

The Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research

Volume 1, Fall 2010

Edited by
Steven Kohm and Michael Weinrath
The University of Winnipeg
Centre for Interdisciplinary Justice Studies (CIJS)
ISSN 1925-2420

“Little Red Riding Hood” Crime Films: Criminal Themes and Critical Variations

Pauline Greenhill and Steven Kohm¹,
The University of Winnipeg

Abstract

Over the past century, crime films have reflected and at times countered conventional and professional wisdom about crime’s causes and appropriate societal reactions to criminal transgression. Since the 1990s, Western crime films reflect not only changing cinematic styles but also hardening political discourses around individual criminal responsibility, and growing public fear of random violence and predatory strangers. The narrative structure and imagery of “Little Red Riding Hood” trenchantly encapsulates these trends. The tale conventionally warns about the timeless dangers of predatory violence and the monsters (animals) lurking to prey on the innocent and the weak. But in a neo-liberal era characterized by retreating and downsized state agencies of social welfare and security, it can also be cast as a lesson in self-reliance and the necessity for private action to forestall crime. The familiar story provides a convenient cultural referent to elucidate social, political and criminological shifts around issues of crime and crime control at the end of the twentieth century. Films we examine include *Freeway* (Dir. Matthew Bright, 1996), *The Wolves of Kromer* (Dir. Will Gould, 1998), *Promenons-nous dans les bois/Deep in the Woods* (Dir. Lionel Delplanque, 2000), *Little Erin Merryweather* (Dir. David Morwick, 2003), *Red Riding Hood* (Dir. Giacomo Cimini, 2003), *The Woodsman* (Dir. Nicole Kassell, 2003), and *Hard Candy* (Dir. David Slade, 2005). All explore the unfolding of crimes, their investigation, and/or their consequences. They consider institutional and societal reactions to crime and transgression, including criminal trials, incarceration, parole, and vigilantism.

Introduction

For many Euro North Americans, fairy tales offer light-hearted escapist visions that move inexorably toward the conclusion that “everybody lived happily ever after.” For folklorists, however, the vision of wonder tales vastly differs. Maria Tatar, for example, inventories the Grimm collection’s “murder, mutilation, cannibalism, infanticide, and incest” (1987: 3).² Yet even the best-known stories, usually found in the Grimm brothers’ collections, hardly instantiate the saccharine narratives familiar from Walt Disney’s fairy tale films.³ For example, in traditional versions, Snow White’s stepmother is frequently “made to dance herself to death in red hot shoes” (ATU 709, Uther 2004, 384). In some forms of “Cinderella” (ATU 510), the stepsisters mutilate themselves, cutting off pieces of their feet so the glass slipper will fit them (Ibid., 294). And it’s not only the obviously evil characters whose behaviour is questionable. For example, the Prince may not awaken Sleeping Beauty, but nevertheless “impregnates her; she gives birth to two children” (ATU 410, Ibid., 245).

Academic and artistic interventions threatening the conventional view of fairy tales tend to meet with popular resistance. Yet the outrage that audiences feel at the revisioning of familiar fairy tales they associate with the purportedly innocent state of childhood⁴ has never dominated reactions to adaptations of “Little Red Riding Hood” (ATU 333, henceforth “Little Red”).⁵ Though it was the subject of Walt Disney’s first animated cartoon, in 1922, this tale has never become a Disney feature. In the absence of a hegemonic text, Euro North American creators have subjected this narrative to a tremendous variety of reconceptualizations in novels, short stories, children’s literature, comic books, films, television productions, cartoons, video games, and advertisements.⁶ Though some offer fairly straightforward tellings, others parody the story, alter its genre (from wonder to horror, for example), and/or place it in a contemporary setting. Many of these texts explore crime, criminality, and criminal justice issues.

