

“My conscience is clear!”: Villainy in Two 1990s Disney Antagonists

Joni Jäntti
Master's thesis
English Philology
Faculty of Humanities
University of Oulu
Spring 2021

Abstract

This master's thesis examines how the Walt Disney Company portrays villainy in two antagonists of 1990s animated films. Children and adults alike have enjoyed Disney animated films as a form of entertainment for many decades. The period between 1989 and 1999, or the Disney Renaissance, generated several well received classics many of which have recently been made into live-action remakes.

The films examined in this thesis are *Pocahontas* (1995) and *the Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1996). The purpose of this thesis is to investigate how villainy is presented in the antagonists of these films and to clarify if at least some of the villainous traits overlap between the two antagonists. The analysis reveals that antagonists tend to reveal their villainous nature through songs and some traits, such as abusing one's office do indeed overlap between the antagonists part of this study.

Tiivistelmä

Tämä pro gradu -tutkielma tarkastelee, kuinka Walt Disney Company kuvailee kahden antagonistin roistomaisuutta kahdessa 1990-luvun animaatioelokuvassa. Sekä lapset että aikuiset ovat nauttineet Disneyn animaatioelokuvista viihteenmuotona jo useita vuosikymmeniä. Erityisesti Disneyn renessanssi, joka käsittää vuodet 1989–1999, loi useita menestyneitä klassikoita, joista monista on viime aikoina tehty uusintapainos, joka on näytelty.

Elokuviksi valikoituivat *Pocahontas* (1995) ja *Notre Damen kellonsoittaja* (1996). Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on tarkastella konnamaisuuden ilmentymistä näiden elokuvien antagonisteissa, sekä selventää konnamaisten piirteiden limittymistä kyseisissä antagonisteissa. Analyysin mukaan antagonistit paljastavat konnamaisuutensa laulujen kautta, sekä tietyt konnamaiset piirteet, kuten vallan väärinkäyttö, limittyvät tutkimuksen antagonisteilla.

Keywords: Film Studies, Disney, Villain, Antagonist, Race, Colonialism

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Description of the research material.....	6
2.1	The Walt Disney Company	6
2.2	The Antagonists	7
3	Theoretical and methodological framework	12
3.1	Film Theory	13
3.2	Description of villains and villainy	16
4	Analysis of the Antagonists.....	21
4.1	Governor Ratcliffe – “And all of the gold is mine”	21
4.2	Claude Frollo – “It is not my fault; I am not to blame”	31
5	Results	45
6	Discussion	49
7	Conclusion	52
8	List of references	53

1 Introduction

This thesis discusses villainy in the antagonists of two 1990s animated Disney films *Pocahontas* (1995) and *the Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1996). The period from 1989 to 1999 is considered as the Disney Renaissance; during the period, the company produced films that were mostly based on well-known stories. These films were both commercial and box office successes. (Sanza, 2018). Both Disney antagonists and villainy have been studied in the past. For instance, there are several studies that intersect with this study, such as *'This Burning Desire is Turning Me to Sin': The intrapersonal sexual struggles of two Disney singing villains* by McGill and *Handsome Heroes and Vile Villains: Masculinity in Disney's Feature Films* by Davis. While the latter focuses on sexual struggles of two villains, one of whom is part of this study, the former also focuses on heroes, which is not done in this study.

The research questions were formed after examining some of 1990s Disney films. The research questions are: 1) How is villainy portrayed in the two antagonists of this study? and 2) Do villainous traits overlap between the villains? The answer for the first research question begins with finding the definitions for villainy. It is not sufficient to just observe the films and then arbitrarily write whatever the researcher deems villainous. Instead, one must reinforce their arguments with evidence from earlier research and literature that help define villainy. The second research question can only be answered after the first one is answered by comparing the antagonists' traits. Since both films are created during the Disney Renaissance, the underlying assumption of this study is that some of the traits do overlap as if to follow the multiculturalist narratives of the 1990s.

The analysis suggests that both antagonists are, in principle, used as a critique against racism and prejudice which fits the contemporary discourse. During the 1990s multiculturalism was a subversive topic in politics and it challenged the established ways of understanding the public sphere. (Gamble, 2015, p. 273). For example, the relationship between democratic societies and multiculturalism was examined in terms of how democracy modified itself to accommodate multiculturalism (Barber, 2015, p. 300). Therefore, it was not surprising that even the Walt Disney Company wanted to participate in that discourse through its animated films. Both antagonists of this study are portrayed as especially prejudicious and hateful towards cultures that differ from their own. Moreover, they both are of European descent, emphasising how Eurocentrism has been deemed harmful to non-Western cultures. This is

evident in these two films as both antagonists are shown to have more power than the protagonists' cultures, revealing to audiences how oppressed these two non-Western cultures have been by people of European descent. Even though Romani people, who are originally from the Indian subcontinent, have lived in Europe for centuries, they first arrived in Europe during late 13th century (Kenrick, 2007, p. xix). Arguably, Romani people could be considered European. However, genetically they are of Indian descent.

Moreover, Disney films tend to follow the hero's journey template in which a protagonist, or a hero, receives a call to action and leaves old world (known) for a new world (unknown), defeats challenges and the antagonist(s) and returns to his old world as a master of both worlds. Interestingly, in these two films the antagonists are introduced early, even earlier than the protagonists. *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* is a particularly an antagonist-driven film because the antagonist, Claude Frollo, appears on screen for the majority of the film.

The antagonists' villainy can be argued to originate in emotions. While Disney antagonists are not actual human beings, but instead fictional characters, they are created to appear as human as possible. This, naturally, means that they must be portrayed as having the ability to feel human emotions. The Disney films over-exaggerate emotions to the point of mental illness: it is a considered normal response to feel sadness after being rejected by a person one really desires. It is, however, not considered mentally stable behaviour to abuse one's power to burn down a city in order to find the desired person and then imprison them only to have them decide between their captor and execution nor is it considered sane to lust for wealth and possessing a land so much that it drives one to commit genocidal acts. However, such extreme behaviour in antagonists is depicted with a certain purpose in mind. For instance, according to Kjelgaard-Christiansen, antagonists are created to be antipathetic characters that provoke audience's moral disapproval (Kjelgaard-Christiansen, 2019, p. 68). That is to say, antagonists, and their morality, are created to be hated. In principle, they are shaped into characters that audiences love to hate. Arenas argues that antagonists are made for us to discuss and speculate them and their motives. Furthermore, they can be described as textual patterns against which we project, for example, our fears and desires. (Arenas, 2011, p. 3).

On a related note, Disney animated films are usually aimed at younger audiences, but as the analysis of this study shows, they tend to include elements and themes that only older audiences might be able to comprehend. Because Disney films are usually seen merely as children's form of media, many may think that they cannot include any deeper meanings. One objective of this study is, indeed, to demonstrate that there might be meanings that are more intelligible to adults than to children, which could challenge adults to re-watch some of their favourite Disney animated films from childhood. Since Disney+ has arrived in Finland, re-watching the films is easier (and relatively cheaper) than ever before, making these great films of Disney Renaissance available for anyone interested in them.

This master's thesis is divided into two sections. The first section includes the description of the research material and theory and methodological framework while the second part consists of the analysis of the antagonists, results, discussion, and conclusion. The first section shall discuss villainy and villainous traits which shall be used as framework to aid the analysis in the second section. Lastly, the analysis and the research questions shall be discussed in the Results section to provide the results of this study.

2 Description of the research material

The material used in this study is gathered from two 1990s animated Disney films. The chosen films were *Pocahontas* (1995) and *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1996). The antagonists of these films are *Governor Ratcliffe* and *Claude Frollo*. Both films and antagonists have been studied in the past but the possible similarities that these two antagonists share have not been examined. These two films were chosen because they were produced consecutively in 1990s and the antagonists are introduced early in the plotline, allowing the researcher to observe them from the beginning to the end, making it easier to form a more complete analysis on them and their villainous acts. Moreover, their character development can be observed from the beginning to the end of the film. In addition, both antagonists are somewhat similar in their engagement in genocidal behaviour. Native Americans are protagonists in *Pocahontas*, while Romani people are an essential part of the *Hunchback of Notre Dame*. According to Byrne & McQuillan, both groups' otherness can be seen with ease as both groups are victims of a genocidal onslaught (Byrne & McQuillan, 1999, p. 134).

While both antagonists have a great deal of screen time, Claude Frollo appears on screen for the majority of the film and much longer than Governor Ratcliffe. Both films have a direct-to-video sequels which shall not be examined in this thesis. This section shall provide a backdrop for the productions by introducing the Walt Disney Company and moves to give only a brief description of the antagonists while the analysis shall provide a thorough discussion of them. The antagonists of these films shall be analysed by observing both films and using literature as a model for the analytical approach. The literature shall be introduced in the Theoretical and methodological framework section, while the observations shall be discussed in the Analysis section.

2.1 The Walt Disney Company

The Walt Disney Company (formerly known as the Walt Disney Productions) is an American corporation that was founded in the 1920s and is best-known for creating family entertainment. Its headquarters are in Burbank, California. The corporation reveals that its mission is to “entertain, inform and inspire people around the world through the power of unparalleled storytelling, reflecting the iconic brands, creative

minds and innovative technologies that make ours the world's premier entertainment company". (The Walt Disney Company, 2020)

The Walt Disney Company, or its culture, has been observed to combine artistry, business, and family values. It provides immersion in childlike fantasy, facilitated by media, technology and control, and mass consumption. The Walt Disney Company is dependent on other stories and ideas that are modified to impart a range of traditional and progressive values. This Disneyization can be viewed as a globalising force. That is to say the principles that are associated with the Walt Disney Company are spreading throughout the contemporary world. Disneyization especially helps import American culture across the globe, homogenising it. Many European stories have been Disneyized in the similar manner. (Bryman, 2004, p.2, 161; Wills, 2017, p. 4, 56). Both of the stories part of this study are, in fact, European narrations that have been Disneyized by the media giant: Pocahontas is loosely-based on the first English settlers, who seek to amass wealth, in North America and the original Hunchback of the Notre Dame is a novel by Victor Hugo, a French novelist.

While the antagonists of this study are part of works of fiction, the way in which villainy is being constructed and presented in these characters can be reflected in the operations of the Walt Disney Company itself: the company has expanded by purchasing many properties throughout its lifetime which further add to the media giant's net worth. According to Statista (2020) the company held assets worth a total of approximately 193.98 billion U.S. dollars in 2019. To summarise, the Walt Disney Company promotes values that it antagonises in its works, making the company seem, to a certain extent, hypocritical.

2.2 The Antagonists

In subsequent paragraphs, the two antagonists and the general premise of the films are briefly introduced. Firstly, in *Pocahontas* (1995), the antagonist is Governor Ratcliffe, who leads the Virginia company into North America to mine for gold in 1607. Ratcliffe himself does not take part in the mining. Instead, he is shown bathing and eating high-quality food while telling his men that he suffers from back pains and is, thus, unable to help them. He is very confident that the king will reward him handsomely after

returning to England with lots of gold. He holds a deep hatred towards the Native Americans, simply regarding them as savages who are to be killed on sight, and even wants to eradicate them all because he believes that they are hoarding all the gold of Virginia. (Pentecost, 1995.) He is portrayed as a large, dark-featured, obese male with a large, crooked nose and a receding chin.

In *Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1996), Claude Frollo, however, is the pious minister of justice in 16th century Paris. He is especially proud of his purity, and he relentlessly hunts the Romani people who inhabit the city. He regards them as mere vermin before encountering a beautiful Romani woman, *Esmeralda*. Claude Frollo develops an obsession for her, even though he deeply hates the Romani people, and he will either have her for himself or murder her. He will do anything to find her, even setting the city of Paris on fire. (Hahn, 1996.) Claude Frollo is depicted as a tall elderly man with a lean build and receding hairline. He is dressed in black robes that resemble those of a priest. Interestingly, both antagonists have sharp and sinister eyebrows.

Each antagonist of this study can arguably be viewed as an adaptation of previous works or events – fictional or not. It is, however, not relevant to closely examine the original portrayals of the said antagonists because the animated films do not feature accurate adaptations of them and instead, they are merely loosely based on the original works and/or events. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to introduce the original portrayals so that their existence is acknowledged as it inspired the Walt Disney Company to create these two commendable antagonists.

Governor Ratcliffe is based on John Ratcliffe, an English sailor who acted as the president of the governing colony of Virginia. Just like in the film, captain John Smith worked as John Ratcliffe's subordinate. (Montgomery, 2007, p. 38). Yet, instead of hunting the Native Americans of Virginia, he sought to trade with them. However, this led to his demise as he accused them of trading unfairly which, in turn, angered the chief of the Powhatan tribe who had him captured and tortured to death by flaying (Cyprus, 2021). Unlike his Disney film counterpart, John Ratcliffe did not ravage the land in search of gold and riches.

