Introduction

They call him Mr Kiss Kiss Bang Bang; the man with the license to kill; the most famous – and perhaps infamous – secret agent in history; his call sign is 007 and his name, we all know the immortal line, is Bond… James Bond. By investigating two films from the Bond franchise, *GoldenEye* (1995, Martin Campbell) and *Casino Royale* (2006, Martin Campbell) this dissertation will demonstrate that these James Bond films are depictions of the geopolitical and socio-cultural values of the time in which they were made.

The research will be divided into two parts. **Part One** will investigate **the representation of women** while **Part Two** will focus on **the representation of masculinity, conflict and geopolitics** in the respective case studies. Each part will begin by contextualising the case studies within the *zeitgeist*[1], or socio-cultural values and perceptions, of the decades in which they were made. Thus Part One begins with a discussion of the state of feminism and gender equality in the 1990s and 2000s. Part Two begins with an investigation of the socio-cultural values and perceptions of masculinity, conflict and geopolitics in the same two decades. Each part then continues by identifying how these socio-cultural values are clearly reflected by the respective case studies.

The reason for dividing this research into these two parts is simple. This dissertation argues that socio-cultural values and perceptions of women *do not experience a significant*

[1] The way in which this dissertation utilises the term '*zeitgeist*' is usefully mapped out by Marshal in *A Dictionary of Sociology*: "The characteristic spirit (*Geist*) of a historical era (*Zeit*) [...] most fully developed by Hegel [who argued that] works of art [...] cannot transcend the spirit of the age in which they are produced" (1998: available online). Hegel's notion that art – or, in this case, film – "cannot transcend the age in which [it is] produced" (ibid) ties in neatly with this dissertation's argument that these two popular films reflect the socio-cultural values – or "characteristic spirit" – of their times.
Further, just as "the term *zeitgeist* has come to more loosely describe the general cultural qualities of any period, such as 'the sixties'" (ibid), so this dissertation's use of the term will refer to the "general cultural qualities" of the nineties and 2000s.

change between the 1990s and the 2000s. It thus follows that the way in which women are represented in the Bond films from these respective decades does not differ greatly. In fact, it will prove that female characters in both films conform to exactly the same narrative structures and ideology.

In contrast to this Part Two will demonstrate that *a significant change* occurred in the socio-cultural values of masculinity, conflict and geopolitics between the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. In terms of these issues the two case studies, while merely a decade apart, are products of vastly different times. The world of the 1990's (post Cold War; post Gulf War; on the cusp of the millennium; technology obsessed and technology anxious) stands in stark contrast to the world of the mid 2000's (post 9/11; during ongoing and bloody wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; post the coming of the millennium and enduring an elusive terrorist fear). The result is that, in contrast to the representation of women, the representations of masculinity, conflict and geopolitics in the two case studies are vastly different.

These differences in subject matter influence the structure of Part One and Part Two. Part One argues a continuing trajectory in socio-cultural values which can be traced through both case studies. As a result it addresses the two films separately and chronologically, beginning with *GoldenEye*. This allows the dissertation to clearly delineate the depiction of women in the first film and then illustrate how the second followed on this depiction almost exactly. Part Two takes a different approach. Because it argues a dramatic change in socio-cultural values it does not discuss the films separately. Rather it addresses specific aspects in both films (such as the physical representation of Bond; his use of technology or the depiction

his world, for example) demonstrating the very different way in which each case study represents these aspects. Before the investigation can begin, however, it is advisable give a short synopsis of each film.

GoldenEye

While it is set in the early to mid 1990s, *GoldenEye,* directed by Martin Campbell (1995) draws extensively on a Soviet and post-Soviet *milieu* for its plotline and settings. The film revolves around 007's attempts to find a stolen Russian weapon, codenamed: Goldeneye.

The pre-credit sequence is set before the end of the Cold War, depicting how Bond and a close friend, Alec Trevelyan,(a.k.a.: 006) infiltrate and destroy a Soviet weapons facility. Things go horribly wrong and 006 is executed by a Russian, Colonel Orumov, while 007 escapes in a dramatic gun battle climaxing in a fantastical aerial stunt as the complex explodes.

After the credits Bond attempts to thwart the theft of a highly advanced helicopter prototype, the Tiger, by an alluring and beautiful woman, Xenia Onnattopp. The evening before the theft Bond attempts to seduce Xenia, but she rejects his advances in favour of an admiral whom she strangles to death during foreplay in order to obtain the access pass required to steal the Tiger helicopter.

Xenia and her anonymous partner, revealed to be Orumov, (006's executioner in the pre-credit sequence) now a General in the Russian army, use the Tiger to steal a highly advanced weapon system, codename: Goldeneye. During their theft they slaughter the staff of the Severnaya facility, which had run the Goldeneye program. A lone programmer, Natalya Simonova, escapes. M (the head of MI6) and Bond watch the theft and destruction of

Severnaya via satellite. Subsequently M orders Bond to "find Goldenye; find who took it, what they plan to do with it – and stop it" (00:47:36)[2].

The film follows Bond on his mission. Along the way several characters cross his path. One is an arch nemesis, Valentin Zukovsky, whom Bond coerces into helping him – a coup, considering their past animosity. As his search continues he meets Natalya Simonova who, after some coercion, aligns herself with Bond, seeking those responsible for the slaughter of her friends at Severnaya.

Bond is finally led to the villain at the heart of the Goldeneye plot only to discover that it is 006, his old friend. It is revealed that Trevelyan had been in cahoots with Orumov and faked his own death. Bond is shaken by this revelation and ambushed. He and Natalya are left for dead in the Tiger helicopter which is set to self-destruct. Thanks to Bond they escape.

The two of them pursue Trevelyan throughout the rest of the film. During the action-packed pursuits and near death encounters Natalya warms to Bond and the two become lovers. Before their final love scene Natalya probes Bond about the trauma of pursuing an old friend who is now an arch enemy.

In the climax of the film Natalya and Bond discover Trevleyan's stronghold and infiltrate it, only to be captured. In the moments before he has them killed Trevelyan reveals his master plan: to electronically steal a fortune from the Bank of England and then detonate the Goldeneye weapon to erase any trace of his theft. Bond and Natalya fight their way free and sabotage Trevelyan's plot. She programs the Goldeneye weapon to self-destruct and Bond

[2] This dissertation contains two differing types of timecode references. Where the text refers to a series of events within a scene (starts: timecode) gives the timecode at which the relevant scene begins. Where the text refers to specific moments of action or dialogue (timecode) gives the exact moment at which the relevant occurrence takes place.

destroys the massive satellite dish with which Trevelyan could reverse her command. Bond and his former-friend-turned-nemesis battle it out in the metallic confines of the dish until Bond drops the other man to his death.

***GoldenEye* – Main Characters**

James Bond	...	Pierce Brosnan
Alec Trevelyan	...	Sean Bean
Natalya Simonova	...	Izabella Scorupco
Xenia Onatopp	...	Famke Janssen
Jack Wade	...	Joe Don Baker
M	...	Judi Dench
Valentin Dmitrovich Zukovsky	...	Robbie Coltrane
General Arkady Grigorovich Ourumov	...	Gottfried John
Q	...	Desmond Llewelyn
Miss Moneypenny	...	Samantha Bond
Bill Tanner	...	Michael Kitchen

(*GoldenEye*, 1990-2010: available online)

Casino Royale

Directed by Martin Campbell (2006) *Casino Royale* depicts the origins of James Bond; describing the journey which takes him from a novice '00' who is shaken by his violent acts and makes several critical errors during his mission to a cold, cool and ruthlessly capable secret agent.

The film's pre-credit sequence depicts James' first two kills – the requirements to obtain '00' status. After the credits we see *Le Chiffre*, a banker to terrorists, introduced to a menacing

African terrorist by a mysterious Mr White. Mr White's introduction convinces the terrorist to trust *Le Chiffre* with the laundering and investment of vast sums of money.

Meanwhile Bond is tracking an international terrorist network's financiers. His actions cause a very public debacle as he executes a bomb maker and blows up an embassy. M scathingly rebukes him and orders him to lie low. Bond continues his search however, following a lead from the bomb maker. He seduces a terrorist's wife, Solange, kills the terrorist and thwarts the bombing of a massive airliner. *Le Chiffre*, having masterminded the bombing, had done a 'short' transaction (a bet against the shares of this airline falling) – with his clients' money. When the bombing fails his 'short' goes sour, costing him over 100 million dollars. He is desperate to win back the losses before his clients learn of them.

Thus *Le Chiffre* sets up a high stakes poker game: a pot of 150 million dollars. MI6 send Bond to beat him, hoping this will force the banker to turn himself in; seeking protection in exchange for what he knows. Vesper Lynd is the Treasury agent with the power to authorise or deny Bond the funds to buy into the poker game. From the outset their relationship is a witty, tense, sexually charged confrontation.

During the game several complications arise, many of them threatening Bond and Vesper's lives. On one occasion Vesper saves 007; on another he saves her. Despite several setbacks Bond manages to win the game. Subsequently, however, *Le Chiffre*, captures him and Vesper and brutally tortures Bond in an attempt to get him to give up the money. Bond refuses. Just before the villain moves to kill him the enigmatic Mr White appears. He coldly

states that his organisation cannot afford to employ people it cannot trust – and assassinates *Le Chiffre*.

In the final act of the film Vesper and Bond are brought together by their shared ordeal. They fall deeply in love and Bond plans to leave the Secret Service before the harsh and brutal work destroys his soul. However, after intense time spent lovingly together, Bond having submitted his resignation, Vesper suddenly makes off with the money and attempts to give it to Mr White's organisation. Bond kills the henchmen who come for Vesper and the money but Vesper – shamed – commits suicide rather than face Bond.

The pen-ultimate scene of the film depicts Bond's icy bitterness over Vesper's betrayal and her death. M reveals that Vesper had been manipulated by Mr White's organisation by threatening the life of her lover. In the final scene Bond goes after the enigmatic Mr White, brutally wounding him. Standing over the fallen man he utters the famous words for the first time: "The name's Bond... James Bond."

***Casino Royale* – Main Characters**

James Bond	...	Daniel Craig
Vesper Lynd	...	Eva Green
Le Chiffre	...	Mads Mikkelsen
M	...	Judi Dench
Felix Leiter	...	Jeffrey Wright
Mathis	...	Giancarlo Giannini
Solange	...	Caterina Murino
Alex Dimitrios	...	Simon Abkarian

Steven Obanno	...	Isaach De Bankolé
Mr. White	...	Jesper Christensen

(*Casino Royale,* 1990-2010: available online)

Contextualising Bond: Popular Hero and Mobile Signifier

"Alongside [...] Mickey Mouse and Superman, [James Bond] remains one of the most famous fictional characters and firmly established cultural icons in the world" (Lindner 2009: 10). James Bond is undeniably a popular hero – the immense success of the 22-film (and counting) franchise built around him proves that. This dissertation argues that Bond's status as a popular hero gives him a socio-cultural relevance.

Several sources have identified that heroes of popular culture have an intimate and interwoven relationship with the values of the cultures in which they are popular.[3] The essence of the matter which these scholars identify is that "a culture creates heroes who embody the values it most honours" (House 2004: 65). This resonates as an instinctive truth: people's heroes embody that which they find heroic: their ideals and their aspirations; or, their fantasies[4]. Thus James Bond films – as incredibly popular heroic narratives – may depict something of the values of the culture in which they are popular. According to Elkin:

> Those individuals (either of fiction or fact) who embody ... values of the group and receive recognition therefore are likely to be popular heroes of the society. Since popular heroes embody the values of a society they are worthy of study as symbols of the positive values of the culture (Elkin 1955: 97; emphasis my own).

It makes intuitive sense that the "popular heroes" Elkin describes might be found in film. Due to the international influence of the Hollywood machine the heroes which this medium creates are perhaps the most widely circulated in the world and thus the most popular.

[3] See Elkin (1955); House (2004); Jarvie (1978); Leeming (2003); Sanchez (2000); Willis (1997)
[4] See Elkin (1955); Jarvie (1978); Sanchez (2000);

While catering to popular culture, commercial Hollywood cinema develops a symbiotic – but complex – relationship with the values of that culture. Jarvie (1978) wrestles with this relationship in *Movies as Social Criticism*:

> We have seen ... that movies are related in shifting ways to what may be called a collective consciousness of the society, to its present and immediate concerns. The relationship is not direct and simple [...] The group which makes a film in a sense reflects its understanding of the subject and builds up within it a conception of the audience it is trying to reach and adapts the creative decisions that need to be made to that audience. This perhaps explains why the mass media can develop an extraordinary resonance with a contemporary mood (1978: 104&105; emphasis my own).

Jarvie acknowledges a relationship between films and "societal consciousness" – but he does not state it as a given, deterministic fact. According to him the relationship between "what may be called a collective consciousness" of a society in which film is popular and the film itself is "not direct and simple" (ibid). His use of "can" in the emphasised section shows that it is not a given but rather a possibility and that the relationship between film and social consciousness is not an obvious equation but more a "resonance with a [...] mood" (ibid). As shall be demonstrated, over the course of the Bond franchise the production team, on a number of occasions, sought to remodel the Bond narrative and character to resonate with "the contemporary mood" (ibid).