Crime and criminal justice have been enduring subjects of

filmmaking since the medium’s inception at the turn of the 20th century (Todd, 2006). Through various time periods, crime films have reflected, refracted, and sometimes critiqued contemporary practices and assumptions about crime’s causes and societal responses to criminal transgression (Ibid.; Rafter, 2006). Most Anglo-North American crime films of the last century tended to be uncritical of contemporary practices, instead conferring pleasure on audiences through what Nicole Rafter (Ibid.: 3) terms a “double movement.” Thus, conventional crime films allow audiences to pleurably consume representations of criminal transgression, safe in the knowledge that the perpetrators will ultimately be rooted out, morally condemned, and punished dearly for their wrongdoing. Most mainstream crime films follow a predictable moral pattern of “violation, discovery, punishment, and resolution” (Ibid.: 74).

Less common, but growing in importance in the latter part of the 20th century, are crime films Rafter calls critical, alternative, and morally ambiguous—apt descriptions of most of those we consider here. Lacking the easy reassurance of immorality thoroughly punished and order restored, critical crime films “take human evil for granted, assuming that people are fundamentally selfish and justice systems easily corrupted. Even when such films are clear about where right and wrong lie, they may show wrong thriving and virtue being crushed” (Ibid.: 213).

As a result of widespread public dissatisfaction with the liberal crime control policies of the 1970s, the political and criminological landscape radically altered through the 1980s (Garland, 2001). Conservative governments ushered into power in Europe and North America shifted crime control policy from social prevention and individual treatment to classical deterrence theory and rational choice perspectives. No longer viewed as sick and/or underprivileged, criminals were instead seen as rational actors making poor moral choices (Cornish and Clarke, 1986). Punitive sentencing returned and social crime prevention programs reduced

or eliminated. By the 1990s, the political terrain on which crime policy was drawn was further influenced by neo-liberal social and economic policies (Garland, 2001). Governments retreating from social service provision began to invoke rhetoric suggesting that individuals were responsible for ensuring their own protection from economic and social misfortune. Communities and individuals were “empowered” to take up the fight against crime, and the private security industry rushed to fill the vacuum left by the state’s rollback. Thus, crime films of the 1990s reflected and refracted a variety of trends including rising levels of anxiety about crime and economic insecurity, growing levels of disparity between the wealthy and poor under neo-liberal economic policies, and a fast rising prison population in the US in the wake of punitive sentencing policies (*Ibid.* 2001).

The 1990s saw continued growth of critical crime films, breakdown of traditional generic conventions in filmmaking, and creation of new genres that reflected the socio-political shifts taking root. Film historian Drew Todd traces the emergence of postmodern crime films in the 1990s, signaling “a rejection of linear storytelling, of expectations of genre conventions, and of easy distinctions between right and wrong” (2006: 51). To be sure, most crime films of the 1990s maintained the tried-and-true formula and moral structure of mid-century North American filmmaking; crime must ultimately be punished. However, the emergence of a post-modern/absurdist aesthetic in American filmmaking during this period was greeted in large part by box office success, particularly for the works of Quentin Tarantino and the Coen Brothers. Thus, cultural spaces for considering alternative perspectives on crime opened up alongside and even within films apparently reflecting the traditional pattern of evil defeated and morality restored.

A number of new subjects for crime films emerged at the end of the 20th century. For example, the 1990s saw the solidification of the serial killer as a popular cultural icon commodified and represented through a variety of media and cultural forms

(Jarvis, 2007). Further, the rise of the serial killer as a staple of 1990s crime films reflected a general fear of random violence, despite the fact that rates of violent crime were falling in most Western nations (Garland, 2001). Rafter contends that “by the 1990s a new criminal stereotype had taken hold in the public imagination, that of the superpredator, more monster than human, psychopathic, sexually deviant, and ubiquitous” (2006: 91).