The Disney version of Claude Frollo is based on the Claude Frollo featured in the novel by Victor Hugo. In the novel, Claude Frollo is depicted as the archdeacon of Notre Dame rather than the minister of justice of Paris. Like his Disney counterpart he is tormented by his obsession for Esmeralda and is shown to be

conniving and cunning. However, he does not relentlessly pursue and prosecute the Romani people of Paris unlike the Claude Frollo that this thesis examines. (Hugo, 1831.) While the Disney depiction of Claude Frollo is not part of the clergy per se, he is made to appear as a priest. The animators of the film have openly admitted having modelled him after a priest. It is said that they did everything they could to visually indicate that he was supposed to be part of the clergy. Annalee Ward argues that Claude Frollo is presented as a religious leader in all respects except for the title. The association of the church implies that it is full of vice which Victor Hugo criticised in his novel. (Schweizer and Schweizer, 1998, p. 141; Ward, 2002, p. 75.)

The original depictions seem to be somewhat similar to the ones of this study. John Ratcliffe was the president of the governing colony of Virginia and Claude Frollo acted as the archdeacon of Notre Dame. While these were not the titles that they were given in the Disney films, they, nevertheless, were characters of high standing in their original depictions similar to their Disney counterparts. Most prominent similarities are John Ratcliffe's distrust of the Native Americans (both depictions consider them liars) and Claude Frollo's obsession for Esmeralda. There are, however, significant differences between the depictions. Neither of the antagonists prosecuted Native Americans or Romani people in the manner that they were prosecuted in the Disney films, making their film depictions over-exaggerated versions of their original counterparts. Another prominent difference is that John Ratcliffe was not necessarily a villain like he is in the Disney depiction. However, exaggerating a character's villainous traits is a method to make them as interesting a character as possible. It is due to this reason why both antagonists are made to appear as evil as possible. This could be due to the films being targeted towards younger audiences, making it easier to differentiate antagonists from protagonists.

Hollywood antagonists are often portrayed having mental and physical disabilities, linking their villainous behaviour to an ailment (Johnson, 2018). Similarly to Hollywood antagonists, the Disney antagonists of this thesis are presented in a similar manner as both are portrayed having at least either disability: Governor Ratcliffe is, for example, obese and Claude Frollo is delusional. Even if these characters are fictional, linking disabilities with villains can be considered unethical. That is to say, portraying antagonists with disabilities could antagonise people with disabilities.

Figure 1

Governor Ratcliffe arriving on a horse-drawn carriage. (Pentecost, 1995)



Figure 2

Claude Frollo upon hearing a man die from lashing. (Hahn, 1996)



3 Theoretical and methodological framework

It is relevant to examine the dialogues, deeds, and physical features of the antagonists. Watching the films while closely examining the antagonists was chosen as the methodology because it relies on the observations and interpretations of the researcher. Without one's own observations and interpretations, this study would only be a literature review of earlier research. The films shall be used as the primary source, while additional evidence for the analysis and discussion shall be drawn from secondary sources.

As it was stated above, there has been previous research on Disney villains. However, research that examines villainy and compares the villainy of two antagonists is scarce. Luckily, there is at least some research available to be used as a resource for this study: *This Burning Desire is Turning Me to Sin: The intrapersonal sexual struggles of two Disney singing villains* by McGill and *Handsome Heroes and Vile Villains: Masculinity in Disney's Feature Films* by Davis are perhaps the most compatible studies with this thesis. Therefore, these two papers shall be used as models for the analytical approach of this study. The former paper not only examines how two Disney villains, Gaston and Claude Frollo, express their sexual frustration through singing but also compares how they are portrayed, making the premises in the paper similar to the present thesis. The latter, however, examines both heroes and villains but the author classifies antagonists in certain types of villains based on their traits. This classification shall be used to help analyse the antagonists.

Additional material shall be drawn from studies that examine villainous traits and Disney villains to form the analysis. These studies include *Emerson Goes to the Films: Individualism in Walt Disney Company's Post-1989 Animated Films* by Justyna Fruzinska and *Villainy in Western Culture: Historical Archetypes of Danger, Disorder and Death* by Gregory Kendrick. While Fruzinska's study focuses on individualism, it also examines both antagonists. Kendrick, however, classifies antagonists in a manner that is similar to Davis, which helps classifying antagonists as certain types of villains, such as traitor and tyrant.

The two antagonists also display, for example, narcissistic behaviour to some extent. Such disorder has previously been studied in a fictional character in *Pathology in the Hundred Acre Wood: A Neurodevelopmental perspective on A.A. Milne* which examines, among other things, Rabbit's narcissistic tendencies (Gordon, Hawkins, Kawchuk, Shea & Smith, 2000, p. 3). Just like Rabbit in Winnie the Pooh, the antagonists of this study seek to be the centres of their respective worlds. However,

while Rabbit is not necessarily a villain of his world, he displays behaviour that is, to some degree, similar to the antagonists of this study. Moreover, literature on villainous traits, such as treason, sadism, and tyranny shall be used to gain further proof for the analysis.

The analysis shall be done by using the theory examined in this section. The theory shall be applied to the researcher's own observations of the two antagonists. The findings shall be further discussed in the Results section.

3.1 Film Theory

According to Thomson-Jones, the term "film" can be defined as an art form that uses different types of physical media, for example, videos and digital formats (Thomson-Jones, 2008, p. 1). Since this thesis examines antagonists that are presented in films, it is important to examine film theory as a part of the methodological framework. Bettinson & Rushton describe film theory as a field of inquiry in which several discrete theories of cinema are gathered. In other words, there is no uniform "film theory" that scholars approve in unison. (Bettinson & Rushton, 2010, p. 1). Buckland argues that if film theory is to advance further, it must establish the grounds for disagreement among its multiple schools and needs to identify misunderstandings (Buckland, 2000, p. 4).

Notably, Noël Carroll states that film theory was historically considered to be a singular theory which sought to answer every question one had about films. However, this singular view on film theory contrasts a view which suggests thinking in terms of plural film theories. Moreover, Carroll argues that film theory should not be confined to only theorise the stylistic features of films. (Carroll, 1996, p. 38-39.) Therefore, it is important to examine different film theories that are relevant to this study. Such theories include race film theory, postcolonial film theory, and cognitive film theory. While not necessarily part of film theory, film language, too, shall be examined along with the above-mentioned theories in the following paragraphs.

Race film theory studies how people of colour are represented, or misrepresented, in films. Furthermore, race film theory attempts to find ways in which people of colour are portrayed as equals to whites in

order to show that there is humanity in every human being while even endorsing oppressed people to fight their oppressors. (Bettinson & Rushton, 2010, p. 90, 99.) Both films of this study, arguably, examine groups of people of colour from this point of view. Firstly, the films of this study seek to portray people of colour in a positive light by featuring them as protagonists while making antagonists white and European. Secondly, the films aim to show that people are fundamentally equal. It is wicked people, such as the antagonists of this study, who mislead people to think otherwise, prosecuting people of colour. Both antagonists, however, are removed from power when their villainy and wickedness is discovered by others.

Similarly to race film theory, postcolonial film theory examines films that give positive voices to colonised peoples in order to allow them to narrate their stories. Moreover, films like these tend to show how the oppressed fight their oppressors, making postcolonial films effectively anti-colonial. (Bettinson & Rushton, 2010, p. 94.) Both *Pocahontas* and *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* fall into this category as they feature peoples that are oppressed by antagonists of European descent. Additionally, the films are mainly narrated from the point of view of the oppressed, who are forced to fight their oppressors, making them anti-colonial. *Pocahontas*, especially, explores the first English settlers in Virginia. However, instead of befriending the Powhatan tribe of Native Americans, they attempt to drive them off Virginia through force and ravage the land for its minerals.

Bordwell claims that ever since it gained entrance into university, the field of film studies has been dominated by interpretation over analysis and evaluation. Additionally, the process of interpretation has become highly regulated to fit the institutional norms even though that said process is still constructive by being inferential. (Thomson-Jones, 2008, p. 91.) That is to say, the faculties dictate policies that define how to interpretate films accordingly. According to Bettinson & Rushton, cognitive film theory investigates the spectator's comprehension of cinematic texts. It seeks to answer what procedures are typical in the act of film viewing. (Bettinson & Rushton, 2010, p.156, 160.) That is to say, cognitive film theory explores how audiences perceive and interpret films. Bordwell states that it is possible to understand the plot of a film while remaining wholly oblivious to its more abstract symbolism. He divides this phenomenon into comprehension and interpretation. (Bordwell, 1989, p. 2.)

While Disney films are relatively easy for children to comprehend, since they are aimed for younger audiences as a form of entertainment, it is unlikely that children are unable to interpret the films' more complex meanings. In other words, it might be easy for younger audiences to understand how the plot unfolds in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* without realising its sexual and religious themes. Therefore, it is important to interpretate both films and seek the themes that are relevant for the analysis.

Given that human languages must be learnt by understanding the conventions that govern the meaning of words and grammar, it can be argued, that film works like a human language. Film is often explained regarding one's inherent skill to understand what is shown on the film screen. (Thomson-Jones, 2008 p. 57.) Considering Thomson-Jones' proposition, film, arguably, functions like a human language. Humans have an innate understanding of language, making it as natural to learn a language as flight is for birds. However, Thomson-Jones claims that if one is to read a film like a language, the understanding of films is not inherent after all (Thomson-Jones, 2008, p. 57). To gain a better understanding of what film language is, one must first find definition(s) for it.

Polikarpova defines film language as 1) a set of filming techniques that are presented in a film, such as filming and editing, 2) viewer perception and understanding of the film, and 3) when the film transmits something to the audience, making viewing an act of communication. (Polikarpova, 2019, p. 26). Polikarpova's definitions of film language are shared by Thomson-Jones, who claims that images in films are individual shots that are combined into sequences through editing (Thomson-Jones, 2008, p. 58). This process, arguably, works similarly to human language as individual segments, such as pictures, that would have little meaning on their own, are strung together to create meaningful sentences of (film) language. These segments can convey different meanings based on, for example, the camera angle, shots, movement, and focus, making it significantly important to observe the camera movement when interpretating films. Additionally, arguably, Polikarpova incorporates the above-mentioned comprehension and interpretation as part of film language. Bonsignori supplements Polikarpova's definitions of film language by stating that film language shares several traits with spontaneous conversation even if the language used in films is, in fact, artificial as it is written by scriptwriters who are not actually part of the film proper. (Bonsignori, 2013, p. 60-61.) While the audience is unable to participate in conversations in films, they are transmitted to them, proving that viewing is, indeed, an act of communication.

Film language, it would seem, is an integral part of theory of this thesis. That is to say, it is important for the researcher to acquaint themselves with above-mentioned film theories that are applicable to this thesis so that it would be as comprehensible as possible.

3.2 Description of villains and villainy

To understand what are the attributes that make Disney antagonists villains, one must first find definition(s) for the word villainous. According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, the definitions for the word are “befitting a villain (as in evil or depraved character) and being or having the character of a villain, depraved” or “highly objectionable, wretched” The above-mentioned definitions reveal that being objectionable is considered villainous. However, they do not reveal what it is to have the character of a villain. Therefore, it is more important to examine mannerism and acts that are considered villainous instead of merely looking at the definitions of the said word.

A fictional villain, arguably, should have a motivational dimension. They must be able to change the world around them by using their will. Moreover, villains should be adaptive so that they may have alternative ways of reaching their goals and have a certain degree of self-awareness. (Arenas, 2001, p. 7). An unadaptable antagonist could be considered shallow and too predictable, making them uninteresting. While wild animals and natural disasters can be considered as villains, they are not connected to ethics and morality. Anthropomorphic villains, however, can be connected to ethics and morality and thus viewed as negative figures against expected humane behaviour. (Arenas, 2001, p. 7). Both Governor Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo change the world around them: Ratcliffe has Virginia mined for gold and Claude Frollo has Paris burned, they employ a wide variety of tools, such as other people, and cunning, such as lying, to reach their goals. Self-awareness, albeit lacking, is visible when Ratcliffe admits that he has never been a popular man and when Claude Frollo is confronted for murdering an innocent woman. As antagonists, Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo convey exaggerated emotions of, for example, greed and hate. That is to say, they are portrayed in such manner so that the audience is able to see that they lack morality and are opposed to humane behaviour, leaving little room for doubt whether they are good or evil. In principle, antagonists’ morality is opposed to the morality of the contemporary society, thus acting as a lesson in evil for children.

Disney antagonists can be considered great villains because they are depicted to be bad and wicked through a design that eliminates realism (Davis, 2014). This is to say, audience is intrigued by the antagonist because the developers and animators are not bound by the laws of the real world. Due to this, they are free to create characters with little regard to realism. The antagonists, however, are often based on real characters but they deviate from the original source material, bringing new aspects to the old characters rather than just recycling them as they are.

There are several different types of villains or villain archetypes. Davis identifies six basic types of villains based on their traits: *Pirate Kings*, *Enemies of the Earth*, *Magically Dangerous Villains*, *Criminally Dangerous Villains*, *Comic Villains*, and *Idiot Villains*. (Davis, 2014) She classifies the two antagonists of this study in the following way: Governor Ratcliffe could be described as an *enemy of the earth* with some aspects of a *comic villain* and Claude Frolo a *criminally dangerous villain* as well be discussed in what follows.