Willis (1997) also acknowledges this resonance between film and a collective social consciousness when writing that, "films read, consume and even offer partial analysis of fantasies and anxieties circulating in the social field ... films may tell us what we are really thinking about ... collectively" (1997: 58). It shall be demonstrated that the varying representations of James Bond offer an insight into "what we are really thinking about". The

question arises, however, as to who this "we" is. Thus, with which culture's "societal consciousness" do the Bond films resonate? Another way of putting this question is to ask where James Bond is popular. The box office numbers serve to answer this.

GoldenEye, grossed three hundred and fifty million dollars internationally in 1995 (*GoldenEye Total Lifetime Grosses*: online). *Casino Royale* grossed just short of six hundred million dollars in 2006 (*Casino Royale Total Lifetime Grosses*: online). These two Bond films are perfect examples of 'heroic narratives' which were massively popular. Such simple box office numbers do not, however, identify which countries – and thus which specific cultures - Bond was popular in. A finer breakdown of these numbers reveals that Bond's largest audiences by far are the United States and Great Britain (including Ireland) (ibid). These are followed by Australia, France (including Monaco) and Spain. Box office numbers would thus suggest that Bond can be labelled as a hero of Anglo-American, Western-centred culture.

Such an Anglo-American label makes intuitive sense as Bond is a British hero working for the British Secret Service, created by a British writer, Ian Fleming. Literary criticism[5] further supports this reading. Bond was written as a British character, illustrating and embedding British cultural values (Baker 2006: 32&34; Black 2000: x). With the spy's export to Hollywood he became a more globally Westernised hero, as Ladenson puts it: "the Bond phenomenon [is] a key aspect of late-twentieth century western civilization" (2009: 185). The hero now resonated with the Anglo-American culture rather than merely the British one by "his actions in the service of protecting and vindicating Western values" (Stock 2009: 259). In Western and

[5] Such as Baker (2006); Black (2000) as well as Ladenson (2009) and Stock (2003) – discussed subsequently.

Anglo-American-centred culture James Bond is an incredibly popular hero and both his character and his narratives are sights which draw on and reflect elements of popular culture.

007 is not only a popular hero, however, he is a shifting *presentation* of ever present *connotations* - a 'mobile signifier'[6]. Thus 'James Bond' represents a stable *idea* within popular culture: 'the man every man wants to be and every woman wants to have'; an icon of masculinity and desirability. However the way Bond is *represented* changes. This process is neatly described by semiotics. Before analysing Bond as 'mobile signifier', understanding the concept of 'signifier' (and semiotic theories which define that) is necessary.

'Semiotics' is a complex field of study which has been revised, expanded and critiqued widely and repeatedly over time. According to Chandler:

> Beyond the most basic definition, there is considerable variation among leading semioticians as to what semiotics involves [...] Semiotics has changed over time, since semioticians have sought to remedy weaknesses in early semiotic approaches. Even with the most basic semiotic terms there are multiple definitions. Consequently, anyone attempting semiotic analysis would be wise to make clear which definitions are being applied and, if a particular semiotician's approach is being adopted, what its source is (2002: 5).

It is thus necessary that this dissertation first isolate the theory and theorist which is most apt for understanding the idea of James Bond as 'mobile signifier'.

Two schools of understanding dominate semiotics, Ferdinand de Saussure's 'dyadic model' and Charles Sanders Peirce's 'triadic model' (Chandler 2002: 5-6; Hayward 2006: 307-311). However, as described above, within each of these schools various questions have been raised about, and changes offered to, the theory which spawned it (ibid). Peirce's model

[6] A signifier is a recognized semiotic term; that Bond is a *mobile* signifier is what makes him particularly unique –as the subsequent discussion will explain.

proposes that a sign is comprised of three parts: the representamen (the form which the sign takes – something not necessarily material); an object (that to which the sign refers) and an interpretant (the idea the sign represents) (Chandler 2002: 32)[7]. The terms describing the three parts of the 'semiotic triangle' have often been reworded to change the "unfamiliar Peircean terms" (Chandler 2002: 34) to terms such as 'the sign vehicle' or 'symbol', 'the thought reference' or 'sense' and finally the referent (ibid). What is important for this research is that Peirce's model does not subscribe to the terms 'signifier' and 'signified'.

De Saussure's model, however, not only describes, but is built around these notions[8]. This then is the theory to consult when analysing Bond as mobile signifier. Additionally, it is to be expected that film scholars like Bennett and Woollacott (2003) would use de Saussure's model, as his "theories have had the greater impact to date in film theory" (Hayward 2006: 307).

According to de Saussure's dyadic model a sign consists of two parts: the form the sign takes, the signifier, and the concept represented, the signified (Chandler 2002: 18-19). The sign is given meaning by the relationship between the two (Chandler 2002: 19). Thus the word 'tree' – a signifier – has no meaning if it is not associated with the object known as a tree – the signified. The signifier activates two levels of meaning in the mind; what Roland Barthes[9] has

[7] Understandably a reader without a prior knowledge of semiotics may at first contact with these terms be overwhelmed and might wish for elaboration. All that this dissertation aims to do by mentioning Peirce's theories is to illustrate that they are not directly relevant to the concept of a 'mobile signifier'. Thus it discusses Peirce's theories only very briefly. (Should the reader wish for more information see Hayward (2006), but especially Chandler (2002)).

[8] While Peirce's model does contain parts that *resemble* these concepts it does not fully subscribe to de Saussure's definition of their meaning (Hayward, 2006: 308-311).

[9] Barthes is an important theorist subsequent to de Saussure because "the translation into English of his popular essays […] followed in the 1970s and 1980s by many of his other writing, greatly increased scholarly awareness of

described as “two orders of signification” (Chandler 2002: 144). The first is denotation: the “surface literal meaning” (Hayward 2006: 310). The second is connotation, comprised of “all the associative and evaluative meanings attributed to the sign by the culture or person involved in using it” (ibid). Hayward explains de Saussure’s model neatly by using a photograph of Marilyn Monroe as an example. The photograph (or signifier) evokes two levels of meaning: on the denotative level we have an image of a woman named Marilyn; on the connotative level, however, we have much more, “we associate the photograph with the star qualities of glamour, sexuality [and] beauty” (2006: 310).

It is at this point that one can begin to apply semiotics to Bond. Just as a photograph of Marilyn Monroe elicits associations of stardom, sexuality, beauty and fame, a photograph – or filmic image – of James Bond evokes certain associations. He is the “hyper-capable” (Baker 2006: 34), ever-desirable, masculine hero. As Simpson, somewhat poetically, says:

> James Bond...remains essentially the same ... the man every boy wants to be. He is a superhero without superpowers; a St George fighting contemporary dragons with a handgun and a stream of one liners; a secret agent as admired by men as he is irresistible to women (2002: 5).

In the above Simpson neatly captures the essence of what makes ‘James Bond’ a mobile signifier: despite changes to the way in which Bond is portrayed, from his physical body, to his character; from his accessories to his actions, the associations of ‘James Bond’ as an idea do not change. Thus, for example, in the 1990’s a ‘sexy’ James Bond was Pierce Brosnan, slim and dark-haired, while in the 2000’s a ‘sexy’ James Bond was Daniel Craig: blond and muscular. Similarly a masculine, capable Bond opened the pre-credit sequence of *GoldenEye* by fighting

---

this approach [specifically semiotics in the de Saussurean tradition] in the Anglophone world” (Chandler 2002: 7). Page 18 demonstrates how Barthes’ theories form the final, defining idea in this dissertation’s connection between Bond and popular socio-cultural values.

off hordes of henchmen and performing spectacular aerial stunts. In contrast, in the opening sequence of *Casino Royale* a masculine, capable Bond faces only two opponents, killing both; one in the very unspectacular confines of a bathroom stall[10]. The *depictions* of Bond may change but the *associations* with the *idea* of Bond remain constant[11].

It is as if one were able to replace the person in the Marilyn Monroe photograph with another body – thus changing the denotation – and yet still have the photograph evoke the same connotations. This idea is aptly described by Bennett and Woollacott when they write that,

> Bond, [...] is "[a] mythic figure who transcends his own variable incarnations, Bond is always identified with himself but is never quite the same – an ever mobile signifier" (quoted in Arnett 2009: 2).

Bond is "never quite the same" (ibid) because his representations change. However, he is "always identified with himself" (ibid) because his connotations remain anchored constants.

This understanding lays the foundation to grasping the idea of a 'mobile signifier'. There are some qualifications and additions which round it off. The first is that denotation is inextricably interwoven with connotation. Thus, "while theorists may find it analytically useful to distinguish connotation from denotation, in practice such meaning cannot be neatly separated" (Chandler 2002: 141). Faced with a film sequence of James Bond one might say that the image of a tuxedo-clad man holding a gun is simply that: an image, a "surface, literal meaning" (Hayward 2006: 310) – devoid of association – and that all the connotations of 'James Bond' occur in the mind on the connotative level of meaning. But there is no moment when

[10] These examples, merely teased at here to support the argument, are discussed in far greater detail in Chapter Four.

[11] The relationship between 007's connotation and denotation is not quite this simple – as the following section will demonstrate – but this understanding is a useful point of entry into the discussion.

the image, seen by the mind, is devoid of connotation and simply exists as a picture with only "literal meaning" (ibid). In truth the mind cannot compartmentalise the image of a *man* named James Bond from the ideologies of masculinity, desirability and sexuality encapsulated in the *idea* of 'James Bond'. The image and the idea are intertwined; just as denotation and connotation are intertwined.

This may seem to negate the idea that different *representations* of Bond invoke the same connotations. Bennett and Woollacott offer the solution to this understanding:

> The figure of Bond has changed between […] various moments, […] the cultural and ideological components of which it has been comprised have been mixed in different combinations at different points in time […] 'James Bond' has been a variable and mobile signifier (2003: 31).

James Bond is not merely a character – he is a concept, a sign: "the figure of [James] Bond" (ibid). The connotations of that sign are referred to here as the "ideological components" out of which Bond is "comprised" (ibid). According to Bennett and Woollacott each representation of Bond contains these 'components' – these connotations – but in different "combinations" (ibid). Thus Bond will always be a suave, violent, wise-cracking, seductive, capable hero. But one depiction may "mix" (ibid) in more violence than suavity or less wise-cracking comedy than seduction. Bond's connotations remain present though 'mixed' in different combinations depending on his representation. This resonates with the idea that "Bond is always identified with himself [with his connotations] but is never quite the same [as his denotations mix these in different combinations]" (Bennett & Woollacott in Arnett 2009: 2; parenthesis my own).

Bennett and Woollacott introduce an important parameter to the "ideological components" – or connotations – of James Bond. They are also "cultural" components. Thus

the connotations of Bond are specific to a given culture. This is described by semiotic theory in that:

> There is a danger [...] of stressing the 'individual subjectivity' of connotation: 'intersubjective' responses are shared to some degree by members of a culture; with any individual example only a limited range of connotations would make sense [...] Most adults in Western cultures would know that a car can connote virility or freedom (Chandler 2002: 142).

In exactly the same vein "most adults in Western cultures would know that" (ibid) James Bond can connote masculinity and desirability. But these associations are specific to the Anglo-American culture. In Japan, or Russia, for instance, Bond might mean something very different. But this dissertation seeks to understand Bond as a reflection of popular socio-cultural values in the Anglo-American society. It is exactly because of his potency as a signifier in this culture that he is such an interesting site for study.

Reinvention of 007's representation has, quite consciously, been implemented by the films' producers a number of times over the history of the franchise. Sperb describes how this occurred between two films starring the same actor as Bond:

> Although the Roger-Moore-in-space opus *Moonraker* (1979) had done well financially, the Bond producers realized that the Bond films had become increasingly silly [...] The next film then, *For Your Eyes Only* (1981) was [an] attempt to be a more serious and 'realistic' spy thriller, while also toning down the humour.

However the greatest such shifts in representation are made between Bond actors. As Willis writes of the producer's thinking when casting *GoldenEye,* "the new Bond was to be technological rather than physical, an expert rather than the muscular vigilante played by Timothy Dalton" (2009: 167). Such a shift is exactly what the producers had in mind when making *Casino Royale*. According to Chapman "there was a view within the production team

that *Die Another Day* [the latest Bond film, at the time] had been too excessive" and executive producer Michael G. Wilson felt "'we were getting away from our roots [in *Die Another Day*] […] that's what we were trying to find here [in *Casino Royale*]" (2009: 241). Chapman continues to describe how: "The 'back to basics' approach adopted for *Casino Royale* needs to be seen as one of the series' periodic attempts to reinvent itself […] *For Your Eyes Only* and *The Living Daylights* [Timothy Dalton's first film] are the comparative examples here" (2009: 241-242).