Crime films at the turn of the millennium deliver eclectic approaches to problems of law, order, and justice. Many continue to offer up easy identification with heroes who restore order, or likable villains who go awry of the law but are legally and morally condemned in the end. However, a growing minority of alternative crime films adopt more complex moral and aesthetic positions. All the while, crime films continue to reflect and at times challenge commonsense understanding of problems, policies and practices. These works can therefore be understood as a sort of popular criminological discourse that reveals much about the place of crime in contemporary culture as well as its moral, ethical, and philosophical dimensions (Rafter, 2007). They include films based on ATU 333.

Re-writings of “Little Red” usually maintain an underlying structure focusing on nurturers vs. aggressors; victims vs. rescuers (see e.g. Ghesquiere, 2006). Sometimes individual characters take both sides of these semiotic oppositions. This doubling and overlapping of figures forms an essential element of “Little Red” crime films—works that reference the plot and/or central images of the tale and relate them to some aspect of law-breaking and/or criminality. Since the 1990s, this narrative structure and imagery has offered film makers and viewers a critical metaphorical tool, a malleable cultural referent to engage—often critically—with crime and criminal justice. The familiar narrative of wolves and innocents, predators and victims, villains and heroes provides means for filmmakers both to subvert audience expectations for story-book endings, and to critique accepted wisdom about the causes and consequences of crime.

Our consideration of *Freeway*, *The Woodsman*, and *Hard Candy* as “Little Red” pedophile crime films is available (Greenhill and Kohm 2009), so we take examples from four other feature length, live action films: *The Wolves of Kromer*; *Promenons-nous dans les bois/Deep in the Woods*; *Little Erin Merryweather*; and *Red Riding Hood*.⁷

***The Wolves of Kromer* (Will Gould, 1998)**

As in the traditional “Little Red” narrative, “[t]he human and wolf societies in this film exist side-by-side, ambivalent and even hostile to each other” (Bernhardt-House, 2008: 177). The “once upon a time, not so very long ago” opening voice-over signals a fairy tale—even in the vernacular sense, since it centres upon lycanthrophia as a metaphor for homophobia. In the otherwise realistic setting of a small English village, residents of the woods and wilds beyond are (gay male) wolves, complete with pointed ears, claw fingernails, and tails, dressed in fur coats and ragged clothing. The villagers hate and fear these outsiders, and periodically hunt them.

Fanny, with her friend Doreen, is poisoning their employer Mrs. Drax. They call the vicar, Father David, to her bedside, but also her son Mark who arrives with his wife Mary, teen-aged daughter Polly and young son Kester. Meanwhile, the relationship blossoms between wolves Gabriel and Seth. The two maids abandon Mrs. Drax (the grandmother) in her wheelchair in the woods. The wolves are suspected in her death and are hunted by the townspeople, who include several closeted wolves. When Gabriel has sex with someone else, Seth becomes uncertain of his own orientation. He meets Polly, dressed in a red jacket, in the woods, and she seduces him. Eventually Seth realises “I guess I just prefer wolves,” and declares his love for Gabriel, who has been murdered by the vicar. Father David shoots Seth too, and then walks from the church crime scene, his tail revealed under his vestments. The family realises the maids are responsible for the grandmother’s death and they are removed by the police. As Father David begins a sermon on “the wickedness of wolves,” Mary, Polly, Kester,

and Mark sing “Jerusalem” to drown out his hypocrisy. The rejection of lycanthrophobia/homophobia confirmed, the film closes with the three deceased characters—the two wolves and the grandmother—dancing together to “Spirit in the Sky.”

Writer/producer Charles Lambert calls it “a tragic romance” (DVD commentary), and suggests that the “the play with Red Riding Hood” begins when the red jacketed Polly meets Seth in the woods. (A red jacket signals a “Little Red” link in several films.) He notes that “here what we tried to do was reflect a contemporary, more positive position where there’s more equality perhaps between the wolf and... Red. And perhaps nowadays it’s the wolf who needs rescuing” (Ibid.). But attentive viewers might locate the first reference at the film’s opening, when Doreen, singing girlishly and swinging her basket, meets the wolves Seth and Gabriel on the road, and then when Grandmother is introduced in bed.