Kendrick identifies three types of villains that can be further divided into sub-types. These main types are the *villain as "other"*, the *villain as agent of discord and disorder*, and the *villain as pathology*. (Kendrick, 2016, p. 7, 59, 179). Some of the sub-types are, but are not limited to, the villain as tyrant, the villain as traitor and the villain as sociopath. While Kendrick does not classify Disney villains to any of the above-mentioned types, they shall be used as secondary sources to help analyse the two antagonists of this study.

Next, it is important to examine some of the above-mentioned basic types of villains to help form the analysis and the discussion sections. Villain types that are not an essential part of this study shall be omitted because it is not necessary to examine those types in detail. It can be argued that the antagonists of this study are more overlapping than they are in Davis' categorisation. This hypothesis shall be examined later in the discussion section.

Enemies of the earth are characterised by their need to exploit the environment (the land, its native peoples, and its native species). These villains do not often hold personal grudges against the stories' heroes, but instead target the heroes because they oppose the villains' greed and impact on the environment. (Davis, 2014). Governor Ratcliffe is a good example of an enemy of the earth because his objective is to mine for gold in Virginia and he sees the Native Americans as savages who hoard the land's gold.

Criminally dangerous villains are driven by their delusions of grandeur. This is to say, these kinds of villains consider themselves to be centre of their worlds and they think they are entitled to do anything they deem righteous. (Davis, 2014). While it was stated above that Claude Frolo can be categorised as a criminally dangerous villain, this shall be examined in the analysis. In addition, it shall be investigated whether Governor Ratcliffe fits into this category.

According to Davis, *comic villains* are made to be entertaining to watch. Their objective is to destroy the hero(es) who attempt to hinder their progress of taking over the world. These types of villains usually – almost – succeed in destroying their opposition only to become over-confident, which subsequently causes them to make a decisive mistake at the most crucial moment, leading to their downfall. (Davis, 2014). Arguably, both antagonists can be seen as comic villains according to this description which shall be proven in the analysis.

The villain as “other” can be divided to two sub-types: the villain as nature and the villain as barbarian. The former identifies nature as the main antagonist, making wild beasts and natural disasters among these types of villains (Kendrick, 2016, p. 13). The latter sub-category, however, identifies barbarians as villains. Pocahontas features an excellent example of this which shall be further investigated as Governor Ratcliffe is analysed. Claude Frolo, however, does not fit into this category as the whole setting of the film is in Paris – Claude Frolo’s habitat.

The villain as agent of discord and disorder can be divided to three sub-types: tyrant, traitor, and femme fatale (Kendrick, 2016, p. 60-62). Since none of the antagonists of this study can be described as femme fatales, that sub-type shall not be examined further. There are many ways to define the term “tyrant”. Tyrants can be described as villains who are bestowed with absolute power, which they use to reach objectives that may negatively impact the welfare of their subjects. Tyrants are also associated with violent and unfair regimes. (Newell, 2012, p. 1–2; Kendrick, 2016, p. 78) In principle, both antagonists are tyrants since they enjoy absolute power in their respective worlds. However, both are subjects to even greater powers than themselves: Ratcliffe arrives in Virginia at the behest of his king, James I, and Claude Frolo claims to work under God himself. These above-mentioned greater powers are physically absent from the worlds of these antagonists, allowing them to enjoy absolute power in their respective worlds.

Traitors are one of the most hated characters. Treason is regarded as one of the oldest political crimes in human history. It is considered to be one of the most serious betrayals of one’s own state and is usually

punishable by death. Dante's ninth circle of hell, for instance, is reserved to those who have committed treason during their lifetime. It is the lowest and, subsequently, the worst place in hell. (Head, 2011, p. 95–96; Kendrick, 2016, p. 102) Both Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo see those who oppose them as traitors and threaten them with death, revealing tyrannical behaviour. In addition, the definitions of traitor depend on one's point of view; tyrants consider opponents of their regime as traitors, while the very same opponents of tyranny view tyrants as traitors to their freedom (Kendrick, 2016, p. 106). Claude Frollo, in particular, can be considered true to both these definitions.

The villain as pathology is comprised of two sub-types: sociopaths and psychopathic murderers (Kendrick, 2016, p. 185). The latter is not necessary to examine further as there are no psychopathic murderers among the antagonists of this study. The former, however, shall be examined in the analysis.

Throughout history various groups have engaged in genocide but the term itself is relatively new as it was coined in the 20th century (Cooper, 2009, p.1). It is considered to be the most severe crime against humanity. Genocide can be defined as any of the following five acts committed with intent to destroy, wholly or partially, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group, as it stands: A) murdering members of the group. B) Causing grievous physical or mental harm to members of the group. C) Intentionally inflicting on the group conditions of life that cause, wholly or partially, its destruction. D) Imposing measures intended to prevent births with the group E) Forcibly relocating the children of the group to another group. (Cooper, 2009, p. 3).

Both Governor Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo display genocidal intent as they are, at least, engaged with the acts B and C of the list above. Governor Ratcliffe does not, *de facto*, engage in the act A of the list as he merely threatens to murder the Native Americans but only manages to injure one member of the group. However, Ratcliffe does cause grievous mental and physical harm to the group because he not only threatens the group with the loss of habitat, by claiming the land for himself, but also imposes on the Native Americans conditions that could cause their destruction by bringing the Virginia company with him to mine for gold. While the gold mining itself does not threaten the Native Americans' way of life, Ratcliffe's warlike nature and ruthlessness do as he eventually declares a war on the Powhatan tribe. While the destruction of the Powhatan tribe is not Ratcliffe's main objective, it is necessary for him as he deems them to obstruct him from finding gold.

Claude Frollo, the minister of justice of Paris, however, is engaging in almost every act on the list. In the epilogue of the film, it is shown how he murders a Romani woman, and relentlessly pursues, and subsequently prosecutes, the Romani people of Paris, forcing them to hide, lest they be tortured and killed. After murdering the Romani woman, Claude Frollo forcibly relocates her child from their group into his group, preventing the child from growing up in the Romani culture and the child is instead exposed to Claude Frollo's neglecting upbringing, confining the child in Notre Dame's bell tower, and forcing them to see themselves inferior to other people. Moreover, Claude Frollo manipulates the child to believe that he is the only trustworthy person in the world that is allegedly evil.

As it is stated above, both antagonists are, undoubtedly, versatilely evil. Among other things, both consider themselves entitled to everything, have genocidal intent, and are tyrannous (and traitorous). As the literature suggests, these traits are villainous, making both characters, explicitly, evil.

4 Analysis of the Antagonists

The observations on the antagonists' villainous traits shall be analysed in this section. The analysis shall rely on the researcher's own observations and interpretations, drawing on the literature and findings of other scholars discussed in the previous section. This section is divided into two sections each of which is dedicated to one of the two antagonists. Governor Ratcliffe shall be analysed in the first section, followed by Claude Frolo in the second one. The results of the analysis shall be discussed in the Findings section.

4.1 Governor Ratcliffe – “And all of the gold is mine”

The film tells the story of the Virginia company's journey to North America as the first English settlers. They are blinded by a rumour that the “new world” is filled with riches such as gold. However, it eventually becomes clear that there is no gold to be had. The film presents audience a contrast between possession and spirituality, latter of which is favoured, and seen as virtue, as the Native Americans of Virginia help the Englishmen redeem themselves off their greed.

According to Davis, Governor Ratcliffe can be considered an enemy of the earth because he is a direct threat to the environment and its native people (Davis, 2014). Moreover, he displays villainous traits such as barbarianism, tyranny, treason, and even sociopathic behaviour. Whitley argues that Governor Ratcliffe only wants to ravage Virginia for its resources and is obsessed with replicating the Spanish discovery of gold that is introduced during the film (Whitley, 2012, p. 83). Throughout the film it is evident that Governor Ratcliffe is only interested in possessing and increasing wealth. His desperation and deceit make him a ruthless antagonist who has little regard for people who are different from him.

Next, it is important to observe the antagonist and how he is presented in the film. The chronological order was chosen because it, arguably, makes it easier to follow the plot and character development of the antagonist. At the beginning of the film, when Ratcliffe arrives on a horse-drawn carriage, a red carpet is drawn only for him and his entourage, one of which is a dog, implying that only he is worthy of such

praise. Rows of guardsmen can be seen saluting him as he prepares to board the ship. As he walks up the gangplank, rats, Ratcliffe's namesake, can be seen entering the ship via a rope. Davis points out that as Ratcliffe is first introduced to the audience, the song "*Virginia Company*" begins a verse which almost perfectly introduces Ratcliffe's ambitions (Davis, 2014).

On the beaches of Virginny [sic]. There's diamonds like debris.
There's silver rivers flowin'. Gold you pick right off a tree.
With a nugget for my Winnie and another one for me.
And all the rest'll go to the Virginia Company.
It's glory, God and gold and the Virginia Company. (Menken & Schwartz, 1995)

The lyrics reveal that the men of the Virginia Company have high, and rather unrealistic, expectations of the new world. These expectations, obviously, are ultimately proven false during the film. However, they are sufficient to lure adventurous men to serve under Governor Ratcliffe and join him on the journey to Virginia. While religion is not really part of his ambitions Ratcliffe definitely is after gold and glory on the beaches of Virginia.

After the ship departs for Virginia, there is a thunderstorm at sea. As the crew works hard to keep the ship afloat, Ratcliffe is nowhere to be seen. After one man is thrown overboard by the storm, and subsequently saved by the deuteragonist, John Smith, Governor Ratcliffe emerges from his cabin and asks if there is trouble on deck. When he is told that a crewmember was rescued from sea, he fakes concern by thanking heavens for the rescue. Ratcliffe gives his men a brief motivational speech, encouraging them to complete the journey. He tells them that they are the finest men that England has to offer and no storm nor "a thousand bloodthirsty savages" can stop them. By "bloodthirsty savages" Ratcliffe refers to Native Americans — human beings whom he deeply hates. According to Whitley, the Native Americans of Virginia are seen as obstacles to be eliminated for Ratcliffe in his quest for gold (Whitley, 2012, p. 83).

After his speech Ratcliffe returns to his cabin while telling his assistant, who compliments his speech, that, referring to his crew, he needs "those witless peasants" to mine his gold for him. This reveals a duplicitous trait in Ratcliffe, making him a liar, because he does not consider his crew to be finest in

England. Instead, he regards them to be mindless peasants who are mere tools for his gold mining operations. This is more evident in clothing: Ratcliffe's clothes are purple, which used to be a highly valuable colour associated with power and wealth (Dunn, 2013), while the crew is dressed in grey and brown clothes that almost blend into the background. According to Fruzinska, Ratcliffe differs so much from others in Virginia company that once, at the end of the film, he becomes the only one responsible for the racial hatred, it could be ascribed to his aristocratic decadence. The crew mates, however, can be considered innocent and good-hearted, albeit blinded. (Fruzinska, 2014 p. 82-83).

Immediately when the Virginia Company arrives in the New World, Ratcliffe states that it is full of gold waiting for him. As he looks into a mirror, he admits that he has never been a popular man and this voyage is his last chance for glory, revealing a desperate side that motivates him to please King James I for his own glory. This scene allows audience to sympathise with Ratcliffe. Even though he clearly is evil, he is motivated by desperation and a will to be successful.

As the film progresses, after sending John Smith to determine the whereabouts of the Native American peoples, Ratcliffe has his men start digging for gold. He justifies his actions because the Spanish have, for years, "ravaged the New World of its most precious resources". Furthermore, he states that now it is their turn to do so and initiates a song called *Mine, Mine, Mine*. In that song he clearly exposes some of his ambitions and villainous traits.

It's mine, mine, mine for the taking. It's mine, boys. Mine me that gold! [...] Keep on working, lads. Don't be shirking, lads. Mine, boys, mine. Mine me that gold. Beautiful gold. Make this island. My land! [...] I'd help you to dig, boys But I've got this crick in me [sic] spine [...] And the gold is Mine! Mine! Mine! (Menken & Schwartz, 1995.)

These lyrics indicate that Ratcliffe is obsessed with acquiring wealth and making the whole land his own. Instead of helping his men mine the gold, he encourages them to mine it for him, by firing his gilded pistol in the air, signifying the beginning of the gold hunt. Furthermore, Ratcliffe lies to his men that he has back pains and is unable to help them mine even though he can clearly be seen dancing and imitating digging throughout the song. He has little regard to his liege, King James I, or the Native Americans as he believes that he is the rightful owner of the land and its riches. The Powhatan tribe of Native

Americans has no place in his Virginia as he even orders his men to drive them from their shore. Arguably, as per Davis' categorisation, Governor Ratcliffe can also be seen as a criminally dangerous villain because he considers to be entitled to Virginia and all the gold that the land may hold all the while regarding himself to be the centre of the land as it is explored, in the lyrics of the song.

