reclines on the bed, half-naked and repellent, stuffing himself on luxurious chocolates and becoming increasingly fat. His only words are the refrain 'How goes the work?' as the down-trodden duck, head bowed in the driving rain, carries out all the farmer's tasks. The drawings of the duck feature anthropomorphically strained muscles and bags under the eyes. When he is finally 'sleepy and weepy and tired' (p.13), the farm animals that love the duck meet and make plans. Sheep, hens and a cow carry out the coup; here the only pig is the capitalist human.

Wide-eyed, they creep into the house to chase the farmer away. Their fear and the ugliness of the human situate us firmly with 'the workers.' They eject the porcine farmer from his bed. He half-wakes, only to call again 'How goes the work?', reinforcing our sense of him as parasitic to the core. After the enraged herbivores chase him from the farm, he runs toward the distant horizon and 'never came back' (p.27). The illustration of this text is subdued; however, the sombre browns and greys which dominate the illustrations to this point lift as we are shown the ebullient animals setting to work 'on their farm' (p.32). Now the sun shines and bright yellows echo the triumphant mood of the peasant labourers. The opening endpaper is wintry, with dead trees and foggy skies, but this chill vision is overturned by the peasant revolution. Summer, with its lush greenery and wildflowers, warms the story's concluding endpaper, leaving the young audience with hope in the moral that right can prevail, rather than Orwell's adult cynicism. For children, the right to dream that the egalitarian pastoral idyll might exist is allowed; adults must return to hard truth.

In Pfister's *How Leo Learned to be King*, the warm, soft colours and blurred edges of his animals enable his Leo the Lion to be easily marketed as a soft toy (which was in fact released with the picture book). Pfister examines the

nature of non-democratic rule in Leo's experience of revolution. He is first seen on his 'throne,' wearing a crown. The throne is not traditionally elaborate, but a tattered wicker style chair, which might suggest a colonial tinge to Leo's unearned sovereignty. His intrinsic idleness is indicated as we meet him emerging from a nap. He emits a 'bloodcurdling roar that shook the entire savannah' (p.3), which is immediately greeted by insubordination: "'Oh, shut up!' snapped a little warthog.'" Leo's intent to 'strike him down with one powerful paw' (p.4) confirms the intimation of violence inherent in the *bloodcurdling* roar. 'Might' does not only sustain rulers: the 'people' have their own force in the buffalo that steps in to protect the warthog and exclaim, 'We don't need a King of the Beasts anymore. We can take care of ourselves' (p.7).

His subjects convene in an impromptu parliament and overthrow their monarch. The vulture exclaims: 'You were always a lazy, arrogant show-off' before swooping down to snatch off the crown (p.9). The rest chant in agreement until there 'is nothing Leo could do except flee from the rebellious animals' (p.10). There has been no reason for this King's rule and he justifies it to himself with 'I deserve to be served because I am the King of the Beasts! It has always been that way. Why should I change?' (p.10). His subjects prove to have been correct in their forecast; they do manage well without him, not noticing his absence. He is forced to perceive that the right to rule is not his by heredity and that he has lost his mandate.

From sulking in the long grass, Leo learns to help his fellow animals, and the deeds recorded appear to endorse the welfare state. Leo provides public transport by carrying a mouse across a river. He assists a porcupine to rebuild his home after it has been trampled by a rhinoceros; then Leo pursues the rhino and this benign governor-in-training provides medical treatment for the pachyderm's injuries. The government, it appears, ought to be providing all these services. Finally, his former subjects comment to each other 'That's the kind of king I'd like to have... Someone who cares about you' and 'someone who notices the smallest things' (p.23). At this, they bring him back his throne and his crown, inviting him to be king again. Anarchy is not the aim, but the governor requires democratic support and must earn his status. Leo, 'touched'

by the gesture, declares that it would be a privilege to serve his former subjects. He rejects the accoutrements of power, stating 'while I may be king, I'm still just an animal like all of you' (p.24). There is no longer a Divine Right or Great Chain of Being. There remains no justification for the self-glorifying pomp that marks the British monarchy; Leo appears more like a president, in fact.