Yet the characters don’t map directly onto their prototypes. The worst the viewer *knows* the wolves are guilty of is petty theft, and in the end the maids are most wolfish in their greed and vicious homicidal intentions. The marked Red character, Polly, is by no means central. Some hunters, like the Vicar, have closet wolfish tendencies and tails. The most innocent character is Kester, but his parents suspect him of wolfish inclinations. The character multiplication helps to complicate the obvious attribution of blame and guilt. However, *Wolves* definitely does not side with the vigilantes, and accuses many of internalised lycanthrophobia. The film also makes questions of truth (who really killed the grandmother) less important than issues of hypocrisy and homophobia.

Deep in the Woods (Promenons-nous dans les bois) (Lionel Delplanque, 2000)

“The title, which is taken from a popular French song associated with the children’s game ‘Loup y es-tu?’ is full of childhood resonances for Francophone viewers” (Beckett, 2008: 208). This “part fairy-tale riff... and part generic slasher film” opens with “a mother reading aloud the story of ‘Little Red’...

in a fairy-tale-like room before being precipitously garroted by an unseen killer” (Elley, 2000: 28). She has given her child a Red Riding Hood doll. The main action involves five young actors who leave the city and drive through the woods to an isolated house to perform “Little Red” as a play for young Nicholas and his wheelchair-bound grandfather Axel de Fersen. Like *Wolves*, the film incorporates homosexual themes, including the grandfather’s attraction to actor Wilfried, and two lesbian players, Sophie and Jeanne, as well as heterosexual couple Matthieu and Mathilde. Predictably for its genre, a rapist/killer of women preys upon the actors. The ending, more consistent with the slasher genre than the fairy tale, offers a decidedly queer proto-nuclear family driving away from the chateau: heterosexual dad Matthieu, lesbian mom Sophie, and the undoubtedly scarred boy Nicholas. A reviewer noted that the “[h]astily explained story background near the end is high incomprehensible” (Ibid.).

The tale is narrated twice—first at the film’s opening, and then in the play-within-the-movie, with various passing references to “Little Red.” The five Red characters driving through the woods pass a grandmotherly figure. DVD commentator Brian Yuzna indicates that director Lionel Delplanque intended the scene as a reverse “Little Red” reference—grandmother not Red, goes to town not deeper into the woods, wearing black not red, to care for her nephew not vice-versa.

Wolf allusions include Serge Prokofiev’s “Peter and the Wolf” as diegetical music at the play’s beginning. The two actors who play Red in the play, Jeanne and Mathilde, die. The killer is revealed to the audience in the wolf costume that Matthieu (who survives) wears. Following its genre, the film sets viewers up to suspect nearly every character. The roles of (potential) Red, wolf, and woodsman are exchanged among the characters throughout, but undermined. A police officer, an obvious woodsman candidate, is killed within minutes of his introduction.

Axel, the grandfather, assisted by the rapist, his servant Stéphane, emerges as the murderer. The doubling that charac-

terises both “Little Red” crime films and slasher movies is expressed in Axel’s dual personality—the weakling in the wheelchair and his homicidal and perfectly able alter ego. The source of criminality, then, is insanity. But rather than a medical condition that calls for sympathy and hospitalisation, it’s an inherent evil that must be flushed out and entirely eradicated.

***Red Riding Hood* (Giacomo Cimini, 2003)**

With the tag line “God forgives....Jenny doesn’t,” and opening with the warning “Don’t ever tell this tale to your kids,” *Red Riding Hood* begins with the assassination of a conservative judge. His wife runs off with her young lover, leaving 12 year old Jenny alone in Rome with cash, credit, and a craving for righteousness on her own terms. Her voice-over comments: “Now I know what I want: to improve my education, serve justice, reinstate truth, basically what my father would have wanted me to do.” Bicycling through Rome in her red boots, and accompanied by her alter-ego George (her puppy “grown up”) who wears a long black cape and wolf mask, Jenny wreaks homicidal wrath on purse snatchers, hit and run drivers, shoplifters, adulterers, and blackmailers.