Ratcliffe's traitorous and tyrannical tendencies are also exposed during the same song. At one point of the song he is imagining himself to be back in England. While wearing clothes made of gold, Ratcliffe steals King James' sceptre and crown and has him bow at his feet. Afterwards a portrait of King James I is taken to Ratcliffe and he ruins it by pushing his head through the portrait at the place of King James' head, implying that he is considering overthrowing the king. The lyrics of the song during these two sequences provide further evidence of Ratcliffe's traitorous and tyrannical tendencies, which are part of his delusions of grandeur:

My rivals back home. It's not that I'm bitter.
But think how they'll squirm when they see how I glitter!
The ladies at court. The king will reward me.
He'll knight me, no, lord me!
[...] My dear friend, King Jimmy, will probably build me a shrine
when all of the gold is mine. (Menken & Schwartz, 1995.)

As the song ends, Governor Ratcliffe is seen standing on a mound with a victorious expression while holding onto a Union Flag. Unbeknownst to him, some Native Americans are scouting the camp and the mining operations. As they are discovered, Ratcliffe orders everyone to arm themselves, because he considers it an ambush. Instead of hiding, Ratcliffe joins his men to battle the Native Americans and manages to injure one while his men hit none. As his men are celebrating the victory, he tells them to quiet down because the Native Americans will eventually return to attack them. Ratcliffe then orders his men to finish building the fort and bring cannons ashore. By building a fort and revealing that they had brought cannons with them Ratcliffe reveals that he had anticipated the Native Americans to attack them, albeit they only sought to investigate their motives. This exemplifies that Ratcliffe sees them as warmongers that cannot be reasoned with without an armed conflict, while he is the one who initiated

the gun fight and even willingly participated in it even though he was initially shown to be reluctant to help his men build the camp.

As an enemy of the earth, Ratcliffe does not only endanger the environment. He also poses a threat to the native peoples of the environment. Furthermore, Ratcliffe and his men can be viewed as barbarians. According to Kendrick barbaric villains vary significantly and are not necessarily uncivilised people but could instead hail from a society with technology superior to that of the protagonist's society. Lack of morality could also make societies barbaric. (Kendrick, 2016, p. 34, 59). The Virginia Company's technology is more advanced than that of the Powhatan tribe. However, Virginia company's morality, or the lack of it, presents a direct threat to the environment and the Powhatan tribe.

Moreover, it is evident that the Virginia company never had peaceful intentions with the Native Americans: they brought with them firearms and cannons and Ratcliffe had his men begin to build a fort as soon as they disembarked. Moreover John Smith, a man who allegedly had experience in waging war with the Native Americans, was brought along. The reprise of the song led by John Smith, *Virginia Company* further reveals the morality of the Virginia company: "We'll kill ourselves an Injun [sic] or maybe two or three. We're stalwart men and bold of the Virginia company". (Menken & Schwarz, 1995.) The lyrics reveal that to be a stalwart man of the Virginia company, one must be willing to murder Native Americans, exposing the morality of the Virginia company.

Fruzinska argues that it is clear from the beginning of the film who the good and the bad characters are: the colonial Englishmen are motivated by greed and the spirit of possession while the Native Americans favour spirituality. However, all Englishmen but Ratcliffe are eventually redeemed by Smith, leaving Ratcliffe as the sole perpetrator for the imperialism and greed. (Fruzinska, 2014, p.76, 82). In principle, Ratcliffe's men are merely misled by him and when they are redeemed by Smith, who is initially as misled as the others, they turn on him for misleading them and inciting them to attack the Native Americans.

As his men dig for gold, only to find nothing while growing agitated, Ratcliffe becomes more desperate and thinks that the Native Americans are hiding his gold. As John Smith returns to the camp from his patrol to tell everyone that that the Native Americans in Virginia are different and they should not fight

them because they have no gold, Ratcliffe tells him that they are only lying to him because they are “savages”. He continues and states that anyone who does not shoot a native American on sight is considered a traitor and shall be executed. A scene is shown where John Smith and Governor Ratcliffe are facing each other, revealing John Smith’s light and attractive features and Ratcliffe’s dark and unattractive features. This presents the viewer with a strong contrast between light and attractive and dark and unattractive.

Due to the previous scene with Ratcliffe, as Smith sneaks away from the camp once again to see the eponymous protagonist Pocahontas, Ratcliffe has one of his men follow him. Pocahontas tells Smith that the Powhatan tribe plans to attack the Virginia company because they are perceived as a threat to them. Eventually they share a kiss, but a Powhatan warrior witnesses it and attempts to slay Smith in a jealous rage, only to be shot by the Ratcliffe’s man who followed Smith. Subsequently, Smith is captured by the Native Americans to be executed in the following morning.

Consequently, upon hearing that Smith has been captured by the Native Americans, Ratcliffe states that the situation is perfect, and the alleged gold is as good as his because he can now justify an attack on the Native Americans. The song “*Savages*” provides multiple instances where Ratcliffe shows his barbarianism and how he is an enemy of the earth. When Ratcliffe starts singing the song, torches are lit and the colours red, orange, and purple become emphasized in the characters and the background. Eventually, even the sky changes into sanguine, and a single thunderbolt can be seen. Ratcliffe wears a black armour and even his eyes take on a red colour. The lyrics emphasize his wrath towards the Native Americans as Ratcliffe marches his men to wage war against them:

What can you expect from filthy little heathens? Here’s what you get when races are diverse. Their skin’s a hellish red. They’re only good when dead. They’re vermin, as I said. [...] They’re savages! Savages! Barely even human [...] Drive them from our shore! They’re not like you and me, which means they must be evil! We must sound the drums of war! [...] What are we waiting for? Destroy their evil race until there’s no trace left. (Menken & Schwartz, 1995.)

As an enemy of the earth, Ratcliffe goes so far that he shows genocidal tendencies. It is not enough for him to just drive Native Americans out of Virginia, a land which Ratcliffe has already claimed his property: Ratcliffe wants them all dead and again encourages his men to do all the work for him, while emphasizing that the Native Americans are evil savages only to be annihilated and erased from history. Ironically, Ratcliffe refers to the Native Americans as vermin even though his name, and nature, suggests that he is the only vermin in Virginia. Europeans might have introduced the black rat into America (Rejmanek & Simberloff, 2011, p. 574) but Ratcliffe introduced himself into America, posing as a direct threat to the native population.

The Native Americans of Powhatan tribe reciprocate Ratcliffe's lyrics, revealing that they, too, have prejudicious tendencies against the Englishmen:

This is what we feared. The paleface is a demon. The only thing they feel at all is greed.
Beneath that milky hide, there's emptiness inside. I wonder if they even bleed.
They're savages! Savages! Barely even human. Savages! Savages! Killers at the core.
They're different from us which means they can't be trusted. We must sound the drums of war. (Menken & Schwarz, 1995.)

The lyrics create a juxtaposition by showing how similar the two groups are. First, both groups claim that the other group's skin colour has diabolical associations: "their skin's a hellish red" and "the paleface is a demon". Both groups dehumanise each other by claiming that the members of the other group are savages that are barely even human. Xenophobia is a prominent theme in the song as both groups claim that the other group cannot be trusted due to being different from them. Finally, both groups are ready to wage war as they claim they are obliged to sound the drums of war. This shows that Ratcliffe, while being the catalyst for the conflict, is not the only one with villainous features. The Powhatan tribe, arguably, merely reciprocates Ratcliffe's prejudice and hate. In Native American culture trading is not only reciprocal, but it is also an honour, meaning that it is as much an honour to give as it is to receive. Therefore, because it is such an honour to receive, there is also an obligation to give. (Adamson & Berry, 2000). Hence, the Powhatan tribe's hatred towards Ratcliffe can also be seen as trading which they are obliged to return as it is their honour to do so.

Arguably, Ratcliffe projects his own barbarianism on the Native Americans of Powhatan tribe. Rather than treating Native Americans as equal human beings, Ratcliffe considers them savages and barbarians. However, the Powhatan tribe treats the Englishmen and Ratcliffe similarly. As it is stated above, societies that are advanced are not immune barbarianism meaning that they, too, can display barbaric behaviour. Ratcliffe does not only display barbarianism but also projects it on the Powhatan tribe as he deems the Englishmen to be civilised and the Native Americans mere savages. However, Ratcliffe invades Virginia, ravages it for resources and attempts to slaughter the peaceful and spiritual Native Americans, making him very barbaric. Rather than realising his own barbaric behaviour, he merely projects it upon people who are different from him.

After the song, the tension between the two groups is highly visible but nothing grievous has happened yet. The chief Powhatan attempts to execute Smith, but Pocahontas intervenes by throwing her body on Smith. Subsequently, the chief decides not to execute Smith since he sees how much Pocahontas, his only daughter, loves him. He announces that anger has brought the two groups here and if there is to be more killing, it would not start with him. Rays of light and colourful leaves are seen flying towards the chief as he delivers his speech to everyone present. Ratcliffe sees this as an opportunity and orders his men to attack the Powhatan tribe, but instead they refuse, stating that they (the Native Americans) do not want to fight them. Ratcliffe is angered by his men who are reluctant to fight, claiming that the Native Americans are lying, and quickly seizes a rifle to attempt to assassinate the Powhatan chieftain. However, the bullet is intercepted by the deuteragonist John Smith, who is seriously injured and Ratcliffe is subsequently captured. Ratcliffe, seized by his own men who regret to ever have listened to him, threatens to have everyone hanged for disobeying his orders. This scene, arguably, proves Ratcliffe a comic villain as he was close to being successful in his objectives, only to fail at a crucial moment by making a grievous mistake.

Afterwards, as Ratcliffe accidentally injures Smith, he reveals his true nature to his men: he is a character who is unable to take responsibility for his actions and instead resorts to explaining how he only meant to shoot the chieftain instead of Smith, showing how little value the lives of Native Americans have for him. However, Ratcliffe is shown being slightly concerned for Smith's life. This, arguably, is because he knows that the men will turn on him for injuring him because Smith is popular among them. That is to say, Ratcliffe was only concerned about retaining his own *status quo*, reminding us of his ruthlessness.

In *Pocahontas*, the Native Americans are, arguably, romanticised. Incidentally, the noble savage, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, is a mythic conception of people who are from non-European cultures and have an innate natural simplicity and virtue that has not been corrupted by European civilisations. The Native Americans of *Pocahontas* do not differ from the said definition as they are above the greed and the bloodlust that Governor Ratcliffe brings to their lands. When asked about gold, the Native Americans do not even know what that substance is and upon hearing that it is a valuable yellowish solid, they associate it with maize which they consider very valuable as it feeds them, making maize even more valuable than gold for them. The Native Americans do not even want to fight the Englishmen, but they feel they are compelled to do so to defend their homes.

However, the war scene shows how the Native Americans of the Powhatan tribe have a superior morality compared to that of the Englishmen and Ratcliffe. It was Pocahontas who convinced chief Powhatan not to execute Smith. This, subsequently, ended the hostilities between the two groups even if Ratcliffe refuses to withdraw from the war. The colourful leaves symbolise how chief Powhatan is in harmony with the nature unlike Ratcliffe who still is corrupted by greed and his will to kill. Ratcliffe's men are visibly astonished by the leaves, making them lower their rifles and realise they had been misled prior to this moment. Ratcliffe, however, can not realise, or understand, the error of his ways and is unable to repent, thus, making him the only one responsible for the villainy in the film. (Fruzinska, 2014, p. 82).

The colours (yellow, red, and black) that are presented in the song *Savages* evoke demonic associations. However, the moment of Chief Powhatan's realisation of truth is marked by light and colourful leaves of spirituality. (Fruzinska, 2014, p. 85). This is a juxtaposition between malice and wisdom. The dark colours of the songs symbolise malice that, according to Fruzinska, de-individualise both groups, turning them into violent mobs (Fruzinska, 2014, p. 85). The sudden flash of light and the colourful leaves, however, reveal that, unlike Ratcliffe, the Chief Powhatan is able to cleanse himself of malice that once inhabited him and replace it with wisdom instead. As Ratcliffe is reprimanded by his formerly loyal men for injuring Smith, his black battle armour is not removed by them and his eyes are still glowing red, showing how the hellish colours have permanently become part of Ratcliffe and how he is unable to rid himself of malice.

As it is shown at the end of the film, as the Englishmen are leaving Virginia for England, because Smith is gravely injured and would undoubtedly die if he stayed in Virginia, some of them are discussing whether the ship is ready to sail. One of them remarks that they are ready as soon as they load the last bit of cargo onboard. The cargo, however, is revealed to be Ratcliffe who is bound in chains and gagged. As he is thrown into a rowing boat, still wearing the black battle suit, Ratcliffe demands to be untied immediately and threatens to have the heads of his men if they refuse to untie him. This is the beginning of the punishment Ratcliffe receives for his acts of villainy: he is disgraced by his men and made to appear as if he was a piece of luggage – an object that can be owned by someone. As Ratcliffe wished to own Virginia, he experiences the fate of being referred to as property and made to appear as a piece of property, making his punishment poetic justice. His purple hat, which is slightly tattered, is a single reminder of his former aristocratic background and power which he has lost. He is still portrayed wearing his hellish black armour, revealing that he has retained his belligerent nature which, humorously, caused his downfall at the hands of his own men who were able to see past bloodshed through which Ratcliffe sought to gain riches and more power.