> This short history describes how,
>
> > The 007 films are successful ... in regenerating their social relevance and popular appeal, [and] also in sustaining the cultural mythology that has come to define the figure of James Bond (Linder 2009: 5).

James Bond is successful because he can change. Yet when changing he remains true to the connotations which define him – even if he does vary their combination in order to remain popular. Thus, because he is a 'mobile signifier' the idea – 'the figure' – of James Bond has remained constant in the minds and imaginations of Anglo-American viewers for decades, creating "the most successful and enduring cycle of films ever produced" (Lindner 2009: 1). This cycle of films, each reconfiguring the hero's representation while reaffirming his connotations, has served to create "the cultural mythology that has come to define the figure of James Bond" (Lindner 2009: 5).

It is this "cultural mythology" (ibid) of 'the figure of Bond' which motivates this dissertation. Semiotics, specifically a theory comprised by the influential Barthes[12], articulates Bond's importance as a cultural 'myth':

[12] See footnote on page 14.

> Related to connotation is what Roland Barthes refers to as *myth*. [...] for Barthes myths were dominant ideologies of [their] times. [...] Barthes argues that the orders of signification called denotation and connotation combine to produce ideology. [...] In the third (mythological or ideological) order of signification the sign reflects major culturally variable concepts underpinning a particular worldview – such as masculinity, feminity [...] and so on (Chandler 2002: 145; emphasis my own).

In the above Barthes neatly describes how 'the figure of Bond', through the relationship between its representation and its associations – and the very way in which these changed – describes something of the ideologies a culture has about those connotations. The 'figure of Bond' thus becomes something mythic because it "reflects major culturally variable concepts" (ibid) such as views of women, masculinity and geopolitics.

Omry has described "Bond's prominent mythology within popular culture" (2009: 159). When one thinks of 'James Bond' one does not necessarily think of a face or a person – certainly not only; one thinks of an *idea*: ideas of masculinity, of sex-appeal, of consumerism, of 'cool' even. This aspect of 007 makes him a particularly insight-rich figure for study. Changes in the way Bond is depicted – when met with popular success – reveal something about changes in the way popular culture thinks and feels about the connotations of Bond: masculinity, heroism, desirability.

This research, then, aims to investigate the remodelling of the figure of Bond, to see how changes in his representation reflect changes in socio-cultural values in Anglo-American society. The logical choice for such an investigation is the latest remodelling of Bond's representation, from Pierce Brosnan to Daniel Craig in *Casino Royale*. This reconfiguration is also acknowledged as the most dramatic:

> Revisions made to the Bondian universe in *Casino Royale* appear to alter how the film constructs 007 more radically than any of the re-vampings that took viewers from Connery to Brosnan (Goggin and Glas 2009: 68).

Interestingly the director of *Casino Royale,* Martin Campbell, also helmed the first Pierce Brosnan film, *GoldenEye,* eleven years earlier in 1995. According to Sperb "one might argue that Campbell was deconstructing […in *Casino Royale*…] something he already knew how to build"[13].

It is fitting, then, that the first film of each new take on the franchise be used in the research. Thus, what follows is an investigation of the reconfiguring of 007 in order to see what can be surmised about socio-cultural values and perceptions from the mythic secret agent with the license to kill.

[13] While *Casino Royale* was made after *GoldenEye* it was in fact the very first of Fleming's original books. Due to copyright complications the producers were unable to make *Casino Royale* the first film, settling instead on *Dr No* (Terence Young, 1962); by 2004 this had changed (Chapman 2009: 241-242). As the above has demonstrated, the film's producers sought, with the first Daniel Craig film, to turn back to Bond's "roots" (ibid). Basing the film on first book, which describes James Bond's origins and his first mission as a '00', was aptly suited to the producer's ideas of producing a new film which continued the Bond *mythology* while recreating his *character.* Arnett terms this, "remixing" (2009: 1). He describes how in *Casino Royale*'s producers drew on "previous film iterations, Ian Fleming's novels and [Bond's] fan base" to create "a transformation of the franchise that acknowledges previous iterations while claiming its own autonomy" (Arnett 2009: 2).

Part One: Socio-Cultural Values of Women in Bond

Chapter 1: Contextualising the Times

An investigation of the socio-cultural values which the James Bond films reflect and illustrate cannot overlook their representation of women. The 'Bond girl' is crucially interwoven in the 'mythic figure of Bond'. Part One of this dissertation will demonstrate how the representation of these women is largely similar in the two case studies. An extensive analysis of both films will show that *Casino Royale* (2006) furthers a narrative and ideological trajectory set out in *GoldenEye* (1995). More importantly it will be illustrated that the treatment of women in these Bond films is a precise reflection of the treatment of women in Anglo-American culture in the decades the films were made. This dissertation argues that during the 1990s and 2000s women enjoyed a great deal of autonomy and equality in Anglo-American culture – but were still not *fully* equal. Rather they existed within a patriarchal society in which they were often discriminated against through employment selection, remuneration and most poignantly, culture[14].

Chapter One will describe both the increased freedom won by women towards the end of the 20th century and the ever-present patriarchal constraints which limited them. It will do so by drawing on two sections. The first is an investigation of feminism in these two decades. The evolution of feminism serves as an apt articulation of the ways in which women won

[14] This will be discussed on pages 32-37. Relevant references are: Elmuti (2003); Goodman *et al* (2003); Huffman & Mann (2006); Roth (2006); Stanley (2005);

autonomy and equality. Thus a brief description of feminism's history contextualises these two decades.

However this picture is misleading. Chapter One will continue by describing numerous instances of women being subjected to patriarchal dominance or male discrimination. The chapter concludes with a "filmic footprints" section which describes how these trends – these socio-cultural values – were articulated in popular film and television during these decades. This serves to lay the foundation for Chapter Two which will illustrate how the two Bond film case studies clearly reflect those same values.

The Evolution of Feminism: Winning Equality

The 1990s and 2000s form an era generally described as the "third wave" of feminism[15]. In order to grasp the mentality and values of this wave, and of women during this period, it is useful to trace – briefly – the evolution of feminism which led to it. Bailey articulates this point:

> A meaningful discussion of the third wave depends, in part, on an understanding of what constitutes the second wave. Gaining a tolerably clear sense of the second wave requires some exploration of the boundaries of the first wave (1997: 18).

The first step, then, in investigating current feminist values is to look back, briefly, to how these values came about.

[15] Bailey (1997); Banet-Weiser (2004); Frith (2001); Krolokke & Sorenson (2006); LeGates (2001); Mann & Huffman (2005); Though it should be noted that the very concept of a 'third wave' is hotly disputed. This is not directly relevant to the research of this dissertation but the above sources discuss it in detail.

According to Macey:

> Although feminism can take many different forms, its common core is the thesis that the relationship between the sexes is one of inequality and oppression. All forms of feminism seek to identify the causes of that inequality and to remedy it, but the issue of exactly which agency produces and reproduces inequality is the source of many of the differences between feminists (2001: 122).

Thus the central issue of inequality manifested itself in a variety of primary concerns at any given time, whether it be a woman's right to vote; the degradation and cheapening of the female body; or the right to individual autonomy (to name but a few). Changing social and political landscapes invited changing views of inequality and varying strategies to resist it. It is due to this tendency of the movement to change over time that "it has become conventional to describe the history of feminism as a series of successive waves which peak and then recede" (Macey 2001: 123). This metaphor is fitting as it illustrates the way in which differing periods saw differing perspectives on the issue of female discrimination growing in intensity and popularity (peaking) and then, depending on the obtained results, or upon the emergence of a new way of thinking, dying away (or receding). According to Bailey:

> 'Wave' just doesn't sound like the right word; the lone occurrence of something. Waves that arise in social and political milieus, like waves that arise in water, become defined only in context (1997: 18).

Bailey articulates neatly the idea that each feminist wave peaked and receded as the result of a socio-cultural *milieu*. Building on the established feminist metaphor, one might describe such a milieu as a 'tide' of changing social and cultural events which swept into being a mass-based feminist movement – a wave.

Krolokke and Sorenson offer a brief but thorough overview of the timeline of the three waves:

> First-wave feminism arose in the context of industrial society and liberal politics but is connected to both the liberal women's rights movement and early socialist feminism in the late 19th and early 20th century in the United States and Europe […] the second wave of feminism [...] emerged in the 1960s to 1970s in post-war Western welfare societies, when other "oppressed" groups such as Blacks and homosexuals were being defined […] Second-wave feminism is closely linked to the radical voices of women's empowerment and differential rights and, during the 1980s to 1990s, also to a crucial differentiation of second-wave feminism itself, initiated by women of color (*sic*) and third-world women. We end our discussion with the third feminist wave, from the mid-1990s onward, springing from the […] context of information society and neoliberal, global politics (2006: 1-2).

The above demonstrates that each of the feminist waves centred on specific issues of gender-based discrimination and that they were the product of the changing socio-cultural moods – or 'tides' – of their time. The tide which carried the first wave is neatly described by Hunt *et al*:

> In the early 1800s seeds of dissension against the subjugation of women were growing across many countries in Europe and Eurasia, and in the United States. A heavy emphasis on oppression inherent in laws regulating marriage and the denial of the vote to women was growing (2010: 375).

It makes intuitive sense that as laws were changed and women obtained the vote in America in 1920 (Bailey 1997: 3) the socio-cultural tide surging against women's subjugation began to ebb and as a result that particular feminist wave slowly receded. This was observed by both Mann and Huffman (2005: 71) and Taylor (1989: 768-769), who term the decades between the 1920s and 1960s a "period of abeyance" (ibid) in feminist activity. However according to Huffman and Mann:

> This does not mean that there were no feminists or feminist activism before or even after these waves, but simply that their ideas and actions did not materialize into a mass-based, social movement [...] we are not suggesting that the waves of feminism are equivalent with the history of feminism. Rather, waves are simply those historical eras when feminism had a mass base. (2005: 58).

Another such wave was in the making in the 1950s and early 1960s as a variety of factors began to generate a new tide in society and culture. This slowly gathered momentum and generated a mass-based movement in the 1960s. Hunt *et al* neatly summarise the factors which contributed to this swelling tide:

> The birth control pill was developed in the 1950s [and] liberated women, like men, to more freely exercise their sexuality beginning in the early 1960s. [...] Secondly Betty Friedman's book, *The Feminist Mystique*, published in 1963 [...] questioned whether these [...] suburban middle-class women [...] were satisfied to identify themselves only through relationships with others – a wife, a mother, a caregiver [...] The book sparked a revolution, including new conversations amongst women [...] Third, the civil rights movement was a training ground for many who became activists in the second wave. (2010: 377).

All of these factors allowed the second wave of feminism to break onto Anglo-American society. "The term *second wave feminism* refers mostly to the radical feminism of the women's liberation movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s" (Krolokke & Sorenson 2006: 7). This is perhaps the feminism most widely remembered in the Anglo-American world, the feminism of bra burning, mass demonstration and publicized events[16]. Not only were these women's methods radical – but so were the effects they had.

Thanks to the second wave the way women functioned and were perceived in Anglo-American society changed forever. According to Inness:

[16] For a discussion of exactly when such events occurred see Krolokke and Sorenson (2006: 7-9).

> One needs to recognize how second-wave feminism rippled through American society [...] What emerged were women who pursued many different roles previously held almost exclusively by men [...] They became soldiers, police officers, fire fighters and construction workers - all jobs that had been considered too rough for "ladies". In addition women demanded more authority and power in the workplace [...] to demonstrate that they were tough enough to handle even the most stressful and demanding jobs, from CEO to Congress member. On the sports field, too, women's roles changed due to feminism (2004: 5-6).

The above captures two terms used widely in the revised perception which will be seen to "ripple through" popular and filmic culture just as it did "through American society" (ibid); namely 'equality' and 'toughness'. Not only did women enjoy a far greater equality but they also began entering more physical and dangerous careers and doing "the most stressful and demanding jobs" (ibid). That women were now considered "tough enough to handle" (ibid) the work, challenges and roles conventionally reserved for men will be reflected in popular culture, and especially in the James Bond case studies which follow.

With these sweeping changes to the socio-cultural landscape, the tide which had propelled the second wave began to ebb in the 1980s. As seen throughout feminism's history, changing tides of values and perceptions affect changes to feminist waves. Thus the 1980s saw a transformation of feminism which would begin to define it into the 1990s and spawn the third wave.

The Evolution of Feminism: Shifting from 'Equity' to 'Identity'

The 1960s and 1970s had seen a 'radical' and vocal outward focus by women on the factors denying them equality. During the 1980s and thereafter "the women's movement

[...] experienced a turn inward to focus on self-growth and transformation" (Mann & Huffman 2005: 85). Women were no longer talking about the oppressive societal constraints as much as they spoke about the internal dynamics of being women and their relationships to one another. Krolokke and Sorenson have described this as "a crucial differentiation of second-wave feminism itself" (2006: 2). According to them:

> During the 1980s this new framework grew into 'difference second-wave feminism' […] the need to address the differences among women simultaneously promoted the theory of different standpoints and the divergences between them […] As a consequence, difference feminism gradually grew into what is now often referred to as 'identity politics' (Krolokke & Sorenson 2006: 12).