When her grandmother arrives and wants to take Jenny back to New York with her, the girl sends her to bed for a nap. After dinner, Jenny tells her grandmother the story of “‘Little Red Riding Hood,’ the uncut version, told by the wolf, a story that finally uncovers the truth.” Red is a litterbug and the wolf complains that she makes disrespectful comments about his teeth. “You know how I have a complex about them,” he says. The tale’s grandmother “spread rumours that wolves eat little kids.... And since then, the lives of all wolves have been miserable.”

The drugged grandmother never hears the story’s conclusion, but the next day Jenny promises “Don’t worry, one of these days I’ll get the wolf to tell you herself.” When she finds out her dentist’s adultery, she tells him “Check my canine teeth!” Yet when she discovers that her tutor Tom (whom she loves) has reconciled with his girlfriend, Jenny’s point of view is offered in a shot tracking through the woods. The grandmother, on the re-

ceiving end of wolf/Red/Jenny's wrath, survives. Tom, perhaps the best candidate for a woodsman/rescuer figure, also apparently recovers from the wounds the girl inflicts. But the film's conclusion suggests that Jenny's psychosis remains, though her wolf/dog George has been replaced by her father's corpse.

The tale's psychology, along with its links to "Little Red," are murky. Jenny alternately sees herself as Red and wolf, victim and scourge. She understands her favourite literary figure, Don Quixote, as herself and her father, but she also wants to be Dulcinea to Tom's Quixote. The entire closing section seems to be Jenny's hallucination. Otherwise one might wonder how a girl, apparently armed only with a giant syringe, could simultaneously sever the dancing legs of a hospital delivery worker. Nevertheless, *Red Riding Hood*, like the other films, enacts its drama through the doubling of characters to question not only the identity but also the etiology of crime.

***Little Erin Merryweather* (David Morwick, 2003)**

The eponymous *Little Erin Merryweather*—"a flash of red and then you're dead"—becomes a serial killer because her father molested her when reading her the tale. Her crimes re-enact the search for her father in the "wolf's" belly, as well as the placement of rocks therein. The film opens with a university student walking through the woods. Seeing a red-hooded and caped figure carrying a basket, he follows her. He tries to flee when he sees her face, but his failure is shown by a splash of blood on the snow and the caped figure obscuring an unmoving body. Three other murders follow, interspersed with Erin's memories and a voice-over, telling her version of "Little Red," along with illustrations which she paints while wearing her red cape. "Every night, Father would read from his favourite book, his favourite story. Father's dirty hands would turn the page.... A wolf appeared and showed his rage." This narration turns out to be Erin's English class fairy tale assignment, and is punctuated by her recollections of the abuse, presided over by an eyeless Red Riding Hood doll.

Three friends who work for the student newspaper seek to

solve the mystery of the serial killer's modus operandi, assisted by their abnormal psychology professor, Dr. Paula Sheffield. Student Peter Broom is attracted to librarian and fellow student Erin, who in those manifestations wears her cape with the black side out. As the body count mounts, the students discover that the killer's m.o. has a fairy tale precedent. The professor seeks a link to the serial killer's real world and finds it speaking with a colleague who remembers a local pedophilia case: "Her father would read her fairy tales and molest her, violate her, and rape her." The girl speaks through her doll, and eventually tells the psychologist that a wolf had come and taken her father away. Finally realising what the viewer has known from the beginning, that the librarian/artist/writer/student/pedophilia victim/serial killer is Erin (made up to resemble her doll)—Peter and Paula chase her into the woods. As she is about to attack Peter, Paula shoots her, but Erin escapes, and the final voice over warns: "This story doesn't end here, so tremble wolf, may you always live in fear."