While the two picture books allow scope for a revolution that ends positively, the films which address the topic work differently. Film, as an 'industrial' art form, and one that requires substantial sums in the making, is implicitly connected with the market economy. While this can also be said of the production of books, they are produced on a much smaller scale. The smaller investment required leaves greater freedom of content; it has been easier to sneak subversive messages through in published texts, which require a considerably smaller market to subsidise their production. The films I discuss entrench a conservative, capitalist agenda of the sort Republican voters might approve. When Walt Disney shifted his focus from animation with edge in the 1920s, he aimed to achieve substantial audiences by appealing to a middle of the road demographic (Zipes 1996, p.16). The films emerging from his company have favoured a conservative politics ever since.¹

The product marketing that accompanies any Disney release makes the fluffy toy which the publishers sold alongside *How Leo Learned to be King* look laughably amateur in the consumption stakes. Every aspect of the Disney Corporation aims for maximum profit. Disney's perception of the world as a market encourages the company to share the government's aim to keep the world open to US imports, or as Philips and Wojcik-Andrews put it, 'the expansion of the Disney "Empire" is coterminous with the expansion of the US Empire' (1996, p.78). These aims are apparently best achieved in the expressing of 'middle-American normative expectations' (Wood 1996, p.33).

Roth has studied *Pinocchio* (1940) in the light of Walt Disney's flirtation with Nazism (1996, pp16-18). Those represented as wicked or ludicrous in Disney films remain variations on the 1940's theme: ethnic minorities, communists, and homosexuals (Neff 1996). The films

support a largely conservative domesticated function for women, even as the heroines grow feistier (Maio 1998, pp. 12-14). These combine to form an ideological package familiar to that of Disney's intended audience (Wood 1996, p.33). While this ideology also marks much of the broader mass market film production in Hollywood, the attempt to persuade families with their children to see Disney's films can often lead to fewer attempts to challenge prejudices than might be tackled for an older audience; films for young adults contain some positive representations of all the marginalised groups mentioned above. Part of the ability to employ such outdated representations relates to the form; the disguising of categories within the apparently 'innocent' field of animation, particularly in those featuring animal characters, can lead to disingenuous comments by management: 'It's only a cartoon.'

That these film texts can be read as an endorsement of capitalism compared to the egalitarian, conscience-driven picture-book texts should not surprise. Pierre Bourdieu provides a theorisation of the process. His analysis of the workings of the 'fields of production' describes the anomalous position of the field of cultural production. In the distribution of power and respect, which he terms 'specific capital', this field runs two inverse hierarchies. In one part of the field of cultural production, the part in which cinema largely exists, the hierarchy runs parallel to that of the fields of economy and power, where financial rewards, bourgeois acclaim and prizes are valued (Bourdieu 1993, p.39). The bigger the film or the greater the sales of Bryce Courtenay's books, the more their producers value them. But in the field of cultural production's autonomous hierarchy, the inverse is true: 'Loser wins.' Here financial success, acclaim and prizes are the signs of having 'sold out,' and it is only the regard of other sanctified producers that can signal success. Having sold fewer copies of a work which is 'canonised' (p.34) by respected peers is considered a greater triumph in many quarters of the literary world than risking making money like Jeffrey Archer (p.38). The Disney Corporation relishes its alignment with the fields of economy and power.

A thoroughly Shakespearean understanding of the nature of kingship marks *The Lion King* by contrast with *How*

Leo Learned to be King. Here, kingship is an hereditary office and qualities that endorse supremacy mark the true holder of the throne. The sequel, *Simba's Pride* endorses and extends this intrinsic nature of royalty; when Princess Kiara seeks to distance herself from her destiny as future Queen, King Simba tells her, 'That's like saying you don't want to be a lion. It's part of you.' Conversely, a false king, gaining power by bloody crime, rules poorly. As in *Macbeth*, the kingdom is nearly ruined by the reign of the usurper. Re-making Shakespeare, the natural world echoes the moral judgement; here it works by withholding rain. When the crown prince, Simba (Hamlet), overcomes his hesitations and returns to overthrow his murderous uncle, fire and flood purge the land; his subjects are able to return as the territory becomes once more benevolent.² This vision of the nature of kingship is fitting for a tale that advocates capitalism. A benign monarchy is able to ensure the stability necessary to foster the market economy, here denoted 'the circle of life.'

Mufasa (Old Hamlet) delivers a message of stability to his son and the audience. He lectures his son on the benefits of the 'circle of life' where everyone is in their rightful place eating each other as necessary to maintain the balance. The families who view the film perceive how this balance works perfectly. All the herbivores seem happy with their lot and the lions' rule is benign; the grass is abundant and food is in plentiful supply. Roth has noted that the subject beasts bow down and worship their predators: they must love the king who eats them (1996, p.15). Does this mean we must love the multinational which feasts on our susceptibility? Perhaps it implies that we subjects must love this ideal autocratic government, even when its acts hurt.