Further, Mann and Huffman describe that:

> The crux of this new direction in feminism was a critique of the 'essentialist woman' of the second wave, which [critics] claimed ignored or downplayed differences among women. [...] women focus upon their oppression as women and ignore differences of race, sexual preference, class, and age. There is a pretence to a homogeneity of experience covered by the word sisterhood that does not in fact exist' (2005: 59).

The above illustrates that the question of more individual identities for women – beyond merely being 'woman' became a primary focus of feminist discourse. To a large extent this shifted the focus from the external oppression of 'women' to definitions of identity within that broad classification. Krollokke and Sorenson describe this as "a basic shift from an equity approach to a difference approach"[17] (2006: 12)[18].

[17] "equity" here refers to "claiming the natural equity of women" (Krolokke & Sorenson 2006: 3). 'Equity' can thus, in this context, be read as 'equality'.

[18] It must be noted that while this overview has thus far implied a relative unity in the first and second waves this was not the case. According to Mann and Huffman: "there is a tendency for attention to be drawn to the common themes that unify each wave, and this often obscures the diversity of the competing feminisms that actually exist [...] within it" (2005: 58). In the case of the first wave, these included "equity" or "equal opportunity feminism"; "liberal feminism" and "Marxist/socialist feminism" (Krolokke and Sorenson 2006: 5-6 & Macey 2001: 122). In the second, Marxist/socialist feminism again featured, as well as "women's liberation" feminists; "radical feminism" and "liberal feminism" (Krolokke and Sorenson 2006: 8-10).
These diverse feminisms were swept together, however, by the momentum of the first and early second waves. In short the external issues of subjugation took precedence over – and united to some degree – the internal differences. With the success

This change in approach lies at the root of the mindset and values of feminists in the 1990s and beyond: values of the third wave. In addition, these values articulate not only feminist standpoints but the societal perceptions of women in general. The 1990s were characterised not only by women who were 'tough' and 'equal' but highly *individual*[19]. Such individualistic definitions of identity began with the second wave's 'decentering'. This,

> Resulted in two opposing political camps: one that embraced identity politics as the key to liberation; and a second that saw freedom in resistance to identity. The former is best illustrated by feminists of color and ethnicity [...] The latter is exemplified by postmodernist and post-structuralist feminists who critically questioned the notion of coherent identities and viewed freedom as resistance to categorization or identity (Mann & Huffman 2005: 58).

The 'decentering' had begun with women who were not traditionally white, heterosexual and middle class defining their identities according to their difference of race, class and sexual preference. But it stimulated women to go even further in defining their difference. These "postmodernist and post-structuralist" (ibid) women refused to classify themselves and their experiences according to only race, class or sexual preference (or some combination of the three). Instead they defined themselves according to a highly personal, totally individual identity.

Feminism, and the values and perceptions of women, had changed. As a result so would the new generation of women coming of age:

> Given these transformations, it is not surprising that the focus of the new generation of recruits, who entered the women's movement in the 1980s and 1990s, differed from their second wave sisters on several important dimensions (Mann & Huffman 2005: 85).

---

of the second wave these unifying oppressions fell away to some extent – sufficiently so that the internal rifts could begin to take precedence.

[19] As will be discussed on pages 29-31.

These women had different perspectives and values. It was their way of thinking which, in the late 1980s and specifically the 1990s heralded the birth of the third wave of feminism.

The Third Wave: Strong, Assertive - and Playful

Women in the 1990s and beyond were confident in their equality and capability. They were assertive and strong; aggressively, but also playfully so, not taking their independence as seriously as previous waves because it had already, to a large degree, been obtained. But, contrary to the previous two waves, they articulated these values in a great variety of ways. Marcelle Karp writing in 1999 captures something of the essence of the times:

> We've entered an era of DIY feminism - sistah, do-it-yourself- and we have all kinds of names for ourselves: lipstick lesbians, do-me feminists, even postfeminism. . . .No matter what the flava is, we're still feminists. Your feminism is what you want it to be and what you make of it. Define your agenda (quoted in Mann & Huffman 2005: 75).

Her informal slang and laid-back tone imply a casual acceptance of women's equality and ability. She celebrates it, but her tongue-in-cheek tone is also playful about it.

What is more, Karp articulates openness to a divergence of feminisms. This is an important aspect of the 1990s. The third wave was a not a mass-based social movement like the two before it. The changes of the 1980s had made such (fairly) unified action partly unnecessary (thanks to radical social changes) and partly unwanted (thanks to identity politics and post-structuralist visions of identity). However, while the third wave was not a mass-based movement, that does not mean that it was any less a social presence than its predecessors. Karp's words capture this: women were voicing their equality and ability – just not cohesively as in previous waves, but individually. Further, individual identity was not only permitted but

celebrated and widely lived in the real world[20]. Bellafante offers empirical evidence of the widespread presence of feminist values:

> Yes, the women's movement changed our individual lives and expectations, and young women today acknowledge this. A hefty 50% of those from ages 18 to 34 told the pollsters in the TIME/CNN survey that they share "feminist" values, by which they generally mean they want a world in which they can choose to be anything – the President or a mother, or both (1998: 55).

Several of these diverse and multiple feminisms articulate values and ideologies which are reflected in the portrayal of 'Bond girls' in *GoldenEye* and *Casino Royale*.

The first of these is the 'grrl'(*sic*) power punk-rock bands of the 1990s. These bands met with great success – reflecting popular appeal – and they articulated values which the women of the Bond case studies reflect. Describing the phenomenon Krolokke and Sorenson write that,

> Many [women] have been empowered by the new grrl[21] (*sic*) rhetoric, which originated among girls-only punk bands such as Bikini Kill [...] in the United States in the early 1990s. In their manifesto-like recording "Revolution Girl-Style Now" (1990), Bikini Kill celebrated the self-reliance and acting out of prepubescent girls and mixed the feminist strategy of empowerment with the avant-garde or punk strategy of D.I.Y.: "Do It Yourself." This message was soon absorbed by a growing number of "riot grrl" (*sic*) groups all over the United States and Europe and further spread by "fanzines" and net-based "e-zines." (2005: 15-16).

These bands voiced an overt, unapologetic feminist ideology, unashamedly owning the 'brand' or 'feeling' of feminist rhetoric. As Krolokke *et al* describe it "these young feminists […] [engage] in a new, more self-assertive—even aggressive—but also more playful and less pompous kind of feminism" (ibid). Thus the very idea of 'feminism' became something to sing

[20] It should be noted that, among others, both Mann and Huffman (2005: 63) and Frith (2001: 1) record that these varying ideologies were often, even "bitterly" and "acrimoniously" (Frith 2001: 1) at odds with one another. Nonetheless, the varying ideologies existed – and thrived.

[21] The spelling here refers to a specific brand or movement of female culture in the 1990s; what Bellafante describes as: "'girl power,' that sassy, don't-mess-with-me adolescent spirit that Madison Avenue carefully caters to" (1998: 55).

about as well as (or perhaps instead of) shout and protest about. Furthermore, the grrl *(sic*) bands introduced new values which they 'mixed in' with these more traditional feminist ideas namely "self-reliance", "do it yourself" and "acting out" (ibid). The popularity of their rhetoric proves its resonance with the dominant values of the time. These playful, aggressively assertive and self-reliant, values feature strongly in *GoldenEye* – again describing how this film reflects the popular values of its time.

Another current of feminism which is reflected in the 1990s Bond film is that of politics of power feminists like Elizabeth Wurtzel. She states that in the (mid to late) 1990s "putting out one's pretty power, one's pussy power, one's sexual energy for popular consumption no longer makes you a bimbo. It makes you smart" (Wurtzel quoted in Baumgardner and Richards 2000: 141). This view was echoed by the likes of Marcelle Karp describing "our tits and hips and lips [as] power tools" (quoted in Huffman and Mann 2005: 73). According to Baumgardner and Richards "it appears that many in this new generation appreciate the rebellious desire to reclaim what has previously been used against them" (2000: 188). This was clearly quite a popular desire as Bellafante describes:

> In the heated atmosphere of early-'90s gender politics […] [Camille] Paglia quickly began turning up all over the media voicing her controversial opinions on the sex wars […] Relish sexual power, she told women, but don't go to frat parties expecting men to be saints. The argument was powerful and full of merit (1998: 56; emphasis my own).

As Chapter Two will demonstrate, the women in the Bond films under discussion clearly embody these popular values. They use their bodies as tools, as sights of power – and even as very lethal weapons.

From the above it is evident that the position of women in the 1990s had improved immeasurably, compared to their predecessors. These women were assertive and empowered, self reliant and confident in their ability. Yet they were also sassy and playful. All of these are characteristics which the Bond films reflect. Yet for all this, the equality of women in the real world was not nearly as certain as it would seem. The next section will illustrate that their still lurked a dark undertone of residual female inequality in society.

Women in the 1990s and 2000s: *Glass Ceilings*

A surge in gender equality began before the 1990s and continued into the 2000s. According to Elmuti *et al* "the past 20 years [1983-2003] has cultivated a revolution in the number of women now in managerial and professional jobs" (2003: 2). Several sources confirm this overwhelming increase in female employment[22]. However to paint a picture of absolute gender equality in the Anglo-American world from the 1990s onwards would be a fallacy. The truth is that while women enjoyed far greater freedoms and equality, they had still not broken free from the constraints of a patriarchal society. In the private sector, legal and corporate worlds, this trend is often described by the notion of a "glass ceiling". According to Elmuti *et al*:

> The term "glass ceiling" was first introduced to the American public three decades ago in a Wall Street Journal column entitled "Corporate Woman." The term attempted to delineate the unseen artificial barriers that bar women from top executive jobs. These barriers are usually created by individual or organisational prejudices (2003: 5).

[22] Bellafante (1998); Elmuti *et al* (2003); Goodman *et al* (2003); Innes (2004); Krolokke & Sorenson (2006)

This dissertation argues that exactly the same 'glass ceiling' was evident in the representation of women in the two James Bond case studies. Much like the women in the real world they were ostensibly far more equal to Bond, both in character, plot relevance and action. However, as in the real world, these fictional women were still not allowed total equality or control. Chapter Two will discuss this in detail. In order to prove that this treatment of women reflected socio-cultural values in the real world, however, it is first necessary to map those values in the 1990s and 2000s.

While the concept of 'glass ceilings' was introduced in the 1970s and one might hope that the subsequent decades allowed for its slow elimination from professional culture this is certainly not the case. Several sources reveal that the 'glass ceiling' had by no means disappeared by the turn of the millennium[23]. Among them are Goodman *et al* who identify this notion as something very plausible and real in American society in the 1990s[24]:

> Although women's participation in the U.S. labor force has increased, and women occupy 44% of management jobs in American companies (Powell 1999; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1998), top management ranks remain dominated by men. Only 3% to 5% of the top management jobs in private-sector companies are filled by women (Morrison & Von Glinow 1990; O'Leary & Ickovics 1992; Powell & Butterfield 1994; U.S. Department of Labor 1991, 1995) (2003: 475).

These numbers are doubly enlightening as they begin by describing the vastly improved position for women in the labour force – having risen to nearly half of the "management jobs in American companies" (ibid). But this positive picture serves only to make the "top management" numbers even more starkly condemning. Women's virtually equal

[23]Elmuti *et al* (2003); Goodman *et al* (2003); Huffman & Mann (2006); Roth (2006); Stanley (2005)
[24] The original sources cited by Goodman *et al* are included so as to reinforce the accuracy of these numbers and the overwhelming support for their argument.

representation at mid-level suddenly disappears at executive level – dwindling from almost one in two to one in *twenty*. Goodman *et al* continue to spell out the socio-cultural values which these numbers articulate:

> The exclusion of women from positions in top management is evidence of a glass ceiling. It is a barrier that appears invisible but is strong enough to hold women back from top-level jobs merely because they are women rather than because they lack job-relevant skills, education, or experience (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Morrison, White, Van Velsor, & the Center for Creative Leadership 1992; Powell & Butterfield 1994; U.S. Department of Labor 1991, 1995) (2003: 475).

The idea of an insurmountable, even though "invisible", (ibid) gender barrier is thus clearly evident in the United States as late as 1999[25]. The sweeping social changes created by the second wave of feminism would have one believe that women had achieved equality. Unfortunately their equality was not absolute but qualified. Men, or patriarchy, still ruled even though women were allowed greater freedom and equality within it.

Elmuti *et al* echo these sentiments almost exactly: "While women are making progress in closing the gender gap in middle management jobs, they are still significantly under-represented in top management positions" (2003: 5). They continue: "a study in the *Issues and Controversies* publication states that for every dollar a man makes, a woman makes only 75 cents" (ibid). Bellafante reaffirms this point:

> The average female worker in America still earns just 76[cents] for every dollar a man earns, up 17[cents] from the '70s but still no cause for rejoicing. And for most women, the glass ceiling is as impenetrable as ever. There are only two female CEOs at FORTUNE 500 companies, and just 10% of corporate officers are women (1998: 55; brackets original).