The film's abnormal psychology class directly asks the question whether insane persons should be considered responsible for crimes they commit. Yet it offers no answers. The film itself follows its horror/slasher forebears in leaving further dastardly deeds a distinct possibility. Yet its androgynously-named (Erin/Aaron) "final girl" (see Clover, 1992) is the perpetrator. She's a victimiser, but has her reasons. Her victims may seem blameless, but Erin's survival suggests a vindication of her position.

Discussion

Over the past century, films have reflected and at times countered conventional and professional wisdom about crime's causes and appropriate societal reactions to criminal transgression. Since the 1990s, Western crime films reflect not only changing cinematic styles but also hardening political discourses around criminal responsibility, and growing public fear of random violence and predatory strangers. The narrative structure and imagery of "Little Red" trenchantly

encapsulates these trends. The tale warns about the timeless dangers of predatory violence and the monsters (wolves) lurking to prey on the innocent and the weak. But in a neo-liberal era characterized by retreating and downsized state agencies of social welfare and security, it can also be cast as a lesson in self-reliance and the necessity for private action to forestall crime. The familiar story provides a convenient cultural referent to elucidate social, political, and criminological shifts around issues of crime and crime control at the end of the twentieth century.

Recent postmodern approaches to filmmaking have disrupted the established moral structure of crime films by offering multiple points of view, moral ambiguity, a blurring of conventional generic boundaries and at times an ironic or even playful approach to the otherwise grim subject matter. Moreover, in professional and academic criminological discourses since the 1990s, little agreement emerges on the causes of crime or solutions to counter the general public's erroneous view of its growing menace. Indeed, serial killers and sexual offenders have become the current bogeymen (Silverman and Wilson, 2002: 1). Some crime films of this period and beyond take up and refract this academic discord and public anxiety, identifying monsters, sexual deviants, and super-predators as the problem. The films we have discussed reflect these trends, using the structures and symbols of "Little Red Riding Hood" to navigate this terrain. Serial killers and pedophiles figure centrally as wolves while heroes and victims take up their expected positions as Woodsman and Red. However, in keeping with the postmodern turn in filmmaking since the 1990s, these character positions invariably blur and reverse. The result disorients the familiar and denies the easy solutions that Rafter (2006, 2007) sees as central to conventional crime films.

Subverting audience cravings for vindication of the innocent and punishment of the wicked, "Little Red" provides an irreverent vehicle to interrogate the etiology of crime, current crime control policies, and the impulse toward vigilantism and privatized justice in neo-liberal times. These films deny their

viewers simple fairy-tale endings, substituting contradiction and ambivalence for easy answers. *The Wolves of Kromer* suggests that vigilantes can themselves be perpetrators, and their motivations anything but pure. *Deep in the Woods*, *Little Erin Merryweather*, and *Red Riding Hood* simultaneously punish crazed criminals and vilify the neo-liberal darling–traditional family values–that originated and nurtured their insanity. In short, the familiarity of “Little Red,” combined with its attendant moral lessons and great adaptability have provided critical and postmodern filmmakers with a genre bending tool to interrogate late modern trends in crime and crime control in ways that are frequently critical of conventional and professional orthodoxies. In this way, “Little Red Riding Hood” provides the narrative backbone for a variety of critical post-modern variations on the theme of predatory crime.