However, it is not revealed what kind of a punishment Governor Ratcliffe suffers after the events of the film but, arguably, the worst punishment is that he returns to England empty-handed: at the beginning of the film, he revealed that this venture was his last chance for glory and riches, which made him seem desperate to succeed. However, no matter how hard he tried, his greed and prejudice eventually caused his impending failure. Moreover, his men, whom he considered as mere pawns that were to help him attain riches, were the ones who seized and captured him, showing how the social standing and class were tipped upside down. prior to his imprisonment, Governor Ratcliffe was the leader of the colony due to his aristocratic background but eventually his men of low standing seized the control and locked him away to await his punishment.

4.2 Claude Frollo – “It is not my fault; I am not to blame”

The hunchback of Notre Dame is a thrilling, heart-warming tale full of incredible action, hilarious comedy, and charming songs. Inspired by Victor Hugo’s classic novel, Disney brings the heroic adventures of Quasimodo, the gentle and lonely bell ringer of Notre Dame, to spectacular life. (Hahn, 1996.)

According to McGill, *the Hunchback of Notre Dame* is the first Disney film that is outwardly religious and its antagonist, Claude Frollo, is the first Disney villain to display complex adult emotions such as lust and desire (McGill, 2018, p. 35). Interestingly, the age restriction on the film is merely 6+ on Disney+ even though it is claimed that it displays complex adult emotions, implying it would be more suited for older audiences. The film indeed displays complex adult emotions that, arguably, are relatively difficult for younger audiences to understand. However, this should not stop them from enjoying the film as it is suitable for young and old alike since the adult emotions are, inconspicuously, mostly hidden from younger audiences.

Claude Frollo can be seen as a criminally dangerous villain, with aspects of the enemy of the earth type of villain. He considers himself to be the centre of the world, entitled to anything he desires, and the guardian of righteousness and morality, but instead he is so corrupt that the evil that he sees in others is merely a reflection of his inner darkness. Claude Frollo reveals through songs his sexual torment and presents himself as a martyr. (Davis, 2014; McGill, 2018, p. 36). Moreover, as the zealous minister of justice of Paris, Claude Frollo displays tyrannical, treasonous, and sociopathic behaviour that not only endangers the Romani people of Paris but also the city itself.

The prologue of the film reveals the audience Claude Frollo’s ruthless nature. As he makes his first appearance in the film, riding his high horse to oversee the imprisonment of some Romanies, which he mockingly regards as Gypsies, the field of view emphasizes Claude Frollo’s high status by displaying him from the bottom to top, as if through the eyes of those Romanies, allowing the audience to take on the point of view of the fearful Romani people. In the next scene the field of view shifts to Claude Frollo’s eyes who looks down on the said Romanies and orders his men to “bring these Gypsy vermin to the palace of justice” (Hahn, 1996).

The lyrics of the song *the Bells of Notre Dame* reveal Claude Frollo's objective: "Judge Claude Frollo longed to purge the world of vice and sin. And he saw corruption everywhere but within." (Menken & Schwartz, 1996). In accordance with Davis' categorisation, Claude Frollo can be viewed as a criminally dangerous villain because he sees evil in others but never within. Additionally, he eventually becomes obsessed with a Romani woman and will do anything to own her, indicating dangerous obsession.

Moreover, the lyrics imply that Claude Frollo himself is filled with vice and sin, but instead projects these traits onto others. This is evident when a Romani woman attempts to escape him while holding onto a swaddle. Claude Frollo is certain that the swaddle contains stolen goods which are to be taken from her. When he murders the woman and seizes the swaddle, Claude Frollo realizes that it is a deformed baby, making him to frantically look at his surroundings while calling the baby a monster. As he sees a well, he attempts to drown the baby in it. McGill argues that Claude Frollo wishes to dispose of the baby because he does not want to take responsibility of him after murdering his mother and instead opts to flee his guilt by drowning the baby (McGill, 2014, p.36). Davis suggests that Claude Frollo is unable to see innocence in the baby through his deformities and instead assumes it must be evil. (Davis, 2014) When the Archdeacon thwarts his attempt to drown the baby, Claude Frollo responds by saying "this is an unholy demon. I am sending it back to hell, where it belongs" (Hahn, 1996). The Archdeacon attempts to make him realize his mistake by singing:

See there the innocent blood you have spilt on the steps of Notre Dame.
Now you would add this child's blood to your guilt on the steps of Notre Dame.
You can lie to yourself and your minions. You can claim that you haven't a qualm.
But you never can run from nor hide what you've done from the eyes.
The very eyes of Notre Dame (Menken & Schwartz, 1996).

As the Archdeacon is confronting him, Claude Frollo attempts to assure him that pursuing the woman, and subsequently murdering her, was a righteous deed. With a cold expression he tells the Archdeacon, "I am guiltless; she ran, I pursued." and "My conscience is clear!" (Hahn, 1996). When the Archdeacon tells Claude Frollo that he is unable to hide his deed from Notre Dame, the statues of Notre Dame are shown to be looking at him and Claude Frollo, with a frightened expression, gazes back at them as the

lyrics reveal his fear: “And for one time in his life of power and control, Frollo felt a twinge of fear for his immortal soul” (Menken & Schwartz, 1996). Prior to this, it is implied, Claude Frollo had been in control of events concerning his life but now he truly felt humbled and powerless before the gazing statues of Notre Dame.

Subsequently, as the humbled Claude Frollo asks the Archdeacon what he should do with the baby, he orders that Claude Frollo raise him as his own, which he agrees but instead of living with him, he has the baby live in the bell tower of Notre Dame, keeping him out of everyone’s sight. Based on the baby’s deformed appearance, Claude Frollo cruelly names him *Quasimodo* (Latin for “half-formed”). McGill states that having Claude Frollo raise Quasimodo as his own son is a punishment for murdering his mother (McGill, 2018, p. 35).

Claude Frollo, however, does not agree to raise Quasimodo without ulterior motives: “Even this foul creature may yet prove one day to be of use to me” (Menken & Schwartz, 1996). As the prologue is ending, the narrator presents a riddle to the audience: “Who is the monster and who is the man?” (Menken & Schwartz, 1996). Based on the prologue, the answer is already clear; it is Claude Frollo who is the monster. McGill argues that the riddle provides a framework to contrast Quasimodo and Claude Frollo throughout the film: Quasimodo is physically deformed, while Claude Frollo is truly twisted on the inside. Moreover, Claude Frollo’s character is framed in a monster/man dichotomy where he is socially superior but morally and ethically inferior to Quasimodo. (McGill, 2018, p. 29, 37).

At the end of the prologue shadow puppets of Claude Frollo and Quasimodo are seen ascending the stairs to the bell tower of Notre Dame. Eventually Quasimodo is playing the bells alone. This foreshadows the relationship between them and their character development: Quasimodo is initially forced to follow Claude Frollo and live in his shadow, like a puppet, but in the end gains independence from him while Claude Frollo is a puppet, or a slave, to his own desires and he eventually disappears from Quasimodo’s life, freeing Quasimodo of his influence.

After the prologue, the relationship between Claude Frollo and Quasimodo is explored through the song *Out There* and in the scene before it. Right before the song, Quasimodo has revealed his intention of leaving the bell tower for the first time to attend a festival below but is intercepted by Claude Frollo who

joins him in the bell tower for lunch. Quasimodo addresses Claude Frollo as master and he has Quasimodo place his tableware on the table for him. Claude Frollo's tableware are ceramic and ornate while Quasimodo's are wooden and in poor condition. Moreover, their drinking cups resemble them: Claude Frollo's cup is tall and gray, while Quasimodo's cup is short and brown. Claude Frollo's cup dwarfs that of Quasimodo, symbolizing their relationship perfectly: Claude Frollo is Quasimodo's master and Quasimodo is confined to live in his shadow as his slave.

Afterwards, Claude Frollo has Quasimodo review the alphabet which reveals how he has imposed his principles on him: "A is for abomination, B is for blasphemy, C is for contrition [...] when they reach the letter F, Quasimodo mistakenly utters the word "festival" which angers Claude Frollo as Quasimodo is considering joining the festival below. Quasimodo attempts to gain his permission to join the festival, but Claude Frollo reminds him of his place in the society through the lyrics of the duet *Out There*. Quasimodo's lines are written in italics:

The world is cruel. The world is wicked.
It's I alone whom you can trust in this whole city.
I am your only friend. I who keep you, teach you, feed you, dress you.
I who look upon you without fear.
How can I protect you, boy, unless you always stay in here? Away in here.
You are deformed. *I am deformed.*
And you are ugly. *And I am ugly.*
And these are crimes for which the world shows little pity.
You do not comprehend. *You are my one defender.*
Out there they'll revile you as a monster. *I am a monster.*
Out there they will hate and scorn and jeer.
Only a monster. (Menken & Schwartz, 1996).

The lyrics reveal how Claude Frollo has manipulated Quasimodo that he is the only trustworthy and good human being towards him in the cruel and unforgiving world. Interestingly, Claude Frollo tells Quasimodo that he teaches, dresses, and protects him but subsequently states that he is a deformed and

ugly monster who must be hidden from the outside world. Claude Frollo even considers deformity and ugliness crimes for which the outside world would not show pity.

To further solidify his position as Quasimodo's guardian, Claude Frollo has lied to him prior the song that his mother had abandoned him at birth. As he is singing, Claude Frollo caresses Quasimodo's face, soothing him and making his lies easier to affect Quasimodo. As Quasimodo's lines begin, he closely follows Claude Frollo as they walk back to Quasimodo's room as if to symbolize that Quasimodo is destined to follow his footsteps and live in his shadow. McGill suggests that Quasimodo's imitative and dependent lines reflect how Claude Frollo has imposed those thoughts on him throughout the years (McGill, 2018, p. 38). Fruzinska further argues that Claude Frollo has done this procedure repeatedly to show Quasimodo his place in the world (Fruzinska, 2014, p.150).

According to Breithaupt, Stockholm syndrome allows a hostage to take on the perspective of a hostage-taker. In this process, the hostage loses their self (Breithaupt, 2019, p.38). This is to say, one completely submits to a cause. In this case, Quasimodo has suffered a loss of self to Claude Frollo and has taken on his perspective on life: Claude Frollo sees evil everywhere but within and has Quasimodo believe that the world is a cruel place and the only trustworthy person in the world is him, who allegedly cares for him, whereas, in reality, he actually is Quasimodo's hostage-taker.

As Frollo is leaving the bell tower, Quasimodo apologizes him for considering leaving the tower and Claude Frollo forgives him, reminding him that the bell tower is his sanctuary. Quasimodo, however, eventually decides to join the carnival below Notre Dame and, subsequently, is crowned as the king of fools, which angers Claude Frollo. Before the crowning, however, The Romani Woman, Esmeralda, dances in front of Claude Frollo, captivating him, which presents him with a cognitive dissonance: he detests the Romani people but has now fallen in love with Esmeralda, who is a Romani woman.

Before the carnival, however, Claude Frollo meets his new captain of the guard, Phoebus, in the palace of justice. Sounds of whipping can be heard in the torture chamber as Claude Frollo instructs his interrogator not to whip too frequently because the new lash would numb the old one too quickly and the torture would be less painful for the victim. As Captain Phoebus enters the scene, Claude Frollo reveals that the last captain of the guard was a disappointment, implying that he was executed for failing to meet

Claude Frollo's standards. At the same time, a single lash and a loud scream of agony can be heard, causing Claude Frollo to smile for a moment, revealing that he gains pleasure from others' suffering (as it is shown in image 1). This is a sociopathic trait as Claude Frollo does not feel empathy towards others and instead strives to increase the amount of suffering that they experience. His knowledge in inflicting pain could suggest that he has engaged in torture between the prologue and the main story. In the main story, however, Claude Frollo mostly uses others to inflict suffering on others rather than inflicting it himself. Sociopathic villains are described to be short-tempered, arrogant, dominant, and manipulative characters who completely lack empathy for others and feel no guilt or remorse for suffering they cause through their actions (Kendrick, 2016, p. 185). Claude Frollo completely lacks empathy and feels no guilt for his actions. As he murders a Romani woman, Claude Frollo claims to be innocent because she fled from him. When he discovers that the woman was carrying a deformed child, he attempts to drown him in a well. He ends up fostering the child but manipulates him throughout the story. The scene in the torture chamber further proves that Claude Frollo displays sociopathic behaviour.

As they walk into the balcony, Claude Frollo tells Phoebus that he has arrived in Paris to save the weak-minded from being misled by the Romani people. According to Claude Frollo, they live outside of the "normal order" and their heathen ways inflame people's lowest instincts and for that they must be stopped. Phoebus questions this, by asking why he was summoned from wars to capture fortune-tellers and palm readers to which Claude Frollo answers that the real war is in Paris. He tells that for twenty years he has been prosecuting the Romani people one by one, as he squishes three insects beneath his thumb. He then lifts a brick, revealing dozens of more insects and tells Phoebus that the Romani people have a nest, or a haven, in Paris. As the Captain asks what must be done, Claude Frollo squishes all the insects beneath the brick, implying that he thinks that Romani people are merely vermin that are to be murdered. The two subsequently join the carnival below.