That the 'circle of life' has economic as well as environmental overtones needs exploration. It is in the figuring of the film's villain that the links to capitalism become explicit. The bad uncle who tries to murder his nephew as well as his brother combines Claudius with a good dose of Richard III. Scar, who inherited from 'the shallow end of the gene pool' when it comes to strength, is able to manipulate his family to achieve the power he desires. The lush colour and gentle magnificence that mark Mufasa's territory and characterisation are absent

in Scar's scenes, slyness and physical puniness taint him, not to mention his upper-class English accent (Jeremy Irons' voice). His weakness feminises him and the illustration (as well as the nature of his rule) orientalises him. His realms are pictured in dark and gloomy tones matching the mood he inspires.

Scar's most dramatic scene is the one in which he sings 'Be Prepared' (a cynical overthrow of Boy Scout principles) in a display of bared teeth and ambitions. The devilish element to this character is underlined by the formation of an image from mediæval paintings of hell. Hyenas are cast across the walls of a chasm like demons, and flames shoot up from the depths. Other hyenas march past their leader in goose-step, clearly alluding to totalitarian and militaristic regimes, and as the song mounts to its crescendo, the camera's angle descends to have Scar silhouetted atop his pinnacle against a crescent moon, like hammer and sickle (or perhaps even signalling the Muslim nations).

With Scar in charge the economy falls into ruin. The 'totalitarian' implications of his troops' goosestep focus more closely on Eastern Bloc paradigms. Resembling lazy communist apparatchiks, Scar and his hyenas (lions' natural enemy in the wild) lie around depending upon the work of the old-order lionesses to feed them (something of Little Red Hen's lament again). The economy, as anyone who has sat smugly in the United States observing the communist nations for the last decades can tell you, will not survive this misuse, and the herds leave the dying Pridelands. The lionesses, verging on starvation, cannot convince Scar that the problem is beyond redemption; being Disney females, they must await the return of a male leader to deal with their problem (Roth 1996, p. 18).

Finally Simba decides to overthrow his uncle, having abandoned the flawed philosophy of 'hakuna matata' (Swahili for 'no worries' - or, loosely, 'If life turns its back on you, turn your back on life'). So, well-built scion of American economic principles fights the underhand tricks of the evil, misshapen usurper. Rafiki, the mad mystic baboon crowns the victor, who reassumes his hereditary right to the privileges and responsibilities of rule. Simba's mandate is religious, sanctioned by the supernatural powers that express their displeasure through the natural world and allow paternal ghosts to reappear to

steer their sons onto the proper path. This is underlined more strongly in *Simba's Pride*, where Mufasa's ghost appears almost god-like, delivering advice to the mystic and wafting spiritual breezes of blessing over official ceremonies. His voice sounds from the heavens, delivering a message of approval to Simba once the godly father's plans are executed.

The Cold War associations are taken further in the film's sequel. The Outsiders, the remnants of Scar's followers, lurk in miserable conditions inflaming their hatred of Simba, while Xera, Scar's widow, leads this 'shadow' pride in chanting their belief in the badness of Simba's pride. Kovu, Scar's son, is the chosen one, providing hope for the band of exiles. He absorbs Xera's incantations, until he has matured into their representative. This brainwashing is undermined by love and doses of good wholesome American fun. Like Eastern European athletes, he has to question 'the point of this training,' not recognising 'leisure activities' (of which, Disney might claim, movie-watching is the best). When he 'loosens up' enough to exclaim that the point-less activity is a 'blast' he gains the stamp of approval: 'You're ok, Kid.' Romantic love, orchestrated by the ghostly Mufasa and his 'priest', assists him in disentangling his distorted value system and trained evil from his naturally good self. Inhabitants of the former USSR will be relieved to note that Xera's followers desert her once she is proved wicked: it is only the communist leaders who are evil.³

Two 1998 animated films have drawn on the nightmare of the mechanised meaninglessness we perceive our technologised lives to be, and explore the fear of lives infinitely and pointlessly replicated. The nearest reflection of this anti-individualism in the animal kingdom is in the lives of 'super-organisms': giant colonies of workers devoted to the common good, such as bees and termites. Ants, the focus of both films, don't even get to fly as compensation. Both films reflect an ethos disturbed by an individual's inability to think for him or herself, in the face of inadequate leadership. The imagination of a visionary in both societies shatters the paralysis and, to varied degrees, the status quo, saving the colonies.