[25] See the first extract from Goodman *et al* citing Powell in 1999 and the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics in 1998.

It is revealing that Elmuti and Bellafante's numbers are almost exactly the same. The years in which they record these numbers, however, are not. Bellafante writes in 1998 that women earn 76 cents to men's 1 dollar. Elmuti cites her source in 2000 as making that number 75 cents. This reveals the pay-discrimination between genders to be a certainty (because of multiple sources) and a continuing trend over a two year period – at least.

It therefore becomes abundantly clear that *despite appearances* during the 1990s women in the United States were still not enjoying full equality with their male counterparts; neither in pay, nor in position. Exactly the same pattern will demonstrated in *GoldenEye*, a film made squarely in the midst of this decade in 1995. However, this research has thus far argued that the Bond films reflect the socio-cultural values of the Anglo-American world in general, not only of the United States. It is thus necessary to demonstrate that the 'glass ceiling' effect and the subjugation of women, despite perceived equality within a patriarchal system, was present throughout more than just the United States.

In this regard Hull and Nelson are particularly useful. They offer a far wider perspective through an Investigation of three books about "the gendered division of labour" (1998: 682) in the legal sphere in three different countries. These "major new books" examine gender inequality in law firms and legal practices in "Toronto and throughout Ontario, Canada", as well as "Australia" and a "corporate legal department in San Francisco" (ibid). They find that:

> The books are interesting as a collection [...] They reveal a depressing, if not terribly surprising, continuity across disparate settings. In all three contexts we find the persistence of sexism and gender inequality despite significant changes in the gender order within law (Hull & Nelson 1998: 683).

It is interesting to note that Hull and Nelson do not seem surprised by the gender inequality they find. One might assume that they expected as much. This creates the impression that discrimination against women is by no means a rare occurrence. This impression is reinforced by the fact that three different sets of authors, across three countries and two continents, felt the need to address this issue. The gender discrimination which these sources outline is bleak: from grossly unequal pay for the same billed hours (1998: 684-685) to creating a hostile, patriarchal hierarchy which treats "women lawyers as sexual objects or otherwise eliciting docile, compliant, "feminine" behaviour from them" (1998: 688).

All the sources cited thus far only address female inequality in the 1990s. *Casino Royale*, however, was made in 2005. In order to demonstrate that it, too, in subjugating women to a patriarchal order, reflects the dominant socio-cultural values of its time it is necessary to prove that women were still being treated unequally to men in the 2000s.

Some striking evidence hereof comes from Louise Marie Roth (2006) who describes, in one fell swoop, a string of legal cases brought against Wall Street firms in which women were found to have been discriminated against. She begins with the "infamous 'Boom-Boom Room'" (2006: 357) case, an example from the very year *GoldenEye* was released:

> In 1995 after enduring years of put-downs, lewd remarks, sexual gestures and practical jokes as well as being denied access to the best accounts three women at Smith Barney [...] filed a class action suit charging the firm with sex discrimination and sexual harassment (ibid).

Roth then traces the same tendency nearly a decade later – the year before *Casino Royale* was released in "a similar class action suit against Merril Lynch [in which] a panel of arbitrators awarded Hydie Sumner $2.2 million on April 19, 2004" (ibid).

Roth continues to describe how several "individual women also filed suits" from 1999 until 2004 – and won (ibid). What gives Roth's account particular punching power is that it describes a legal finding of "systematic discrimination" (ibid). These, then, are not merely opinions or stories; a court found them to be facts. And they demonstrate, again, that as late as the mid 2000s, women were still being discriminated against based on gender. They were denied absolute equality and still tried to exist within a male-dominated world. Chapter Two will demonstrate how the same is true for the 'Bond girls' in *Casino Royale* – which released a year after Hydie Sumner won her settlement.

To summarise, the socio-cultural values held by and about women during the 1990s and throughout the 2000s comprised the following elements: firstly, women enjoyed an unprecedented degree of freedom and equality. They were enjoying their freedoms with sass and playfulness as well as confidence and certainty and reclaiming their bodies as sites of beauty and sexual allure – partly for personal pleasure and partly for power.

However, while it is easy to describe the position of women in these decades with words such as freedom, equality and power, the fact remains that they were still not completely equal. They earned less than men and lived in a society where men still held the almost all senior positions. Such a culture is clearly a patriarchal one where the dominant values and power structures belong to the masculine mindset.

Both the positive flowering of women's freedom and the persistent presence of patriarchy are depicted in the James Bond case studies. However, these films were by no means alone in reflecting the values of these decades. The subsequent investigation of television and filmic culture around the turn of the millennium will demonstrate that such

patriarchal values were clearly present in these mediums; reflecting the popular *zeitgeist* of the times.

Filmic Footprints: Illusions of Equality

It has been demonstrated how divergent and multi-layered the fields of feminist writing were in the 1990s and 2000s; how women found themselves far more empowered and yet still suffered a degree of separation; how women reclaimed their bodies as instruments and weapons. Reflections hereof are clear in the popular cinema of the time. In order to contextualise an investigation of these ideas, however, a small but essential foundation of theory must first be laid out.

This important piece of theory is Laura Mulvey's essay *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* (first printed in 1975). While written two or even three decades before this dissertation's case studies, her text remains – as this section will demonstrate – still almost entirely relevant to them and the greater filmic popular culture of the time. Erens describes it as "one of the most influential feminist essays" (1990: xix) and Hayward writes that: "this important text is perceived as *the* key founding document of psychoanalytic feminist film theory" (2006: 138). Hayward's assertion is important as it spells out that Mulvey serves as "*the* key" link between feminism and feminist theory on the one hand, and popular filmic culture on the other.

"In her essay [Mulvey] examined the way in which cinema functions through its codes and conventions to construct the way in which woman is to be looked at" (Hayward 2006: 372). Her essay coined, for the purposes of this dissertation, three important notions: firstly, the idea

of “the gaze”; secondly, the active role of the male and passive role of the female; and thirdly – most pertinent to this research – the notion that the visual and the narrative seek to incorporate “the alien presence” of women into a patriarchal ideology (1990: 33-57).

Mulvey describes how,

> In a world ordered by sexual imbalance, pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female. The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure, which is stylised accordingly. [...] The man controls the film fantasy and also emerges as the representative of power [...] as the bearer of the look of the spectator [...] The image of woman as (passive) raw material for the (active) gaze of man takes the argument a step further into the structure of representation, adding a further layer demanded by the ideology of the patriarchal order as it is worked through its favorite (*sic*) cinematic form – illusionistic narrative film (1990: 33; 34; 38).

The first assertion which draws attention here is the idea that the world is ordered by a sexual imbalance – an inequality of gender roles. This was certainly the case in the 1970s when Mulvey wrote the essay (one need merely reflect on the mass-based second wave of feminism which was still in full swing at the time, in direct reaction to this widespread inequality). It is still true in the 1990s and 2000s, as the prior investigation has proved. Film then – the “favourite (*sic*) cinematic form” of the “patriarchal order” (ibid) – constructs its narratives and its visual codes to reflect this. It does so by making the male an active protagonist and the female a passive sight for the male gaze. This gaze is firstly that of the protagonist, but because he serves as the “bearer of the look of the spectator” (ibid) the gaze is extended into the audience member. Thus the audience becomes complicit in, and part of, the male gaze and the patriarchal ideology of the film.

Mulvey’s argument then leads her to two further questions. The first is to ask,

> What happens to the female spectator, given that the narrative of the classical narrative cinema is [...] tightly bound up with male perceptions and fantasies of

> women? How does she derive visual pleasure? Mulvey can conclude only that she must either identify with the passive position of the female character on screen, or, if she is to derive visual pleasure, she must assume a male positioning (Hayward 2006: 139).

This first question, then, addresses the issue of the female spectator and her reaction to the male gaze and its focus on the woman. The second addresses the male reaction to this same gaze. In this context Mulvey writes:

> The woman as icon, displayed for the gaze and enjoyment of men, the active controllers of the look, always threatens to evoke the anxiety it originally signified. [namely that of] [...] her lack of a penis, implying a threat of castration [...] The male unconscious has two avenues of escape from this castration anxiety: [...] re-enactment of the original trauma (investigating the woman, demystifying her original mystery), counterbalanced by the devaluation, punishment or saving of the guilty object [...]; or else complete disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object or turning the represented figure itself into a fetish so that it becomes reassuring rather than dangerous (1990: 35).

While Mulvey's language may seem dense and her ideas complex, the essence of her argument is simple. 'Man' finds 'woman' a threat or danger because she does not have a penis and thus represents an alien presence (1960: 33). In order to deal with this alien presence, this threat, the man – and the patriarchal filmic order – has two options. Firstly, to make the woman an object of voyeurism; this can be done by devaluing, punishing and or saving her. Any of these three treatments of the woman places her within the constructs of male power. Through any of them she is restored to her position as subordinate to the male and the threat of her 'alien-ness' is resolved.

The other option is to "disavow" (ibid) her 'alien-ness' by making the woman a site of fetish instead of danger. Thus the woman becomes alluring, sexy and beautiful, a fetish object instead of a threat, or, as Mulvey terms it, "reassuring rather than dangerous" (ibid). She

summarises her argument by writing that "woman as representation signifies castration, inducing voyeuristic or fetishistic (*sic*) mechanisms to circumvent her threat" (Mulvey 1990: 38).

The key elements of Mulvey's essay which are essential to this dissertation's argument and understanding are: firstly, "the gaze"; secondly, the active role of the male and passive role of the female; and thirdly the notion that classical Hollywood narrative film, as an ideological site, seeks to incorporate "the alien presence" of women into a patriarchal ideology (1990: 33-57). Mulvey wrote this essay in 1975, in a world clearly dominated by men. This dissertation has argued that the world of the 1990s and 2000s, while having experienced significant surges in female equality and empowerment, was still dominated by such a patriarchal ideology. Examining the films made in these two decades the same patriarchal dominance is clearly evident.

This having been said, the 1990s did see one aspect of Mulvey's analysis change dramatically – reflecting the new freedoms and opportunities women were enjoying in the real world. According to Enns:

> The 1990s witnessed the rise of a new kind of female action hero, who brought into question many of the assumptions underlying feminist film criticism. By representing women as both sex objects and strong protagonists, television programs […] and films […] challenged the notion that popular texts always represent women as passive spectacles and men as active agents (2009: 874).

The "female action hero" (ibid) which this decade ushered in was by no means "passive" (ibid)[26]. These characters were wielding weapons (be it machine guns or swords); driving narratives (as the central protagonist) and generally recreating female roles as far more active,

[26] While the immediate reference here is Enns, the term "passive" reaches directly back to Mulvey, as discussed before.

assertive and empowered[27]. Mulvey's assertion that women served only as passive objects was being radically refuted. Yvonne Tasker argues that,

> At one level the action heroine represents some kind of response to feminism, emerging from a changing political context [...] In responding to feminism image makers sought to present women as active and as powerful, mobilizing already existing types and conventions, images that were an established part of popular culture (1993: 15&19).

Tasker here outlines the importance of feminism and the surge of female equality in the 1990s and beyond in creating more equal roles for women. She also echoes the idea that women were being made into 'active' rather than 'passive' agents[28]. But Tasker mentions a third and important aspect here. In order to "present" women as "powerful", filmmakers mobilized "already existing stereotypes and conventions" (ibid) in their representation. Thus the empowered woman became not so much the CEO or the Congresswoman, but the action heroine. Catherine Driscoll makes this connection between changing gender stereotypes and perceptions (fuelled largely by feminism) and popular culture explicit: "Feminism, in the sense in which the term is used in the late 1990s, has always focused on popular culture because feminists are interested in the impact of modern life on women" (1999: 173). Modern life was certainly having an impact on women, granting more freedom and opportunity, and popular culture was reflecting it.

Several sources describe the "explosion of tough women in the popular media – including films, television shows, comic books, and video games" (Inness 2004: 1)[29] throughout the 1990s and early 2000s. Perhaps the most popular and widely cited filmic examples are

[27] Examples of these action heroines are discussed on the following page.
[28] That these terms are so widely used to describe the female/male constructions is further evidence of how influential Muvley's essay and its ideas were.
[29] See also: Andrade (2003); Enns (2009); Neroni (2005); Tasker (1993); Tasker (1998)

Sarah Connor in *Terminator 2* (James Cameron: 1991) and Ripley in the *Alien* franchise (1979, 1986, 1992, 1997). "Ripley and Connor's success led the way for the large number of tough female characters who appeared in subsequent years" (Inness 2004: 3) such as Lara Croft who featured in the *Tomb Raider* films (2001, 2003); the women of *Charlie's Angels* (2000, 2003); and popular televised characters like *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (Joss Whedon, 1997-2003)*; Xena: Warrior Princess* (John Schulian & Roger Tapert; 1995-2001) and Sydney Bristow from *Alias* (JJ Abrams; 2001-2006)[30].