References

- Beckett, Sandra L. (2005) ‘Recycling Red Riding Hood in the Americas’, in Mark Cronlund Anderson and Irene Maria F. Blayer (eds) *Interdisciplinary and Cross-Cultural Narratives in the Americas*, pp. 7-28. New York: Peter Lang.
- Beckett, Sandra L. (2008) *Red Riding Hood for All Ages: A Fairy-Tale Icon in Cross-Cultural Contexts*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Bernhardt-House, Phillip A. (2008) ‘The Werewolf as Queer, the Queer as Werewolf, and Queer Werewolves’, in Noreen Giffney and Myra J. Hird (eds) *Queering the Non/Human*, pp. 159-183. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Cornish, Derek & Clarke, Ronald V. (1986) *The Reasoning Criminal*. New York: Springer-Verlag
- Daniels, Morra. (2006) ‘Little Red Riding Hood.’ *Electronic British Library Journal*, article 5.
- Dundes, Alan (ed). (1989) *Little Red Riding Hood: A Casebook*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Fecskó, Edina. (2008) ‘The Words and Images of the Tale:

- Psychoanalytic Interpretations of *Little Red Riding Hood*,’ in Ágnes Pethő (ed) *Words and Images on the Screen: Language, Literature, Moving Pictures*, pp. 300-313. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Garland, David. (2001) *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ghesquiere, Rita. (2006) ‘Little Red Riding Hood where are you going?’, in Paul Catteeuw, Marc Jacobs, Sigrid Rieuwerts, Eddy Tielemans, and Katrien Van Effelterre (eds) *Toplore: Stories and Songs*, pp. 84-99. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Greenhill, Pauline. (2008) ‘Fitcher’s [Queer] Bird: A Fairytale Heroine and Her Avatars.’ *Marvels & Tales* 22 (1): 143-167.
- Greenhill, Pauline and Anne Brydon. (2010) ‘Mourning Mothers and Seeing Siblings: Feminism and Place in *The Juniper Tree*,’ in Pauline Greenhill and Sidney Eve Matrix (eds) *Fairy Tale Films: Visions of Ambiguity*, pp. 116-136. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Greenhill, Pauline and Steven Kohm (2009) ‘Little Red Riding Hood and the Pedophile in Film: Freeway, Hard Candy and The Woodsman,’ *Jeunesse: Young Peoples, Texts, Cultures* 2(1): 35-65.
- Greenhill, Pauline and Sidney Eve Matrix (eds). (2010) *Fairy Tale Films: Visions of Ambiguity*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm. (2002) (Jack Zipes trans) *The Complete Fairy Tales of the Brothers Grimm*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Mieder, Wolfgang. (1982) ‘Survival Forms of “Little Red Riding Hood” in Modern Society’, *International Folklore Review* 2: 23-40.
- Nodelman, Perry. (1980) ““Little Red Riding Hood” as a Canadian Fairy Tale,’ *Canadian Children’s Literature* 20: 17-27.
- Orenstein, Catherine. (2002) *Little Red Riding Hood Uncloaked: Sex, Morality, and the Evolution of a Fairy Tale*. New York: Basic Books.

- Rafter, Nicole. (2006) *Shots in the Mirror: Crime Films and Society* (2nd edn). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rafter, Nicole. (2007) ‘Crime, Film and Criminology: Recent Sex-Crime Movies.’ *Theoretical Criminology* 11(3): 403-20.
- Silverman, Jon and David Wilson. (2002) *Innocence Betrayed: Paedophilia, the Media and Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Snowden, Kim. (2010) ‘Fairy Tale Film in the Classroom: Feminist Cultural Pedagogy, Angela Carter, and Neil Jordan’s *The Company of Wolves*,’ in Pauline Greenhill and Sidney Eve Matrix (eds) *Fairy Tale Films: Visions of Ambiguity*, pp. 157-177. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Tatar, Maria. (1987) *The Hard Facts of the Grimms’ Fairy Tales*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Todd, Drew. (2006) ‘The History of Crime Films,’ in Nicole Rafter (ed) *Shots in the Mirror: Crime Films and Society* (2nd edn), pp. 21-59. New York: Oxford.
- Uther, Hans-Jörg. (2004) *The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography* (3 vols). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Vaz da Silva, Francisco. (2002) *Metamorphosis: The Dynamics of Symbolism in European Fairy Tales*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Zipes, Jack. (1983) *The Trials and Tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood: Versions of the Tale in Sociocultural Context*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Endnotes