Antz is a Dreamworks production; the company established by Steven Spielberg (amongst others) has attempted to

challenge Disney's domination of the animated feature market. The film targets an older audience; both the story and the colouring are gloomier, with more sophisticated comedy. Woody Allen dominates the mood as well as the soundtrack. The ideological implications of the film are therefore somewhat different to those of the Disney family films. The life of these ants is regimented in a way that is analogous to the West's perceptions of automaton Soviet worker; even the dancing at the workers' bar after hours is announced over the tannoy and takes place with militaristic precision (to a doleful 'Guantanamera'). *Antz* flirts with a workers' revolution, threatening this ghastly predestined existence, with dissident workers meeting in whispered utterance about controlling the 'means of production.' Humanity's acceptance of the daily slog in the industrial machine is shaken when the ants are ordered to return to work and they ask, 'Why?'. The militaristic demagogue, General Mandible, however, swiftly reconverts them.

The dream of Utopia is explored and dismantled as Z, the protagonist, finds possible paradises of colourful consumption and hippy disaffection. The film implies that both are inadequate solutions: the gaudy wares for consumption at the picnic are barred to Z by plastic wrap, nor may Z remain in the 'bohemian' Insectopia outside the hard work and communal values of the Colony; it's ultimately meaningless. Once the threat of the insane army commander is ended, things return for him and the Colony to 'the way they were at the start'. This time, though, we are supposed to believe that the miserable Z's problems have been sorted by romantic love for the Princess and the knowledge that his existence is now the outcome of his own choice. While his life is presumably privileged as the new Queen's consort, the 'freedom' of existence achieved for his fellow worker ants is of a very limited sort.

The parallels between Z and his voice, Woody Allen, seem numerous; we are introduced to Z in a session of therapy and his concluding voice-over mentions his new, more satisfactory therapist. Allen's tiresome dilemmas seem as eternal as therapy, and perhaps this is why the failed revolution and minor alterations at the conclusion are enough to seem like changing 'the underlying social order' to Woody/Z, while creating no real change at all.

This film is proved ultimately to be aimed at adults in its dimming of the happy ending that appears nearly mandatory in films for children.

'The Little Red Hen' and *Farmer Duck* share a fear of parasitic creatures despoiling the riches earned by the diligent. This narrative was first recorded in Aesop's 'The Grasshopper and the Ants', which provides the plot kernel for Disney's *A Bug's Life*, a film which retains *The Lion King*'s respectful attitude to royalty and benign capitalism. The royal family of this colony appears restrictive mainly because it operates from the fear of gangster grasshoppers, and its resistance to change does not long outlast any obviously workable option. The inventive, therefore disruptive, individual, represented by Flik, is initially rejected by the powers that dominate this insect life. In contrast to *Antz*, however, he finally triumphs, having changed the nature of ant existence fundamentally.

Flik's clumsiness, and fear of retribution, drive him to seek 'bigger bugs' to help the colony meet force with force. Instead, he brings back circus bugs by mistake. While they are perceived to be warrior bugs, it is the circus bugs' ability to stage a good show, together with Flik's inventions, which enable the ants to join together and beat off the evil band. In this way, we perceive again the value that Disney attributes to the world of entertainment and its power to shape the social order. The changes in this colony are marked both in their new openness to innovation and also in their ability to party. As music, food and dancing herald the colony's liberation from external oppression and limiting tradition. The exuberant conga line here resembles the anti-festive dance of the workers in *Antz* only distantly. This understanding of the productiveness of inventor and capitalist sits comfortably with this vibrantly coloured work, the product of Disney's fostering of Pixar, home to some of the most innovative producers of computer animation. As in *Toy Story* (1995), they create a work that provokes as much wonder at the spectacle as identification with their protagonists.⁴

In *Lion King I* and *II* and *A Bug's Life*, Disney appears to endorse social stability. Both communities are content

with their monarchies. At the same time the films endorse the significance of enjoyment and the individual's right to party; presumably self-indulgence promotes consumption better than old-fashioned constraint. Both worlds address religion. On the savannah, mystical and patriarchal religion is at the core of stability, but *A Bug's Life* seems more questioning. The ants work through the summer to fill the 'offering table' with food for the appeasing of vengeful creatures, never seen as long as they are served with the respect they demand. The 'gods' of this world burst through the roof of the anthill when they are thwarted, proving to be violent stand-over men rather than deities. Fear provokes Flik's drive to a solution, so that the ants can keep the fruits of their labours, and in this way they are liberated from the restrictions and traditionalism which mar their lives and are able to provide for their own needs in a relatively liberated fashion. Does someone at Disney equate the tithes of religion with the unwarranted impost of taxation?