These are films which "challenged the notion that popular texts always represent women as passive spectacles and men as active agents […] by representing women [not only] as [...] sex objects [but also as] strong protagonists" (Driscoll 1999: 173; parenthesis my own). But even as Driscoll describes how women challenge the notion of being a "passive object" for the benefit of the "controlling male gaze" (Mulvey 1990: 33&38) she introduces how these active heroines still conform to that gaze. They are represented as "strong protagonists", but also as "sex objects". The subsequent analysis of this surge of tough action heroines in the 1990s and 2000s will demonstrate how these women refute only one of Mulvey's three assertions. They certainly become more active, but they remain presented as objects for the male gaze and, more importantly, they remain constructs within and subordinated to, a patriarchal narrative structure. Exactly the same will be demonstrated of the case studies' 'Bond girls'. Chapter Two will investigate how, whether it be the seductress who attempts to crush Bond between her thighs in *GoldenEye* or the lover who succeeds in crushing his heart in *Casino Royale*, these

[30] References are to the series' executive producers / creators.

assertive, seemingly equal women are simply not allowed to definitively conquer the iconic signifier of masculinity: James Bond.

Enns, examining the depictions of newly empowered female heroes in the 1990s, finds that they “serve to illustrate the limited options available to women: they can either remain subject to the controlling male gaze or disappear” and their choices are thus "entrapment and coercion or a symbolic death" (Enns 2007: 875). Enns is describing an argument made by Rosie White's in *Violent Femmes: Women as Spies in Popular Culture* (2007). White’s essential point of departure is to acknowledge that these women are represented as "active, intelligent and (largely) independent professional women, but all these qualities were contained in a glamorous and marketable package” (ibid). These characters, for all their seemingly pro-feminist characteristics, cannot be accepted by popular culture if they are not represented in a “marketable package” (ibid) of sex-appeal and glamour. Thus these women “remain subject to the controlling male gaze” (ibid) because they are still ‘packaged’ in such a way as to appeal to a male viewer. White writes this with reference to “female spies in the 1990s [...] in films like *La Femme Nikita* (Luc Besson, 1990) and [its] American remake *Point of No Return* (John Badham, 1993)” (ibid); both films depict violent, capable women who are also ‘packaged’ as sexy and desirable. The tendency she outlines is by no means limited to these examples. Several sources echo her views when investigating other texts with an empowered, active heroine.

The first is Helford who writes of the *Xenia Warrior Princess* television series that: “the series’ sexual politics rely on patriarchal myths of gendered identities and relations that belie the feminist and queer pleasures so many critics and fans applaud” (quoted in Andrade 2003: 18). Helford here articulates the idea that these empowered heroines are still constructed and

packaged according to a male gaze. Perhaps the most sweeping expression of this idea comes from Inness (2004). In her introduction to *Action Chicks* (2004) she outlines not only her own opinion but that of several of the authors who contributed to her anthology about tough heroines in television and film during the 1990s. She writes that:

> Tough-women characters, however, do not entirely escape traditional gender expectation, and chapters in *Action Chicks* also focus on how these females adhere to gender, [...] stereotypes. [...] the characters are predominantly [...] attractive, feminine and heterosexually appealing. The freedoms that these figures suggest frequently lie within a narrow set of prescribed social boundaries.
>
> Several of the authors included in the anthology are dubious about how revolutionary the tough woman is. […] are they sex symbols developed primarily for a male audience? (Inness 2004: 8-9)

Inness confirms the continuing presence of the controlling male gaze in and on these empowered female characters.

Reconsidering for a moment the earlier discussion of the state of socio-cultural values about women during the 1990s and 2000s it is clear that popular culture was a reflection of popular socio-cultural values at the time. It has been extensively proven that women won greater equality during the 1970s and 1980s. In fact this chapter has already described how the notion of 'tougher' more capable women emerged thanks to the second wave of feminism and women taking on roles traditionally reserved for men. It is evident that such 'tough' images of women rippled through popular culture. Simultaneously, however, the reflection of socio-cultural values in popular culture also captured the continued inequality of women. Where women in the real world were still subject to "lewd remarks" and "sexual gestures" and "systematic discrimination" (Roth 2006: 357) the tough women of film and television were still

treated as “sex symbols” who function within a “narrow set of prescribed social boundaries” (Inness 2004: 8-9).

Identifying these “prescribed social boundaries” (ibid) in both the real world as well as the world of filmic popular culture around the turn of the decade helps to place the Bond case studies in their socio-cultural context. The following chapter will illustrate how these two films treat women according to the same ideological ‘boundaries’ which are so evident in that context, thus demonstrating how these films reflected popular socio-cultural values.

Such an ideological treatment of female characters resonates with Mulvey’s assertions decades before. She described how “the image of woman [...] [takes] the structure of representation [...] demanded by the ideology of the patriarchal order” (1990: 33-34)[31]. But this ideology, as Mulvey described, suffers “anxiety” because of the “alien presence” of the woman (1990: 35 & 33). This was written in 1975, describing a passive female, one can only imagine what anxiety the tough, capable action women of the 1990s and thereafter must stimulate. Thus these images are also treated according to the demands of the ideology of the patriarchal order – they are made into “sex symbols” (Innes 2004: 9) or, as Mulvey termed it “fetish objects [...] so that it becomes reassuring rather than dangerous” (1990: 35).

Further proof of this ideological packaging and consumption of women is clearly illustrated by Andrade (2003) whose study is based in factual, rather than theoretical, analysis. She acknowledges that theorising has not fully proven the psychology behind viewers’ consumption of female action heroes:

> One of the goals of my investigation of the gender politics of the viewer-media relationship with respect to the female action hero has been to hone in on the

[31] The introductory discussion of Mulvey can be found on pages 38-41 should the reader wish to revisit it.

> individual viewer. In this way I wanted to focus in on what I see as the neglected story of the individual human experience [...] as opposed to common theorizations of group viewing behaviour (2003: 50).

Conducting a series of interviews and polls amongst several hundred college students in America[32] her findings support the theoretical notions of a controlling male gaze and sex-symbol-orientated consumption of action heroines:

> The reasons for enjoying female action hero media found most often through my survey seem to fit stereotypical ideas about gendered likes and dislikes for both males and females. For instance, 74.39% of the male respondents watch female action heroes for their sexual attractiveness, as opposed to only 23.08% of the females. Some male respondents supported this statistic by commenting that they were drawn to female action heroes by "less clothes" (Respondent 223), and "hot women stars" (Respondent 152) (Andrade 2003: 45).

As active as these popular women heroes were – thus destroying Mulvey's assertion of a purely passive female character – they still conformed to gender stereotypes of femininity, sex-appeal and attractiveness. They were still packaged according to the male gaze; a gaze which Mulvey has described as "controlling" (1990: 33). This ideology of control, however, extended beyond merely the visual 'packaging' of these heroines and – far more bleakly – into their narrative representation, as the subsequent section will demonstrate.

In her analysis of female action heroes in the 1990s Yvonne Tasker argues that women do not occupy fully equal roles in the ideological structure of films from this era. Examining texts such as *Eraser, Speed, Bad Boys, True Lies* and *Broken Arrow*[33], all blockbusters from the 1990s, Tasker comments that women are proximate to 'the action' and even participate, but they are not the hero, rather they serve as sidekick. These women are one of a range of

[32] Andrade does note that her research has several short comings, mostly that she accesses a fairly homogenous group of people in terms of race, age and class (2003: 41-44).

[33] For the sake of the argument's flow the full filmic references are included here: *Eraser* (Chuck Russell, 1996); *Speed* (Jan de Bont, 1994); *Bad Boys* (Michael Bay, 1995); *True Lies* (James Cameron, 1994); and *Broken Arrow* (John Woo, 1996).

supporting characters [generic to such films] typically played by white women or black men […] who follow the white, male hero 'but never quite as equals, never with quite the same access to the speed of worldly sensation' […] the relationship between [the hero and this supporting character] emphasizes hierarchies of knowledge and skill [...] that of the professional and the amateur in need of protection (Tasker 1998: 74)[34].

The "hierarchy of knowledge and skill" (ibid) which Tasker identifies is very much in evidence in the James Bond case studies, as Chapter Two will discuss. These women, while possessing martial abilities to rival Bond, or knowledge necessary for him to complete his mission, are always placed on a lower rung of skill and ability to the masculine hero. Thus the controlling male ideology extends beyond the appearance and packaging of these women and into their narrative treatment.

This study thus reveals three tendencies in action films (and popular television series) during the 1990s and 2000s. The first is a surge in female lead characters – reflecting a surge in gender equality in the real world during these decades. Despite this, however, these women are not given total equality. They are still confined to a controlling male gaze (the second identified tendency) and often subjugated to a patriarchal narrative treatment. This occurs by placing them on a lower rung of the hierarchical ladder of "knowledge and skill" (ibid) – they are capable, but not *more* capable, they are active, but not *more* active – than the *male* hero.

There are, however, some examples of films in these decades which attempt to refute this ideology and representation. Hilary Neroni (2005) investigates a number of these and

[34] Tasker's argument has been cut extensively because she discusses the "buddy roles" (ibid) of action films such as *Bad Boys* and in contrast to that of the relationship between a male hero and his female "supporting character". While her words have been somewhat condensed, her argument is still accurately contained here.

describes how their independent heroines', while not *subjected* to a patriarchal ideology, are *judged,* and even cast out, by it. She writes that,

> One of the glaring similarities between contemporary films featuring violent women is that the almost requisite romantic union with which so many Hollywood films concludes *does not occur* [emphasis her own]. Violent women are usually alive but left on their own at the end of these films. This suggests how difficult it is for Hollywood – the greatest of ideology machines – to integrate the violent woman into its typical narrative structure […] This absence of romance, especially in so many mainstream Hollywood action films, is astounding considering the rate at which heterosexual couples usually end up in such a union (Neroni 2005: 85; emphasis my own).

Neroni's observations make it clear that even where women are granted freedom (as violent protagonists) the ideology of Hollywood can still not embrace them. Their punishment is to be "barred from romance" (Neroni 2005: 112). This is a severe punishment, as the absence of the "requisite romantic union" proves to be "astounding" (Neroni 2005: 85).

This ideological treatment is even more pronounced in the Bond case studies. Here women who attempt to outstrip 007 in the hierarchy of skill and knowledge – whether it be the woman who tries to kill him, or the woman who betrays him – are also punished; but more severely. They are not denied a romantic union, they are killed. No woman can (whether through physical violence or heart break) better Bond, the signifier of masculinity.

Mencimer's words make for a fitting end to this chapter's investigation:

> No doubt our action heroines have come a long way since Wonder Woman, but the feminist critics are right: Women are still only allowed to be violent within certain parameters largely proscribed by what men are willing to tolerate [...] Women playing real action figures who menace real men still don't sell [...] To achieve box-office success, the new action babes have to celebrate women's power without being so threatening that men would be afraid to sleep with the leading lady (2001: 18&19).

The above acknowledges that female representation has "come a long way" (referring to the freedoms enjoyed by women in the 1990s and after). But she also articulates that these female representations are, inextricably, contained and packaged according to what a male viewership – a patriarchal ideology – finds palatable. A woman in a man's world must subscribe, on some level, to the ideologies of a man's world – whether it be through romantic entanglement, playing a supporting role or, if playing the main role and being truly autonomous, being denied a romantic union and thus full acceptance. Mulvey's assertion that women served as passive objects has certainly been refuted. But her claims that the controlling male gaze still governs film, that "favourite cinematic form [...] of the patriarchal order" (1990: 38), and that it will continue to subdue the threat of woman's "alien"-ness (1990: 33) within that patriarchal ideology remains true.

This dissertation argues that the *GoldenEye* and *Casino Royale* reflect the socio-cultural values of their time. This chapter has interrogated and delineated these values. An investigation of feminism in the 1990s and 2000s has described how women of this era became more equal, assertive, strong and playful. The chapter continued to describe how a patriarchal ideology above still permeated both the real world of 1990s and 2000s as well as the worlds of filmic and television fiction. Chapter Two will demonstrate how these same values are starkly and definitely clear within the two case studies.

Chapter 2: Comparing and Contrasting the Representation of Women

> What I love most about Bond women, especially Bond women of today, is not only are they beautiful and sexy; they also have evolved into very intelligent, articulate and very ...well equipped adversaries for Bond. [...] as women have empowered themselves the movies have changed with them – Halle Berry (*Bond Girls are Forever)*

The first impression of the 'Bond girls' in both *GoldenEye* and *Casino Royale* would seem to suggest that women have been granted autonomy and independence; that they have become Bond's equals whether as villain or partner. The word 'equal' is in fact used quite regularly to describe these Bond women[35]. Not least of these examples is the documentary film *Bond Girls Are Forever* (John Watkin, 2002). The film consists of a series of interviews done with varying 'Bond girls' from across the franchise's history who assert that Bond women are represented as 'more equal' to 007. These include Samantha Bond, who plays the role of Moneypenny in the Brosnan films, Judi Dench, as M, and Oscar winner Halle Berry, who stars as a 'Bond girl' in the 20th instalment[36].