In that scene, it is revealed that Claude Frollo prosecutes the Romani people because they do not fit into his mould of normality, and they are pagans who inflame people. Ironically, it is Claude Frollo who falls victim to this as he not only becomes obsessed with Esmeralda, who is a Romani woman, but also blames her for captivating him. Claude Frollo's insect squishing implies that he considers Romani people to be insects only to be exterminated.

The Palace of Justice is opposite Notre Dame. Both of these great structures overlook Paris but are, in fact, moral opposites. Byrne & McQuillan argue that the Palace of Justice is a hellish counter to Notre Dame which is revealed to act as a sanctuary for the persecuted (Byrne & McQuillan, 1999, p. 133). The Palace of Justice serves as Claude Frollo's headquarters. However, the justice that the palace serves has long ago been corrupted by Claude Frollo's sense of justice as the innocent of Paris are being, and have been, persecuted there. The positioning of both Notre Dame and the Palace of Justice proves that the Archdeacon's words were true in the prologue: Claude Frollo can never truly escape or hide his deeds from the gaze of Notre Dame as it stands *vis-à-vis* the Palace of Justice.

In the carnival, after his coronation, Quasimodo is bound to a spinning platform and the crowd starts throwing vegetables at him. He begs Claude Frollo to help him to which he responds with silence. When his captain asks permission to end the maltreatment of Quasimodo, Claude Frollo states that "a lesson needs to be learnt here" (Hahn, 1996). With these words, Claude Frollo betrays Quasimodo even though he had assured him earlier that day that he is his friend and only trustworthy person in Paris. There, however, is no lesson to be learned as the only reason why Claude Frollo refuses to give the order to intervene is because he enjoys seeing Quasimodo's humiliation and suffering.

Subsequently, Quasimodo is freed by Esmeralda, angering Claude Frollo who asks her how she dares to defile him. She responds by telling him how he speaks of justice but is indeed cruel to those who need his help. Claude Frollo vows to make her "pay for this insolence" (Hahn, 1996). In this scene, Claude Frollo is, for the first time, confronted how the evil he sees in others is merely a reflection of his own evil personality.

For her defiance at the Carnival, Esmeralda is forced to hide in the cathedral, but Claude Frollo eventually finds her and tells his captain to arrest her. He refuses, saying that she claimed sanctuary and there is nothing he can do about it. Claude Frollo orders him to drag her out, but the Archdeacon intervenes and tells her that Claude Frollo has learnt to respect the sanctity of the church. Claude Frollo is angered and begins to depart from the cathedral but decides to hide behind a pillar. As the Archdeacon is escorting the captain out, Claude Frollo grabs Esmeralda from behind, states that "she will not stay in this prison for long because Gypsies do not do well inside stone walls" and sniffs her hair. She questions his gesture but he lies that he was "just imagining a rope around her beautiful neck." Esmeralda claims to know what

he was really imagining but Claude Frollo tells her that it is typical for her kind “to twist the truth to cloud the mind with unholy thoughts.” As he is taking his leave, Claude Frollo tells her that if she left the cathedral, she would be his.

Fruzinska, however, claims that Claude Frollo’s statement “Gypsies do not do well inside stone walls” means that Claude Frollo sees the Romani people as savages who cannot thrive in closed spaces (Fruzinska, 2014, p.151). Quasimodo’s yearning to leave the bell tower proves it true that the Romani people cannot thrive in closed spaces: Claude Frollo has forced him to live in the bell tower for his whole life, claiming that he is only protecting Quasimodo from the wicked outside world. However, Claude Frollo has merely acted as Quasimodo’s jailor instead of his protector. As Claude Frollo knows that the Romani people cannot thrive inside stone walls, keeping Quasimodo imprisoned in the bell tower could be part of his sadistic behaviour. This could also suggest that Claude Frollo has learnt during his relentless persecution of Romani people how to inflict as much suffering as possible on them.

In that scene, it is shown how Claude Frollo is unable to take responsibility for his own “unholy thoughts” that are strongly implied to be carnal lust. He instead claims that the Romani people are able to impose such thoughts upon others, giving Claude Frollo an additional reason to prosecute them while in reality Claude Frollo has become obsessed with Esmeralda – a Romani woman.

In a scene before the song *Hellfire*, a mass is held at Notre Dame with the Latin prayer *Confiteor* (Eng. I Confess, I acknowledge) being chanted as the field of view slowly shifts from Notre Dame towards the Palace of Justice where Claude Frollo can be seen facing towards Notre Dame. The English translation of the name of *Confiteor* foreshadows the lyrics of the song: throughout the song Claude Frollo confesses his obsession with Esmeralda and that it is turning him into sin. However, he is unable to acknowledge that the feelings he experiences are his own and instead believes that they are imposed on him by Esmeralda whom he considers a witch. It was revealed prior to this scene that Claude Frollo holds a belief that the Romani people are able to inflame people’s lowest instincts and impose “unholy thoughts”, which are heavily implied to be of sexual nature, on others.

Through the lyrics of the song *Hellfire*, Claude Frollo explores his cognitive dissonance which causes him sexual frustration. Confused by these feelings, Claude Frollo pleads Mary, mother of Jesus, for guidance and to assure himself of his righteousness:

Beata Maria, you know I am a righteous man.
Of my virtue I am justly proud. Beata Maria, you know I am so much purer than
The common, vulgar, weak, licentious crowd. Then tell me, Maria
Why I see her dancing there? Why her smouldering eyes still scorch my soul?
I feel her, I see her. The sun caught in her raven hair is blazing in me out of all control.
[...] This Burning desire is turning me to sin. (Schwartz & Menken, 1996).

The lyrics reveal a struggle within; Claude Frollo has vowed to rid the world of vice and sin, but now he is the one with the vice of carnal desire. Moreover, this presents a contrast between prologue and the song: it was revealed that, “in his life of power and control, Frollo felt a twinge of fear for his immortal soul” (Schwartz & Menken, 1996). Now, however, Esmeralda’s eyes are scorching his soul and her hair is blazing in him without control. Claude Frollo rubs a scarf given to him by Esmeralda against his cheek as the flames of the fireplace flicker in her form, revealing how he is not purer than the common crowd, as he is not above human nature, and symbolizing not only his burning desire to own her but also the flames of hell – his alleged destination if he surrenders himself to his carnal desires. According to McGill, the song reveals an incongruence between Claude Frollo’s private and public identity, and it threatens to collapse his public image (McGill, 2018, p. 29). This is evident during the intermission of the song as Claude Frollo is visibly frightened when one of his guards inform him that Esmeralda has escaped from the cathedral.

During the song, Claude Frollo feels that he is guiltless for the vice he is forced to experience: “It’s not my fault. I’m not to blame. It is the gypsy girl, the witch who sent this flame. It’s not my fault. I’m not to blame. [...] If in God’s plan, he made the devil so much stronger than a man” (Schwartz & Menken, 1996). As Claude Frollo is deeming himself guiltless, his consciousness, represented as a red-cloaked choir, is chanting Confiteor’s *Mea Culpa* (Eng. through my fault) segment, attempting to make him repent and accept responsibility. Moreover, the colour of the choir’s cloaks, red, symbolises, for example, fire, lust, and sin (Yu, 2014, p. 58-59). All these themes are part of the scene, signifying the colour’s importance during the song. However, Claude Frollo flees as the choir gazes on him, reminding him that he can never truly escape from his wicked deeds, even if he chooses to ignore his conscience.

As Claude Frollo reaches the fireplace, whereupon the choir merges into a hellish flame that wraps around him, attempting to thrust him into the fireplace. It is during this scene when he laments that the devil is stronger than a man, attempting to justify his vices. McGill states that Claude Frollo is presents himself as a martyr whenever possible (McGill, 2018, p. 36). This scene does not deviate from McGill's statement as Claude Frollo is shown to suffer. However, he himself is the cause of that suffering but he is unable to see it as it was stated in the prologue: "and he saw corruption everywhere except within" (Schwartz & Menken, 1996).

This segment, once again, presents a contrast between the prologue and this song: Claude Frollo felt he was guiltless for murdering Quasimodo's mother and now he feels that the feelings he is forced to experience are imposed on him by an outside influence which he is unable to control, further indicating that he is unable to see the evil within.

Claude Frollo presents his ultimatum to Esmeralda by asking Mary for her protection:

Don't let this Siren cast a spell. Don't let her fire sear my bones. Destroy Esmeralda and let her taste the fires of hell or else let her be mine and mine alone. [...] Choose me or your pyre. Be mine or you will burn. God have mercy on her. God have mercy on me. But she will be mine or she will burn. (Schwartz & Menken, 1996).

As he demands Esmeralda to be his and his alone, Claude Frollo embraces a smoky silhouette that resembles her. He is interrupted by one of his guards who notifies him that Esmeralda has escaped Notre Dame where she had sanctuary. Infuriated, Claude Frollo vows to find her even if he is forced to burn down all of Paris. The fire-themed lyrics, and smoky visuals, of the song, arguably, foreshadow Claude Frollo's demise at the end of the film.

In the following morning, Claude Frollo begins his search for Esmeralda. He has his men destroy Romani people's property and subsequently arrest them when they refuse to reveal any information about whereabouts of Esmeralda. When Claude Frollo suspects a miller and his family to be harbouring Romanies, he orders his captain, Phoebus, burn down the mill to make an example of people who are traitors. Claude Frollo tells the miller and his family that they are under house arrest until he knows more

on the matter and assures them that if they truly are innocent, they have no reason to worry. The captain refuses to burn down the mill, stating that he was not trained to murder innocent people to which Claude Frollo answers that he was trained to follow orders.

As the captain extinguishes his torch, Claude Frollo calls him coward and subsequently ignites the mill himself with the miller and his family still inside. The captain barges in the mill and rescues everyone inside but he is seized and sentenced to be executed immediately for being a traitor. However, he manages to escape and steal Claude Frollo's horse after which Claude Frollo has his men shoot him with arrows, instructing them not to hit his horse in the process. As the captain is hit by an arrow, he falls into a river and Claude Frollo orders his men to stop shooting arrows and tells them that the traitor should rot in his watery grave. He repeats himself by telling his men to find Esmeralda even if they must burn down the whole Paris. Subsequently a scene of burning Paris is shown with dark smoke filling the sky. In this scene, it is evident that Claude Frollo can be considered both a tyrant and a traitor. Firstly, when he attempts to execute his captain, who refused to murder innocent people, he displays tyrannical behaviour as tyrants see those who defy them as traitors. Secondly, Claude Frollo prosecutes the people who he is supposed to be protecting, as he is searching for Esmeralda, making him a traitor to the Romani people's freedom.

The scene of burning the mill and Captain Phoebus' escape present the audience a juxtaposition. Claude Frollo blames his captain for cowardice for not burning down the mill, but the captain does not hesitate to rescue the miller and his family from the burning building. Even though throughout the film Claude Frollo is shown not to care about others, he is concerned for his horse's safety when the captain steals it and attempts to escape horseback. This is a strong contrast to how little value human life has to him.

As Paris is burning, Claude Frollo realizes that Quasimodo helped Esmeralda escape from the cathedral and decides to have lunch with him in the bell tower. As the two begin to eat, Claude Frollo claims to know that something is troubling Quasimodo. A single grape falls off the table and when Quasimodo reaches down to pick it up, Claude Frollo is seen sitting in the background in a judgemental posture. The field of view shifts to Quasimodo's eyes as he looks at Claude Frollo who, looking down on him, claims that Quasimodo is hiding something, but Quasimodo denies this.

This scene is a juxtaposition to the previous meal the two of them shared. The first meal at the beginning of the film showed the audience that Claude Frollo was Quasimodo's master rather than his guardian.

The scene displays further evidence because when Quasimodo is picking up the grape, he almost kneels before Claude Frollo. Moreover, the field of view emphasizes how Claude Frollo dwarfs Quasimodo in stature and in power. As Quasimodo denies that something is troubling him, Claude Frollo claims that something must be troubling Quasimodo, showing how he imposes his suspicions on him as if he knew his thoughts better than Quasimodo himself.

Upon seeing a wooden doll, carved by Quasimodo, that resembles Esmeralda, Claude Frollo claims that Quasimodo helped her escape the cathedral and it is his fault that all of Paris is now burning. Quasimodo defends himself by saying that Esmeralda was kind to him which infuriates Claude Frollo even further. He destroys Quasimodo's scale models while yelling at him that it was not kindness but cunning because Gypsies are not capable of real love. As he grabs Quasimodo by the collar, Claude Frollo orders him to think of his mother, a Romani woman – who in Frollo's false account – abandoned her at birth. As he calms himself, Claude Frollo assures Quasimodo that it was not his fault for he could not have resisted her "heathen treachery".

However, Claude Frollo tells Quasimodo to not worry because Esmeralda would be out of their lives soon and stabs the wooden doll, that resembles her, with a dagger and ignites it with a candle. As the doll is burning, Claude Frollo claims that Quasimodo would be freed from Esmeralda's evil spell, and she would not torment him any longer because he allegedly knew where the Court of Miracles – the place where Esmeralda and the Romani people of Paris were hiding – was. As he leaves the bell tower, Claude Frollo is seen smirking, implying that his previous claim was a lie.