With heavenly paradise in doubt, these books and films explore an earthly version. The world inhabited by animals stands in opposition to the human world as potential idyll to contrast with the flawed and unjust world of adult humans, offering the prospect of an Arcadia in opposition to the dull sublunary world. For *A Bug's Life*, there is the possibility that the world of Ant Island can become a pastoral haven, with food plentiful for the ants' needs and a benign monarchy. *Farmer Duck* concludes in another bucolic fantasy. *Antz* contains an 'Insectopia' which escapes the rules and drudgery of the Colony, but really offers nothing but a 'vacation'. The 'pests' that inhabit it drawl in stoned voices about the meaning of life, but it is merely a hippy resort trapped outside a productive existence. The child represented for the Romantics the last escape of innocence before the prison-house of adult experience, and the Arcadias created by adults in these works are nostalgic fantasies; the child's world is the secret garden which can only ever be temporary.

These stories belong in the secondary world; there is no transition back to the primary world as necessary within Kipling's vision of a Jungle dependent upon the background law of the Raj. In the *Jungle Book*, British manhood allows the possibility of a positive humanity;

man counters the Jungle Law and fear of man limits the animals' actions.⁵ Within these contemporary works, humanity rarely intrudes except as a figure of danger or oppression, as in the farmer in *Farmer Duck* or the sneaker-wearing boy in *Antz* (typically it is giantised creatures that threaten the protagonists in tales for children.) Violence and injustice, often masculine, and always problematic, work as important factors within the life of the state as well as the individual, adult or child, so that the morals at the heart of these works can be read for their private and public significances.

Women have a limited role in the narratives and governments examined. The picture-books examine changes to the power structure from a worker's perspective; the analysis leaves the gender setting on 'default,' male. The Disney films express some ambivalence regarding women in power. In the Pridelands, a lioness in charge can be a sign of times out of joint and *Simba's Pride* features Xera as a kind of Lady Macbeth of villainous rule. Kiara's promised reign is made safe by her pairing with Kovu, and when Rafiki describes them reaching adulthood, he comments on the male's strength but the female's beauty. The insect fables overturn the rule that applies to the lion tales. In the insect realm, the breeder has been termed the 'queen' and so these two allegories feature governance as matriarchal. In *A Bug's Life*, Atta learns to take over from her mother as queen, both proving strong rulers and generally just. The threat to this rule from male violence is overturned by an individual's ingenuity, and community mindedness, without the need to inflict bloodshed themselves. In *Antz*, the Queen retains only the power of endless reproduction, worth little in the face of military cunning; sovereignty remains within the male gift, returned by her saviours to Bala in the film's final scene.

Waddell and Oxenbury evoke a very English image of socialism in opposition to the parasitic British ruling class, while Pfister has evoked a dull Utopia which is strongly democratic. The Hollywood version of these allegories of government seems to support a much more traditional notion of Kingship, which is inherited not only by primogeniture but also within a nobility of the blood, sanctioned by God and nature. Here it is a crime to

rise up against the monarch, not a public service. This conservative ideology allows the free play of an idealised market economy, where all are cared for, if only they accept their place. The insect allegories underline the need for individuals to accept their place only in circumscribed ways; it is the inventor and free-thinker, according to these films, who enable us to shake off foreign and domestic oppressors, to achieve either romantic love or inventor's capitalist success in peace.