This dissertation will, however, argue something different. Its hypothesis is that women in these films, while having a great deal of autonomy (arguably the most in the franchise's history – though previous films are not of direct concern) still fall within almost *exactly* the same narrative structure as the previous Bond films, and the filmic *zeitgeist* discussed in Chapter Three. These women are still seen as a threat to a patriarchal ideology and their threat is eliminated either through romantic involvement – or, more specifically, sexual conquest – with Bond, or through death. Such a treatment resonates with Mulvey's notion of how the "alien presence" (1990: 33) of the woman is dealt with in a conventional narrative as well as the

[35] Brabazon (1999); Garland (2009); Jutting (2005); Kowalski in Garland (2009); Tincknell (2009)
[36] *Die Another Day* (Lee Tamahori, 2002)

prior study of socio-cultural values in the two decades in which the respective case studies were made. This assertion of a strongly patriarchal ideology in Bond films – and the original literature – is by no means a new notion. As early as the 1960s[37] Umberto Eco describes this in his "Narrative Structures in Fleming":

> The general scheme [of "Fleming's woman"] is (i) the girl is beautiful and good; (ii) she has been made frigid and unhappy by severe trials suffered in adolescence; (iii) this has conditioned her to the service of the villain (iv) through meeting Bond she appreciates her positive human chances; (v) Bond possesses her but in the end loses her (2009: 44).

While Eco's analysis was based on the books and not the films it will be demonstrated that it is still very much applicable to the Brosnan and Craig films. Not all of this falls as perfectly into alignment with the filmic characters. Service to the villain, for example, is not always applicable (though it does feature). The women who cross Bond's path are certainly beautiful – something which perhaps does not even need mentioning – and definitely frigid or cold, specifically to Bond (whether these are from trials endured in adolescence, their recent past, or even during the film itself will differ). As Eco describes, Bond overcomes that frigidness and instils, usually with sexual abandon, an appreciation of their "positive human chances" (ibid). The final point that Bond "possesses her but loses her" (ibid) is one which will prove particularly revealing of the ideology communicated in the films.

Eco was by no means the only author to identify a patriarchal "narrative structure" (ibid) in the Bond stories. Subsequent work has often cited the same tendency[38], often as a throw away remark, assuming it as a given to a reader that, that is what the films do. Bennett and Woollacott describe the "violent phallic solutions" which the Bond films offer:

[37] While the original was published in the 1960s this research used a reprint in Lindner 2009.
[38] Bennett and Woolacot (2009); Bennett in Denning (2009); Denning (2009); Neroni (2005); Neuendorf (2010)

> The traditional narrative by which Bond puts attractive women back in their place *sexually* but reserves violence and killing for the villain is reworked to deal violently and finally with those women who cannot be conquered sexually (2009: 30).

This narrative tendency is interesting compared to the one outlined by Eco. The prior's analysis sees Bond as sexually possessing – but ultimately losing – the frigid woman. There is a nod to this in Bennett and Woollacott's work in what they call the "traditional narrative". They then demonstrate how this traditional formula can be, and has been, adapted so that when Bond cannot conquer a woman sexually she must die – a rather condemning judgement. A woman is unavoidably integrated into the patriarchal narrative ("put in their place", as Bennett and Woollacott (ibid) would say). She either sleeps with the hero – or she is killed by him, dealt with "violently and finally" (ibid). Writing with a far lighter tone Hilary Neroni also acknowledges this tendency, when she writes of "Bond female characters" that, "typically, of course, Bond sleeps with her and then either incapacitates her or woos her over to his side (at least long enough for him to complete his mission)" (2005: 128).

While the aforementioned are all 'academic analyses' Neuendorf *et al* conduct a far more empirical study. They performed a "quantitative content analysis of 20 James Bond films [and] assessed portrayals of 195 female characters" (2010: 747) which exhaustively analysed each of these roles using mathematical methods. Their study, employing thorough factual data, confirms what the theoretical analysis has thus far identified:

> In the prediction of victimization of Bond women, it seems that they were, by and large, aggressed upon for identifiable and purposive reasons [...] <u>The ultimate penalty for a woman in a Bond film—death—seems to accrue from promiscuity (often with Bond) and daring to threaten the ultimate iconic masculine hero, James Bond</u>. (Neuendorf *et al* 2010: 758; emphasis my own).

It is indicative that the "ultimate penalty" for a woman in a Bond film is doled out when she is either promiscuous, something certainly not acceptable in a patriarchal society or, more importantly, when she attempts to kill Bond. Note how the authors have phrased that last finding: "daring to kill Bond" gives the impression of a tongue-in-cheek moment; as if this simple, narrative act is something unacceptable – certainly impermissible – in the Bond world; or, more importantly, in the Bond *ideology*. While their analysis did not include *Casino Royale* it will become clear that their findings are equally applicable to it.

As an aside, Neuendorf *et al*'s research highlights two other developments in the Bond franchise over time which are worth mentioning here as both indicate an expanded and more equal role granted to women.

> A number of over-time trends were discovered: As the years have passed, the number of major female roles has expanded, and female characters became more sexually active, […] and were more likely to be the recipients of physical harm. This reveals a slight trend away from the limited female roles of the fifties and the attendant feminization and glamorization of females, and toward a more autonomous and active participation, consistent with observations in popular sources […] However, these trends are substantively rather minimal, and perhaps eclipsed by over-time consistencies (2010: 757).

In essence the researchers are saying that women have been granted far more autonomy as time has progressed. Their study runs up to and includes the final Brosnan films. Thus, as this trend increased over time, the Brosnan films would contain the most such examples – the 'most equal' Bond women. This reflects the socio-cultural picture studied in Chapter One of a greater autonomy and equality being granted to women in the 1990s and after.

The researchers add, however, that these changes are "eclipsed" by the "over-time consistencies" (ibid). These consistencies are what Neuendorf *et al* explain in their previous quote: namely that Bond women must still subscribe to a patriarchal ideology either through

sex (accepting it) or death (being cast out of it). Such an analysis demonstrates yet again how a patriarchal ideology is reinforced within the Bond narratives. This is unavoidably true of the two case studies under investigation.

GoldenEye

According to Garland, "*GoldenEye* heralds the reintroduction of the 'Bond girl' villain, a restructuring of sexual tension, and a re-envisioned approach to Bond's relationship with women" (2009: 184). Garland outlines two issues here which are both of critical importance to understanding the role of women in these films. The first is the reintroduction of "the Bond girl villain", something which she claims "fades into relative insignificance" (2009: 183) within the franchise after *You Only Live Twice* (Lewis Gilbert) which was released in 1967.

This observation ties in with what Chapter One identified about the portrayal of women in film in the 90s; namely that powerful, competent, independent women were portrayed as women with violent, martial abilities – typically masculine attributes. That such representations of women became incredibly popular in the 90s after being absent from popular film since the late 60s makes intuitive sense when thinking of feminist history. The 60s were an era when radical and blatant feminism was very much a mass-based movement[39]. Under such circumstances it makes sense that popular culture – especially a narrative as controversially misogynist as the James Bond films – would need to contain empowered, 'more equal' female characters. Then, according to Garland, such depictions became fewer after 1967. Similarly, while the second wave did certainly not die down this soon, it did begin to

[39](Hutchinson & Mann 2006: 401); (Krolokke & Sorenson 2005: 1&7)

wane and radical elements decreased. With the 90s and a newly equal role for and perception of women in society the female villain returns.

This return of the villainess forms part of a surge in empowered, far more equal women; what Garland terms "a re-envisioned approach to Bond women" (ibid). Except for the villainous Xenia Onnatop, *GoldenEye* features a 'Bond girl', Natalya Simonova, who serves as more than merely a sexual liaison. Natalya's IT skills are essential for Bond to understand and find his enemy and, finally, it is these skills, as much as Bond's, which thwarts the villain's master plan. Moneypenny, a potent figure of feminist articulation, as shall be demonstrated, becomes significantly re-envisioned in her short scenes with 007. And finally, in the most obvious and dramatic re-envisioning of Bond women the patriarchal M suddenly becomes the iron fisted matriarch played by Judi Dench. M is perhaps the only character who does not fully subscribe to the narrative structure outlined by Eco and echoed by other writers (Bennett and Woollacott (2009); Neuendorf *et al* (2010)). However it will be demonstrated that M and Moneypenny fall into a different but equally formulaic treatment. The analysis will illustrate that despite all the changes Garland describes the film does not depict "a re-envisioned approach to Bond's relationship with women" (2009: 184).

This analysis begins with *GoldenEye*'s striking 'Bong girl', Xenia Onnatop. This independent, gun wielding, sexy wildcat of a woman serves as a striking announcement of the arrival of empowered 90s women in the Bond films. She has reclaimed her body as a site of power – perhaps the most frightening interpretation of the 'pussy power' feminism identified in the 1990s is "Xenia's extreme combination of eroticism and death as she later strangles [a man to death] during sex" (Garland 2009: 185). A woman who seduces men with her incredible

looks and then crushes the breath out of them with the same shapely legs they fell for is certainly reclaiming her body as a sexual and powerful tool.

She is also immensely capable. Her martial abilities rival Bond's as is evident in their battle in the steam room/sauna of the St Petersburg hotel (starts: 01:04:32) as well as in their last tussle in the jungle (starts: 01:42:43); during both of these it is Xenia who gets the upper hand – or rather 'upper leg', as she chokes 007 between her thighs – until Bond employs something beyond his own martial abilities to assist him: either scalding hot coals or an AK47. She can pilot the futuristic Tiger helicopter and she can keep up with Bond in an informal race, her blood red Ferrari serving as a sexy counterpoint to his cool, grey Aston Martin.

However, for all Xenia's supposed equal skill and dangerous femininity she is still presented according to the Bond formula. There is a rather novel turn, breaking surprisingly from the conventions, when Bond cannot seduce her after the game of Baccarrat in Monaco (starts: 00:17:52). In fact "against the self-referential system of Bond films, Xenia's rejection of Bond for a short, balding admiral is unexpected" (Garland 2009: 185). But she is still in the service of men. She seems, in fact, to serve two of them – first General Orumov and then Trevelyan. During the theft of the Goldeneye weapons from Severnaya (starts: 00:31:00) the General, while visibly shaken at the pleasure she derives from murder, treats Xenia as a lapdog. When a noise is heard from the kitchen Orumov barks an order at Xenia to investigate, accepting without question that she will obey (00:34:57). As wild and dangerous as she may be, she is still the assistant to the – male – villain. But Xenia's ultimate relegation is not to the villains but to the ultra-masculine signifier, Bond. According to the narrative tendencies identified above it is a given that she must die because she has transgressed the ultimate rule

of a Bond film's ideology: she has dared to threaten 007. In her death the franchise offers us, as Bennett and Woollacott have noted, a "violent phallic solution" to the problem of a woman "who cannot be conquered sexually" (2009: 30).

Natalya Simonova illustrates the other possible role for a woman within the traditional narrative structure: being sexually conquered by Bond. Here too, is a woman who is more equal to Bond. Firstly she possesses essential information with which to assist his mission. She knows about the existence of a second Goldeneye satellite and she sends the spike from the missile train computer (01:32:11) which will leads Bond to Trevelyan's lair. Further she exhibits a striking autonomy and self-confidence throughout the film. The sequence where she cons an IBM computer salesman into giving her access to the best computers the dealer has with the pretence of being a buyer for a school is a brilliant example of this (starts: 00:56:25).

Natalya brings this same sassiness to bear in her interaction with the iconic masculine hero. Indeed the introduction of a 'Bond girl' who is possessed by Bond or, in Bennett's words: "put in her place" (quoted in Denning 2009: 64) yet still exhibits a surprising, rebellious, self-confidence is refreshing. While trying to escape the missile train which Trevelyan has locked them in (starts: 01:27:05) Natalya works fervently to locate Borris and with him Trevelyan's hidden base while James tries to find an escape from the supposedly indestructible vehicle. Pausing momentarily in her work she yells at him "well don't just stand there, get us out of here" (01:27:30) to which Bond snaps to work, although with a surprised smirk crossing his face for a second. Similarly when they are flying over Cuba later, looking for 006's massive satellite transponder Natalya orders Bond where to fly and he responds with a mock "yes sir" (01:40:41). The most poignant example of Natalya's autonomy is perhaps nearing the climax of

the film. Trevelyan holds Bond at gunpoint and threatens Natalya that he will kill 007 if she does not undo her sabotage. Her response, mirroring exactly what James said about her earlier when the situation was reversed is, "go ahead, shoot him, he means nothing to me" (01:50:17). Her self-confidence here is echoed minutes later (starts: 01:56:29) when Bond hands her a pistol and asks whether she knows how to use it. Her response is to check the magazine and cock the weapon with practiced efficiency and a satisfying, metallic click. Lastly, Natalya's proficiency not just with weapons but with computer technology is responsible for setting the Goldeneye satellite on a self-destructive course into the atmosphere. Though Bond destroys the antenna with which Trevelyan seeks to reverse Natalya's orders to the Goldeneye satellite, it is still her programming which finally destroys the weapon.