1. This paper includes excerpts from our “Little Red Riding Hood Crime Films: Critical Variations on Criminal Themes,” currently under consideration with *Crime, Media, Culture*. We thank research assistants Emilie Anderson-Grégoire and Kaila Johnston for their invaluable work on this paper’s background and exposition.
2. Traditional fairy tales and fairy tale films that well represent this series include “Fitcher’s Bird” (ATU 311, see Greenhill

- 2008) and “The Juniper Tree” (ATU 720, see Greenhill and Brydon 2010). The A[arne] T[hompson] U[ther] numbers refer to the catalogue of folktale types originally developed by Antti Aarne, translated and enlarged by Stith Thompson, which has recently been updated and ordered by Hans-Jörg Uther (2004).
3. See Greenhill and Matrix (2010). A forthcoming collection of articles co-edited by Kay F. Turner and Pauline Greenhill offers queer, transgender, and transbiological readings of traditional tales, mainly the Grimm brothers’ versions. Many include manifest content that messes with boundaries conventionally drawn around biology, sexuality, and gender identity. Consider, for example, the very queer “Hans My Hedgehog” (ATU 441), about “a child whose upper half was hedgehog and bottom half, human” (Grimm/Zipes 2002, 361). Initially rejected by his family and forced to sleep on straw behind the stove for eight years, he then asks his father for bagpipes and a shod rooster which he rides like a horse. “Once he reached the forest, he had the rooster fly him up into a tall tree, where he sat and tended the donkeys and pigs” (Ibid., 362). Hans eventually transforms into a fully human creature, but not before raping a princess; “When they had gone a little way, Hans My Hedgehog took off her beautiful clothes and stuck her with his quills until she was covered with blood.... Then he sent her away, and she lived in disgrace for the rest of her life” (Ibid., 363-364)
 4. Telling reactions on IMDB (The Internet Movie Database) to the live-action, horror film *Snow White: A Tale of Terror* (Michael Cohn, 1997) include: “The dwarfs weren’t even played by real midgets, they were normal sized people. That’s just wrong” <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0119227/usercomments?filter=hate>>. Actually, robbers take the place of the familiar Grimm brothers’ version’s dwarves in some versions, and fairies in others (see <<http://www.pitt.edu/~dash/type0709.html>>)
 5. This does not mean that all audiences entirely welcome revisions of “Little Red Riding Hood,” as Kim Snowden (2010) reveals in her discussion of teaching Angela Carter’s wolf stories and Neil Jordan’s filmed version of them, *The Company of Wolves* (1984), in her Women’s Studies

courses. Two casebooks of versions and analysis specifically addressing this tale are compiled by Dundes (1989) and Zipes (1983). Theoretical perspectives are critiqued by Vaz da Silva (2002, especially 113-162).

6. See discussions of such revisions in, for example, Beckett (2005); Daniels (2006); Mieder (1982); Nodelman (1980); and Orenstein (2002).
7. Though it concerns ATU 333 and crime, we exclude the animated *Hoodwinked!* (Dir. Cory Edwards, Todd Edwards, and Tony Leech, 2005). Like the classic *Rashômon* (Dir. Akira Kurosawa, 1950), it offers multiple narrations by different characters of the unfolding of a crime. Unlike its model, in which no ultimate truth emerges, *Hoodwinked!* eventually implicates a character from outside ATU 333. As a family film with a fairy tale setting, it lies beyond our scope. We also exclude *The Brothers Grimm* (Dir. Terry Gilliam, 2005) with its historical setting and magical motivation for criminality. Both films are discussed by Fecskó (2008). Though it is a film for adult viewers, we do not discuss the animated *Jin Roh: The Wolf Brigade* (Dir. Hiroyuki Okiura)