NOTES

1. Although mainstream-radical messages seem to do quite well in some mass-market films. One observation from a conservative publication: 'I never understand why the Right makes such a fuss about sex and vulgarity: the sappiest - *Pocahontas*, say - that's where all the truly dotty propaganda slips through' (Mark Steyn, 'There's Something About Mary', *The Spectator*, 26 September 1998, p.57).
2. This *Hamlet* is rewritten as a formal comedy - the prince and his 'Ophelia' are joined, and their offspring marks hope for the future in the final image of the film. She also marks hope for a sequel, which was released in November 1998. In *Simba's Pride*, 'Romeo' and 'Juliet' are successful in overcoming their family's feud and return peace to their community. There is an interesting contrast in their childhood reactions to power. Simba, male protagonist of the first *Lion* opus, responds to impending power with impatience: he 'just can't wait to be King', desiring the freedom, and to be 'standing in the spotlight'. Kiara, heroine of the second film, desires to reject her 'royalty', allowing it to be only 'half' of who she is, and can see only restriction and responsibility.
3. It is this extension of the paradigm in the second *Lion King* that gives this Cold War reading equal validity with another political interpretation. Roth has marked Scar as that inadequate figure, the liberal politician, who panders to the underclasses until they ultimately destroy him. He provides welfare-like handouts, but pays no heed to the production of wealth which underpins a nation's well-being (Roth 1996).
4. One review remarks on the film's spectacle, exclaiming that *Toy Story* is a 'visual masterpiece that must truly be seen to be believed'. It then observes, 'That such astonishing amounts of money, technology, and highly-skilled labor were put to use in constructing a kiddie matinee presumably says something disturbing about American capitalism and culture, but we'd rather not think about it' (*The Sixth Virgin Film Guide*, 1997, London: Virgin, p.727).
5. *Antz* initially shares Kipling's world-view that the differences between groups are physical, just as Kipling's contemporaries viewed 'races'. The hopelessness this engenders in Z, and later Weaver, is partially overcome in the end as class and 'race' are overcome in the two romantic pairings.

REFERENCES

- Aesop (1990) *Aesop's Fables*. London, Pavilion.
- Foreman, Michael (1999) *The Little Red Hen*. London, Andersen Press.
- Kipling, Rudyard (1950) *The Jungle Book*. London, Macmillan.
- Orwell, George (1989) *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Pfister, Marcus (1998) *How Leo the Lion Learned to be King*. New York & London, North-South Books.
- Waddell, Martin & Oxenbury, Helen (1991) *Farmer Duck*. London, Walker Books.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Martin, Adrian (1998) 'Bugs' boundlessly imaginative world', in *The Age*, Thursday 3 December, p.23.
- McBratney, John (1992) 'Imperial subjects, imperial space in Kipling's *Jungle Book*', *Victorian Studies* 35, 3, 1992. pp. 277-293.
- Clarke, Chris (1998) 'Nature by Design: how Disney's treatment of animals has altered our sense of the wild', *New Internationalist* 308, December 1998, pp. 28-30.

Kramer, Peter (1998) 'Would you take your child to see this film? The cultural and social work of the family-adventure movie' in Neale, Steve & Smith, Murray *Contemporary Hollywood Cinema*, London & New York, Routledge, pp.294-311.

Maio, Kathi (1998) 'Disney's dolls', *New Internationalist* 308, December 1998, pp. 12-14.

Neff, Heather (1996) 'Strange faces in the mirror: the ethics of diversity in children's films', *The Lion and the Unicorn* 20, 1, pp.50-65.

Phillips, Jerry and Wojcik-Andrews, Ian (1996) 'Telling tales to children: the pedagogy of empire in MGM's *Kim* and Disney's *Aladdin*', *The Lion and the Unicorn* 20.1, pp.66-89.

Roth, Matt (1996) 'The Lion King: a short history of Disney-fascism', *Jump Cut* 40.

Stephens, John & McCallum, Robyn (1998) *Retelling Stories, Framing Culture: Traditional Story and Metanarratives in Children's Literature*. New York and London, Garland Publishing, pp.91-125.

Wood, Naomi (1996) 'Domesticating dreams in Walt Disney's *Cinderella*', *The Lion and the Unicorn* 20, 1, pp.25-49.

Zipes, Jack (1996) 'Towards a theory of the fairy-tale film: The case of *Pinocchio*', *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 20, 1, pp. 1-24.



FILMOGRAPHY

Antz (Dreamworks: Dir. Eric Darnell & Lawrence Guterman, 1998)

A Bug's Life (Disney and Pixar: Dir. John Lasseter & Andrew Stanton, 1998)

The Lion King (Disney: Dir. Roger Allers & Rob Minkoff, 1994)

The Lion King II: Simba's Pride (Disney: Dir. Rob LaDuca & Darrell Rooney, 1998)

Toy Story (Disney and Pixar: Dir. John Lasseter, 1995)



BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Lucy Hamilton is a PhD student at Monash University. She is researching representations of 'bad motherhood'. She is indebted to her young sons, without whose predilection for repetition she would never have been forced to deconstruct the texts discussed in this paper.