The scene presents the audience further evidence how the evil Claude Frollo sees in others is merely a reflection of his own self. Even though he ordered that Paris be burned, he blamed Quasimodo for it and when he claimed that the kindness that Romani people show for other people is merely treachery, he was being treacherous as he lied that her mother had abandoned him. Moreover, Claude Frollo claims to know the hiding place of the Romani people so that Quasimodo would be manipulated into leading him there.

Subsequently, Quasimodo accidentally leads Claude Frollo and his men to the Court of Miracles, the hideout of the Romani people in Paris, and Esmeralda is captured by him. Claude Frollo thanks Quasimodo and tells him that he always knew he would be of use to him one day and orders him be taken to the Notre Dame's bell tower. Claude Frollo's remark on Quasimodo's usefulness is a reference to the song *Bells of Notre Dame* in which Claude Frollo ponders if Quasimodo will be of use to him. After

helping him find the Court of Miracles, Quasimodo is no longer of use to Claude Frollo and is subsequently imprisoned in the bell tower of Notre Dame.

Afterwards, Claude Frollo sentences Esmeralda to death for witchcraft which raises opposition in citizens who are observing the conviction. He then tells Esmeralda that he can save her from the flames of this world and the next if she chooses him. Instead, she spits on his face and Claude Frollo declares that she has refused to repent and is to be executed because she is a threat to every soul in Paris. Subsequently he ignites the pyre, attempting to burn her alive. As Claude Frollo considers himself to be entitled to anything he desires, he goes so far that he declares that he can save Esmeralda from the flames of hell. As he is rejected, Claude Frollo deems that no one other could have Esmeralda and decides it would be better to murder her instead. Ironically, Claude Frollo's claim of being able to save Esmeralda from the flames is a blatant transgression of the first of the ten commandments: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me" (Exodus 20:2). Instead of worshiping other gods, he promotes himself a god, which is an act that would have been considered blasphemy in the 16th century.

Fortunately, the unconscious Esmeralda is rescued by Quasimodo, who broke out of his captivity, and taken to the bell tower. He later believes her to be deceased and mourns by her body only to be interrupted by Claude Frollo, holding a knife behind his back who caresses him while telling him that it was his grim duty, hoping that Quasimodo could forgive him. As he is about to stab him in the back, Quasimodo sees the knife's shadow and overpowers him and seizes the knife while Claude Frollo is thrown to the wall. With fearful eyes, Claude Frollo gazes at Quasimodo who tells him that he has lied to him about world being cruel and tells Claude Frollo that people like him are the only cruel thing in the world. As Esmeralda wakes up, Claude Frollo unsheathes his sword and chases after them to the roof.

In this scene Claude Frollo feigns sympathy for Quasimodo's sorrow. The only reason for him to do so is to get closer to Quasimodo to stab him in the back. This shows the audience Claude Frollo's sociopathic side since he uses manipulation and fake sympathy to reach his destination of murdering his foster son as he has outlived his usefulness. Here Claude Frollo's lack of love for his foster son is shown to the audience. Instead of treating him as his offspring, Claude Frollo attempts to dispose of him for not being useful anymore, revealing that Claude Frollo treated Quasimodo as a mere tool to help him reach his objectives. Quasimodo, however, is shown to regain his lost self as he no longer considers the world a

cruel place, like Claude Frollo does, and instead is able to see that people like Claude Frollo make the world a cruel place.

Subsequently, Claude Frollo tells Quasimodo that he knew that he would attempt to save Esmeralda just like his mother tried to save him, revealing Quasimodo that her mother did not abandon him, confusing Quasimodo. Claude Frollo continues and tells him that he shall now do what he was supposed to do twenty years ago and attempts to throw Quasimodo off the roof. Instead, he falls, but Quasimodo catches him by his cape. Instead of repenting, Claude Frollo swings himself onto a Gargoyle and attempts to slay Esmeralda and Quasimodo all the while taunting them by stating “and He (God) shall smite the wicked and plunge them into the fiery pit.” The gargoyle crumbles under his feet and he falls to the burning Paris below, signifying that he was the wicked one which He smote. As Claude Frollo failed to execute his opposition, it was revealed, that he, as well, could be described as a comic villain: like it was explored in the section 3, one of the most prominent traits of a comic villain is to become over-confident and fail at a decisive moment.

Claude Frollo’s death is poetic justice because he falls to the “fiery pit” which is the burning Paris, a place that he had unknowingly created for himself in his mindless pursuit for Esmeralda. Moreover, the song *Hellfire* showed how Claude Frollo’s burning desire turned him to sin and subsequently proved to be the cause of his demise. It is never shown whether Claude Frollo realised his own evil and the divine punishment he received for it.

5 Results

In this section, the results of the analysis shall be discussed. Both literature and observations reveal that Disney antagonists convey their objectives and villainous traits through singing, but also through deeds. Songs tend to underlie an antagonist's villainous deeds. This is to say, a villain will usually commit a villainous act after singing. According to Boyd, the act of singing allows characters to present themselves in a manner that enhances the dramatic effect and creates an emotional connection between the character and the viewer (Boyd, 2010, p.106).

Disney songs can be used as a method to humanise the antagonist. Animated Disney films that were created during the Disney Renaissance (1989-1999) have built-in libretti that create a theatrical world where the focus is on the story and the characters. The songs are designed to enhance the plot and character development. A key to creating musically enriched animated films is developing songs for all the important characters. In other words, antagonists cannot be excluded. (Coleman, 2008, p.286; McGill, 2018, p.28).

The singing antagonists of *Pocahontas* and *the Hunchback of Notre Dame* are no exceptions. After the song *Savages*, Ratcliffe started to wage war on the Powhatan tribe and during and after the song *Mine, Mine, Mine* he started a strip-mining operation in Virginia to find gold, while revealing that it is his fantasy to dethrone King James I. Claude Frollo, however, reveals during the song *Hellfire* that he is obsessed with Esmeralda and explores his burning desire for her. These songs not only enhance the dramatic effect of the films, and fortify the characters' role as antagonists, but also reveal that even these vile characters are motivated by something to carry out their evil deeds rather than merely being evil because the story requires an antagonist. This is to say, the antagonists are not merely created to be defeated by the protagonists but to have complex personality with their own character development. The complexity could help create an emotional connection between the antagonist and the audience, indicating that even the villains could be sympathised.

While the antagonists' villainous traits are somewhat similar, there are also visible differences how they show their villainy. Governor Ratcliffe is mostly driven by his greed for gold and riches, while Claude Frollo's delusions of grandeur make him believe that he is the purest person alive and sees only wicked

and sinful people in Paris. These differences, however, lead to similar results: inflicting suffering on the innocent and damaging the environment for their own gain.

The themes of the antagonists differ greatly and, in principle, are criticism of colonialism and the Catholic Church. This is also visible in the antagonists' minions: Ratcliffe's men are common folk who leave England for Virginia and vary greatly, while Claude Frollo's men are identical guardsmen, whose faces are hidden by the visor of their helmets. Gaze is a recurring theme in the Hunchback of Notre Dame and the guardsmen's visors symbolize how the guardsmen are blind to Claude Frollo's villainous deeds and his evilness. While Ratcliffe's men eventually defect, Claude Frollo's men stay loyal to him until his demise at the end of the film.

The two antagonists' villainous traits overlap a certain degree. Both enjoy almost absolute power and control to the point of tyranny in their respective environments and consider anyone who defies them a traitor. However, both Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo are below an even greater power than themselves; Ratcliffe is a subject of King James I of England and Claude Frollo lives in a constant fear of God, albeit believing to act at his behest. France did have a ruling monarch at the time of the film's setting but he, along with God, is absent from the world and is never physically present. In principle both antagonists are also traitors: Ratcliffe is implied to wish to overthrow the king and Claude Frollo, who is the minister of justice of Paris, has betrayed the justice system and instead of helping the innocent is prosecuting them, while claiming that he is able to save Esmeralda from damnation if she chooses him, making him appear as a (false) God. One of the most prominent features of Claude Frollo is how he projects his evil on others. However, Governor Ratcliffe is as capable of projecting negative traits on others as Claude Frollo.

Interestingly, both antagonists have dark features, while their lieutenants (characters who are second-in-command) have light features. Moreover, both lieutenants eventually defect and betray their respective antagonists because they do not wish to inflict suffering on the innocent. The antagonists, however, have differing reasons for employing their lieutenants. Whitley argues that Governor Ratcliffe and John Smith, before being redeemed, share a certain degree of idealism as they both are driven by materialistic goals of possessing the land before them, but they differ in manner, and while Ratcliffe wants to ravage the land for its resources, Smith seeks adventure. (Whitley, 2012, p. 83).

Even though the lieutenants are initially introduced as the antagonists' minions, it is obvious from the beginning that they are the male heroes of the films because they have handsome features. In addition, one can see that Governor Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo are the antagonists of these films without even seeing them commit any evil deeds because of their appearance. Arenas proves the above statement true by arguing that the aesthetics of villainy coincides with ugliness (Arenas, 2011, p. 10). This is to say, both of the antagonists are made to appear ugly, or at least uglier than the male protagonist, to show the audience that they indeed are villainous.

The contrast between antagonists and their lieutenants can be viewed as the struggle between darkness and light which is derived from the Bible which serves as the basis for almost every theme found in Western literature (Kampf, 2017). In Genesis 1:3-2:3 (English Standard Version) it says that God created light and saw that it was good and subsequently separated it from the darkness. Similarly, John Smith and Captain Phoebus, both of whom represent the light, are separated from their respective antagonists who represent the darkness. Darkness, however, does not universally represent evil in these two films. While it is true that both antagonists have dark features, it is also evident that both dehumanized groups (the Native Americans and the Romani people) also have dark features. In fact, they have darker features than those of the antagonists. Interestingly, Claude Frollo does not prosecute the Romani people because of the colour of their skin but instead because of their lifestyle, while Ratcliffe does comment that "their (the Native Americans) skin's a hellish red, they're only good when they're dead" (Menken & Schwartz, 1995). However, Ratcliffe dehumanises the Native Americans in the same manner as Claude Frollo dehumanises the Romani people.

In principle, neither of the antagonists care about people other than themselves and it is evident how easily they justify the slaying of others. Ratcliffe would commit a genocide for the gold that the Powhatan tribe allegedly hoards, and Claude Frollo murdered a woman because he suspected she was carrying stolen goods only because she was of Romani descent. In fact, the Native Americans and the Romani people are dehumanised to the point that they are compared to animals and insects.

6 Discussion

This thesis examined villainy in the antagonists of two 1990s Disney films. The research questions were 1) how villainy is portrayed in the two antagonist of this study and 2) do villainous traits overlap between the villains? This section shall discuss the analysis of the antagonists and how their villainous traits are portrayed and how the villainous traits overlap, while the conclusion section shall summarise the findings and conclude this thesis.

The data suggests that control over others, the feeling of entitlement, and a ruthless nature, with little regard to human life, make these two Disney antagonists great, and dangerous, villains. The antagonists are portrayed in a manner which shows the audience that these characters are, without a doubt, evil. The songs that the antagonists sing are used to further their character development, making the antagonists more complex and interesting in the eyes of audiences. Moreover, the antagonists' villainous acts and thoughts are greatly exaggerated, which serves as a reminder that they are merely fictional characters. Additionally, the antagonists are eventually punished accordingly for their actions, making their punishments poetic justice.

It was expected in the Introduction section that the antagonists' villainous traits would overlap a certain degree. In line with the hypothesis, they do overlap. Perhaps the most prominent evidence is that both antagonists dehumanise protagonists that are of non-European origin, giving a voice to the oppressed as their stories are told. This, arguably, is in line with the contemporary colonial and racial discussion of the 1990s, showing how the Walt Disney Company endorses its values through its works which is visible in the antagonists: the company favours, for example, spirituality, equality, anti-colonialism, and anti-racism and, in turn, antagonises, among other things, racism, greed, and gaining of wealth. Ironically, greed, imperialism, and gaining of wealth are considered antagonistic objectives in Pocahontas, while spirituality is considered a respectable way of life, even though the Walt Disney Company prospers through these traits: films and merchandise generate income for the company. Moreover, arguably, the films criticise the catholic church and colonialism as the antagonists represent these phenomena.

The results support the existing literature that was discussed earlier. Firstly, as Davis argued, Disney antagonists can be classified into certain categories. While this is, undoubtedly, true, it was expected that

both antagonists would overlap between Davis' categorisation which, as it was expected, proved to be true. Firstly, Davis classified Governor Ratcliffe as an *enemy of the earth* – an antagonist who, to summarise, is dangerous to the environment and its native species (or people) However, such antagonists do not hold a grudge against those who hinder them. (Davis, 2014). Undoubtedly, Ratcliffe can be classified as such antagonist because he is a direct threat to Virginia and the Native Americans who populate the region. Similarly, Claude Frolo could be classified similarly as he burns Paris and prosecutes the Romani people living in the city, proving how the antagonist categories overlap. However, unlike Ratcliffe, Claude Frolo does hold a grudge against those who oppose him, reminding that the categorisation overlaps only partially.

Secondly, in Davis' categorisation, Claude Frolo, in turn, is described as a *criminally dangerous villain* because he considers himself as the centre of his world and entitled to anything he desires (Davis, 2014). This proved to be true as, for the majority of the film, he did everything he wanted unhindered all the while he considered himself, and his deeds, justified. Governor Ratcliffe could also be categorised as a criminally dangerous villain since he considers himself entitled to own the whole Virginia, and all the riches that the land may hold. Moreover, he does not let anything hinder him as he is prepared to slay everyone who he deems to prevent him from gaining riches.

Finally, according to Davis, Governor Ratcliffe can be categorised as *comic villain* as he is made enjoyable to watch while his objective is to destroy their opposition only to fail at the end of the film (Davis, 2014). Claude Frolo, however, experiences a similar fate, which would make him a comic villain as well. However, the antagonists part of this thesis are motivated by greed (Governor Ratcliffe) and ridding the world of sin (Claude Frolo), showing that such categorisation does not perfectly represent the antagonists since, while one of their objectives is to destroy their opposition, the antagonists are ultimately motivated by different objectives. The protagonists, however, attempt to prevent them from reaching their objectives, which is the reason why the antagonists seek to destroy them.

To summarise, while Davis' categorisation on villain types is remarkable, this thesis, arguably, provides a new insight in it by proving that the categorisations do overlap, making them more flexible rather than strict. This would make Davis' categorisation merely directional which helps researchers categorise antagonists into certain types should there be need for it.

While McGill (2018) compared two antagonists in his study, *'This Burning Desire is Turning Me to Sin': The intrapersonal sexual struggles of two Disney singing villains*, he focused on their songs, through which antagonists do reveal their desires and objectives. However, while this thesis did investigate the songs, it focused on villainous deeds and how villainy was portrayed in both antagonists. McGill's study, however, served as an important model for this thesis as it shared, to some extent, similarities with it.

Regrettably, every thesis has its limitations. This thesis is no exception as the generalisability of the results is limited by the number of antagonists analysed: merely two antagonists cannot generalise these traits to be the only defining traits of all the Disney antagonists of 1990s, showing how the sample size was limited. However, additional samples would have lengthened this thesis considerably which, obviously, would have taken significantly longer time to write, consuming more resources. Moreover, an additional antagonist could have proven to be greatly different from these two antagonists, which were, to some extent, rather similar. This, in turn, could have impacted results and perhaps even shifted the focus from comparing the antagonists entirely, possibly making the second research question irrelevant as an additional antagonist could have been too different to compare to these two.

Another prominent restriction in this thesis was that, compared to Claude Frollo, Governor Ratcliffe had significantly less screen time, making the data on that character somewhat lacking. As a result of this, the analysis favours Claude Frollo over Ratcliffe, making this thesis, to some extent, uneven. This problem could have been partially solved by investigating Ratcliffe in the sequel film in which he also appears. The sequel, however, is a direct-to-video film which had a different producing crew which could have portrayed the antagonist in a different manner, creating another problem. Nonetheless, the results of this thesis are valid as they, despite their limitations, manage to answer both research questions adequately.

Due to the limitations of this thesis, further research could be done on the antagonists of 1990s. As it was stated above, the sample size was limited which limited the generalisability of this thesis as Governor Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo cannot be the defining villains of that era, albeit they are well-written antagonists. If one of the objectives of this thesis was to examine the defining traits of Disney antagonists of 1990s, more antagonists should have been analysed. Therefore, further research is needed since it is beyond the scope of this study to answer such question.

7 Conclusion

This thesis aimed to answer how villainy is portrayed in *Pocahontas* and *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. Moreover, it was investigated whether villainy overlaps between the antagonists of the above-mentioned films. By analysing Governor Ratcliffe and Claude Frollo, this thesis has shown that both antagonists not only display villainous behaviour versatilely but also overlap in their villainy. The chosen methodology, observing the antagonists by watching the films and drawing evidence from literature, successfully helped answer the research questions. However, while it was evident that analysing only two antagonists of the 1990s cannot generalise their traits to be the only defining traits of the Disney antagonists of that era, it raised speculations whether there actually are traits that are universal in 1990s Disney antagonists. However, such question can only be answered by another thesis since it was not the objective of this study. In retrospect, it would have been rewarding to investigate all the antagonists of 1990s in this thesis. However, regrettably, the obvious limitations of insufficient resources effectively halted that dream. Nevertheless, it is possible to answer that question by conducting a new research in the future.

As it was stated in the Discussion section, this thesis both confirmed and challenged some of existing literature. Literature on villainy that was investigated earlier indeed proved to be relevant part of this thesis as the antagonists displayed such behaviour. Moreover, interestingly, it was discovered that earlier categorisation on villains did overlap, albeit merely to some extent, challenging the earlier theory by Davis. While this was not the objective of this thesis, it, nevertheless, was an intriguing discovery.

To conclude this thesis, it can be argued that it managed to answer both research questions. Additionally, the thesis provides new knowledge on two Disney antagonists of 1990s, making it at least, partially, relevant. All things considered; this thesis can be considered successful as it created new knowledge and affirmed existing theory.

8 List of references

- Adamson, R., & Berry, M. (2000). *The Wisdom of Giveaway Conference: A Guide to Growing Native American Philanthropy*. First Nations Development Institute print.
- Arenas, E. C. (2011). Villains in Our Mind: A Psychological Approach to Literary and Filmic Villainy. In Fahraeus, A., & Yakali-Çamoglu, D. (Eds.). *Villains and Villainy: Embodiments of Evil in Literature, Popular Culture and Media*. (pp. 3-28). [N.p.]: Brill | Rodopi.
- Barber, B. R. (2015). Can Democracy be Multicultural? Can Multiculturalism be Democratic? In Uberoi, V., & Modood, T. (Eds.) *Multiculturalism Rethought: Interpretations, Dilemmas, and New Directions*. (pp. 300-328). Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press.
- Bettinson, G., & Rushton, R. (2010) *What is Film Theory: An Introduction to Contemporary Debates*. Maidenhead McGraw-Hill International (UK) Ltd.
- Boyd, M. (2010). Alto on a Broomstick: Voicing the Witch in the Musical Wicked. In *American Music*, 28:1 (pp. 97-118).
- Bonsignori, V. (2013). *English Tags: A Close-Up on Film Language, Dubbing, and Conversation*. Newcastle Upon Tyne. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Breithaupt, F. (2019). *The Dark Sides of Empathy*. Ithaca, New York. Cornell University Press.
- Buckland, W. (2000). *The Cognitive Semiotics of Film*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bordwell, D. (1989). *Making Meaning: Interference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema*. Harvard. Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *The Disneyization of Society*. London. SAGE.
- Byrne, E., & McQuillan, M. (1999). *Deconstructing Disney*. London. Pluto Press.
- Carroll, N. (1996). Prospects for Film Theory: A Personal Assessment. In Bordwell, D., & Carroll, N. (Eds.), *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies* (pp. 37-68). Madison, Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin Press.

- Coleman, B. (2008). New horizons: The musical at the dawn of the twenty first century. In Everett, W. A., & Laird, P, R (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Musical* (pp. 284–301). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, A. D. (2009). *The Geography of Genocide*. Lanham. UPA.
- Cyprus, S. (2021). *Who is John Ratcliffe?* Wisegeek. Retrieved from: <https://www.wise-geek.com/who-is-john-ratcliffe.htm>.
- Davis, A. M. (2014). *Handsome Heroes & Vile Villains: Men in Disney's Feature Animation*. New Barnet, Herts: John Libbey Publishing Ltd.
- Dunn, C. *The Colour of Royalty, Bestowed by Science and Snails*. The New York Times.
- Fruzinska, J. (2014). *Emerson Goes to the Films: Individualism in Walt Disney Company's Post-1989 Animated Films*. Newcastle upon Tyne. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Gamble, A. (2015). Multiculturalism and the Public Sphere. In Uberoi, V., & Modood, T. (Eds.) *Multiculturalism Rethought: Interpretations, Dilemmas, and New Directions*. (pp. 273-299). Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press.
- Gordon, K., Hawkins, A., Kawchuk, J., Shea, S, E., & Smith, D. (2000). *Pathology in the Hundred Acre Wood: a Neurodevelopmental Perspective on A.A. Milne*. CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association Journal.
- Hahn, D. (1996). *Claude Frollo Upon Hearing a Man Die from Lashing*. [Picture].
- Hahn, D. (Producer), & Trousdale, G., & Wise, K. (Directors). (1996). *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* [Motion Picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.
- Head, M. (2011). *Crimes Against the State: From Treason to Terrorism*. Burlington, Vt: Routledge.
- Hugo, V. (1831). *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. (I. F. Hapgood, Trans.). Place of Publication not identified. E-artnow. 2013.

Johnson, H. (2020, November 18). The 'Villains' Among Us: Hollywood's Problematic Depiction of the 'Bad Guy'. *The Oxford Blue*. <https://www.theoxfordblue.co.uk/2020/11/18/the-villains-among-us-hollywoods-problematic-depiction-of-the-bad-guy/>.

Kampf, D. (2017). *Dark & Light Symbolism in Literature*. Penandthepad.com. Retrieved from: <https://penandthepad.com/dark-light-symbolism-literature-12280020.html>.

Kendrick, M. G. (2016). *Villainy in Western Culture: Historical Archetypes of Danger, Disorder and Death*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.

Kendrick, D. (2007). *Historical Dictionary of the Gypsies (Romanies)*. The Scarecrow Press, inc. Plymouth, UK. Second Edition.

Kjelgaard-Christiansen, J. (2019). A Structure of Antipathy: Constructing the Villain in Narrative Film. In *Projections: The Journal of Films and Mind* 13:1 (pp. 67-90). Berghahn Books.

McGill, M. C. (2018). 'This Burning Desire is Turning Me to Sin': The intrapersonal sexual struggles of two Disney singing villains. *Queer Studies in Media & Popular Culture Volume 3 Number 1*, 27-49. Florida International University.

Menken, A., & Schwartz, S. (1995). Mine, Mine, Mine. On *Pocahontas: An Original Walt Disney Records Soundtrack*. [Cassette]: Walt Disney.

Menken, A., & Schwartz, S. (1995). Savages. On *Pocahontas: An Original Walt Disney Records Soundtrack*. [Cassette]: Walt Disney.

Menken, A., & Schwartz, S. (1995). The Virginia Company. On *Pocahontas: An Original Walt Disney Records Soundtrack*. [Cassette]: Walt Disney.

Menken, A., & Schwartz, S. (1996). Hellfire. On *the Hunchback of Notre Dame: An Original Walt Disney Records Soundtrack*. [Cassette]: Walt Disney.

Menken, A., & Schwartz, S. (1996). Out there. On *the Hunchback of Notre Dame: An Original Walt Disney Records Soundtrack*. [Cassette]: Walt Disney.

Menken, A., & Schwartz, S. (1996). The Bells of Notre Dame. On *the Hunchback of Notre Dame: An Original Walt Disney Records Soundtrack*. [Cassette]: Walt Disney.

- Montgomery, D. (2007). *1607: Jamestown and the New World*. Williamsburg, Virginia. Colonial Williamsburg.
- Newell, W. R. (2012) *Tyranny: A New Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noble savage. 2021. In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved June 12, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/noble%20savage>.
- Pentecost, J. (1995). *Governor Ratcliffe arriving on a horse-drawn carriage*. [Picture].
- Pentecost, J. (Producer), & Gabriel, M., & Goldberg, E. (Directors). (1995). *Pocahontas* [Motion Picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures.
- Polikarpova, D. A. (2019) Linguistic Approaches in Film-Theory: A Movement Against Film Language. In *Discourse* vol. 5, no. 3. (pp. 24-33).
- Rejmanek, M. & Simberloff, D. (2011). *Encyclopedia of Biological Invasions*. University of California Press.
- Sanza, C. (2018). The Disney Renaissance: How a 10-Year Era Took Disney Fandom to the Next Level. *Inside the Magic*. Retrieved from: <https://insidethemagic.net/2018/11/disney-renaissance/>.
- Schweizer, P. & Schweizer, R. (1998). *Disney: The Mouse Betrayed: Greed, Corruption, and Children at Risk*. Washington, DC: Regency Publishing.
- Statista. (2020). *Total assets of the Walt Disney Company in the Fiscal years 2006 to 2019*. Statista.com. Retrieved from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/193136/total-assets-of-the-walt-disney-company-since-2006>.
- Thomson-Jones, K. (2008). *Aesthetics and Film*. London. Continuum.
- Villainous. 2021. In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved June 5, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/villainous>.
- Walt Disney Company. (2020). *About the Walt Disney Company*. Retrieved from: <https://thewaltdisneycompany.com/about/>.

Ward, A, R. (2002). *Mouse Morality: The Rhetoric of Disney Animated Film*. Austin, Texas. University of Texas Press.

Whitley, D. (2012). *The Idea of Nature in Disney Animation: From Snow White to WALL-E*. Farnham, Surrey. Routledge. Second edition.

Wills, J. (2017). *Disney Company*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Yu, H, C. (2014). A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Symbolic Meanings of Colour. In *Chang Gung Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 7:1 April 2014 (pp. 49-74).