For all her perceived equality, however Natalya still conforms to the narrative structure outlined by Eco[40]. This begins with her witnessing the brutal slaughter of her co-workers and friends at Severnaya and is compounded when she learns that this slaughter was induced by the betrayal of her close friend, Boris; who betrays her a second time in handing her over to Onnatop and Trevelyan to be killed. Such intimate experience of betrayal and death can certainly be described as "severe trials" (ibid).

While these have not "conditioned her to the service of the villain" (ibid) – the only respect in which Natalya does not conform to Eco's structure – they do leave her hurt, anxious and distrustful. Thus, in her initial encounters with Bond she is aggressive and resistant. When he tries to help her from the Tiger helicopter, mere moments after saving her life, she kicks him

[40] In order to keep the ideas fresh in the reader's memory it may be useful to repeat Eco's assertion here: "The general scheme [of "Fleming's woman"] is (i) the girl is beautiful and good; (ii) she has been made frigid and unhappy by severe trials suffered in adolescence; (iii) this has conditioned her to the service of the villain (iv) through meeting Bond she appreciates her positive human chances; (v) Bond possesses her but in the end loses her" (2009: 44). The following "ibid" references refer back to this quote.

in the shin and tries to run off (01:12:50). Shortly afterward they are thrust together in the prison cell and Natalya is unresponsive and cold to Bond, refusing to trust him or tell him anything (starts: 01:13:30). Her distrust of Bond, and the world which has dealt her such horrid betrayals, resonates with Eco's description of a woman who is "frigid and unhappy" (ibid).

In this very same prison cell however, thanks to Bond, Natalya begins to "appreciate her positive human chances" (ibid). He breaks through her resistance by insisting (albeit aggressively) that "I'm on your side. I'm here to help you [...] You can either take your chances with me, or your fellow countrymen who killed everyone at Severnaya" (01:13:55). After these words she slowly, hesitantly begins to trust Bond. Thus her frigid exterior begins to thaw. This thawing is furthered by Bond as he rescues her from Orumov and Trevelyan's clutches aboard the missile train (starts: 01:27:05) and gives her an opportunity for revenge against those who betrayed her and killed her friends. More than this however, the ultimate undoing of her "frigid and unhappy" state is her sexual liaison with Bond. The cold, angry woman Bond first meets becomes a warm, laughing lover driving through the countryside in James' convertible BMW (starts: 01:34:21) or making love to him in their beachfront safe house (starts: 01:39:03).

Natalya does not conform to Eco's final characteristic: Bond does not "possess her but in the end lose her" (ibid); she is still very much his and alive at the end of the film. While not fitting Eco's model this does make intuitive sense within the context of the patriarchal ideology which has been identified within the Bond narratives. Losing the 'Bond girl' means her death but death is a "violent phallic solution" to the problem of a woman "who cannot be conquered sexually" (Bennett & Woollacott 2009: 30) as Neuendorf *et al* (2010: 758) have empirically demonstrated. Natalya does not need to die because the women whom Bond subdues into the

patriarchal ideology through sex do not need to be "put in their place" (Bennett in Denning 2009: 64) through death.

Not only is Natalya not a violent threat to Bond, she is not violently capable at all. In this realm her place is clearly that of the female out of place in a world of men's martial laws. Her representation here recalls Tasker's words in Chapter One:

> The relationship between [the hero and his supporting character] emphasizes hierarchies of knowledge and skill [...] that of the professional and the amateur in need of protection (Tasker 1998: 74)

For all her IT skills; street-smart sass and even her practiced handling of a pistol Natalya still needs Bond for protection. She remains the amateur to his professional. It is Bond who breaks her out of the prison facility where they are interviewed and then pursued by Orumov's men (starts: 01:17:10)[41]. While Bond calmly and deftly takes down scores of henchmen Natalya runs between flying bullets and shrapnel her arms above her head. While Bond escapes cleanly through the window using Q's repelling belt (01:19:49) Natalya - literally - falls into the hands of the soldiers (01:19:41). While she looks on from the back seat of Orumov's car it is Bond who pursues her – in a tank no less – through the streets of St Petersburg (starts: 01:21:31). Similarly when Bond rescues her from the missile train (starts: 01:27:05), for all Natalya's assertiveness mentioned before, it is still 007 who has the wits and technology to 'get them out of there'. It is thus evident that Natalya conforms to what Tincknell has described as a general tendency in 'Bond girls': they "are almost universally inept, imbecile or inadvertent when it comes to danger" (2009: 106). This 'Bond girl', while sassy and independent, still needs Bond for protection and salvation and gives in to his sexual charms. She is, as the term is so popularly

[41] While this same scene commences earlier, Bond and Natalya's escape begins here.

used in reference to 'Bond girls', far more 'equal' – but she is still integrated into the masculine narrative ideology of the Bond films.

The most nuanced re-envisioning of Bond women is not in the villainess or the conquest, but in the working women of MI6. Judi Dench's role as the new M is perhaps the most obvious of these. In what Sperb has dubbed "that now famous line" (2009: 55) M, early in her first appearance in *GoldenEye* derides Bond as a "sexist, misogynist dinosaur, a relic of the Cold War" (00:47:01). This moment captures what Leach has described as "more direct criticism of Bond and his methods in these [the Brosnan] films" (2009: 306). The character of this M, backed up in no small amount by the fact that she is played by the esteemed Dench, creates a female superior to Bond who is most certainly not 'put in her place' by the narrative or the secret agent.

However what the narrative does do is depict the male rebelliousness to her female power. This reflects something of the 1990s and 2000s mindset of 'a glass ceiling'[42] and women's perceived inability to occupy top management positions. Before the film introduces M, her number two, Tanner, describes her to Bond as "the evil queen of numbers" (00:36:30). This quip ties into the idea the film will later build on that M is a number-crunching bureaucrat who does not understand the – masculine – world of hands-on espionage the way that Bond does. But the script, while introducing Tanner's rebelliousness, still assures M's superiority. She hears the little remark and her reaction is a powerfully post-feminist one: she puts him down with a firm and deriding "if I want sarcasm, Mr Tanner, I'll talk to my children thank you very much" (00:38:08). Not only does she exhibit wit and a great deal of authority here – but

[42] As discussed by Bellafante (1998); Elmuti *et al* (2003); Goodman *et al* (2003).

she is also depicted as a career woman *and a mother*. Perhaps the ultimate representation of the post-feminine ideal: she is a professional and personal success.

The number-crunching-bureaucrat-theme arises in the next scene between M and Bond (starts: 01:45:30). When Bond does not seem accepting of M's authority she pinpoints his doubts about her neatly – again demonstrating that the character is certainly not lower on the hierarchical ladder of knowledge than Bond: "You think I'm an accountant; a bean counter who is more interested in my numbers than your instincts" (00:46:57). Bond responds with a dry, "the thought had occurred to me" (00:47:00). While keeping his characteristic calm there is a momentary flash behind his eyes which would suggest he is caught off guard by M's brutally straightforward appraisal. It is this moment she chooses to launch the "sexist, misogynist dinosaur" quip followed by – "and if you think for one moment I don't have the balls to send a man out to die your instincts are dead wrong" (00:47:18). This is a woman who, while dealing with the reality of male judgement about female ability, is absolutely capable of handling it. It can be said of M that she is not put in her place as a woman to be integrated into the narrative, but rather she is put in her place at the top of the narrative's hierarchy – but with a degree of rebellion from the masculine ranks. In light of Chapter One's findings about male-female attitudes in the 90s this is a fitting depiction of the socio-cultural values of the time in which *GoldenEye* was made.

The new M is given an additional facet which adds a "complexity" to the character (Garland 2009: 184). She,

> Combines condemnation that extends beyond the criticism of a senior manager with an almost maternal concern: after telling Bond she has no compunction to send him to his death, she tells him to come back alive (ibid).

This last comment of M's, almost thrown away as Bond is leaving her office (00:48:00), does give the iron-fisted female manager a (Garland's (2009: 184) choice of words is most fitting) "maternal" tone. Even the cold and impressive matriarch cannot help but feel affection for 007. Thus, while definitely not his inferior, she is made to fit into the patriarchal narrative – albeit on the top, benevolently looking down at James.

A similarly complex depiction of an empowered female who still betrays affection for 007 comes from Monneypenny. Brabazon provides a useful contextualisation of the character:

> Moneypenny's scenes with James Bond have become a generic characteristic of the series. The gender politics enacted through these semiotic snippets of text provide an insight into the desperations of filmic feminism (1999: 490).

While Brabazon's use the "desperation of filmic feminism" refers more to her own socio-political argument than what this dissertation is discussing, her words do highlight that the state of feminist thinking as reflected in the Bond franchise has always neatly been captured in the moments between 007 and Moneypenny. No less so in *GoldenEye*. While the dialogue of their interaction is brief, it is quite telling:

> Bond: Good evening Moneypenny.
>
> Moneypenny: Good evening James. M will meet you in the situation room. I'm to take you straight in.
>
> Bond: I've never seen you after hours, Moneypenny. Lovely.
>
> Moneypenny: Thank you James
>
> Bond: Out on some professional assignment – dressed to kill.
>
> Moneypenny: I know you find this crushing 007, but I don't wait home every night waiting for some international incident, so I can rush down here to impress James Bond. I was on a date, if you must know, with a gentleman. We went to the theatre together.
>
> Bond: Moneypenny, I'm devastated. What would I do without you?

Moneypenny: As far as I can remember, James, you've never had me.

Bond: Hope springs eternal.

Moneypenny: You know, this sort of behaviour could qualify as sexual harassment.

Bond: Really? What's the penalty for that?

Moneypenny: Some day, you will have to make good on your innuendo.
(Brabazon 1999: 494; starts: 00:36:26).

This Moneypenny, in the same style as the new, femininely-empowered M, provides both criticism of- and witticism towards Bond; making her seem more of an equal towards him. Brabazon describes the new MI6, populated with such strong-willed women as "a feminist stronghold" (2009: 247). 'Stronghold' seems a fitting description.

Moneypenny's role is firstly one of power, she holds the keys to the castle; she is the one who has authority and clearance to take Bond in to see M. "It is Moneypenny who enters the code into the situation room, not Bond" (ibid). Secondly this Moneypenny is not only authoritatively empowered, she is also sexually, or at least romantically, liberated: instead of waiting for 007 to appear she was out on a date; she has a life independent of both 007 and MI6. What is more, and perhaps the most important, she has the wit and self-assurance to wittily remark on this to Bond. Finally then, she seems to have some kind of resistance to James' casual flirting when she remarks that he "has never had her"; almost as if she wouldn't let him if he tried. Her resistance seems to be personified in her use of the term "sexual harassment" – the epitomy of unwanted advances.

Up to here Moneypenny seems a liberated, independent, post-feminist woman. As Brabazon notes "the power divide between them is narrowing" (2009: 494). But her final

remark, subtly, changes this. Her claim of punishing him by having him make good on his innuendo makes it clear that, post-feminist as she may be, Moneypenny still finds Bond desirable. She is thus still integrated into the system of patriarchy by desiring its central masculine icon.

Chapman described the representation of M and Moneypenny in *GoldenEye* by writing that they diffuse "the obvious criticisms that could be made of the Bond character (that his attitude toward women is out of date in the 1990's) by voicing them itself through the agency of female authority figure [M]" (2007: 220) and her right hand woman. Tincknell, however, traces this approach back throughout the Bond franchise when she writes that:

> More often than not Bond's absurd machismo has been subjected to an ironic critique by a female character whose relationship to Bond is a combination of affection, desire and scepticism. [...] the presence of this feminine counter-discourse in the films thus rescues them from simplistic accusations of 'sexism'. They are much more complex than this (2009: 105).

Tincknell's final statement – that the Bond films are far more complex than merely a 'sexist narrative' is what especially warrants highlighting here. Having studied the representation of women in *GoldenEye* this complexity is evident. These women are granted narrative agency, empowered ability and more equal roles. However they are never allowed total autonomy. These independent women – like those of the real world in the 90s – still exist within a masculine-centred, primarily patriarchal world. This treatment is almost exactly mirrored in the Bond film made a decade later.

Casino Royale

Describing Daniel Craig's first outing as 007 Garland writes that "the success of the narrative restart of the franchise is as much because of the continuation of the Bond formula as it is because of its alteration" (2009: 181). In the context of women the continuation of the narrative formula is most certainly the case.

One exception to this rule is the character of M. Both the character and the actress who portray her are continued over from the Brosnan films. Her portrayal as an embattled matriarch, however, is not. *Casino Royale* features no rebellious or disrespectful second-in-command like *GoldenEye*'s Tanner. Instead M has a male secretary who is quietly and politely at her beck and call. This impression of an M who is thoroughly in control of her organization is reinforced in the opening moments of the film. In the pre-credit sequence Bond tells Dryden that "M really doesn't mind you earning a bit of money on the side Dryden; she'd just prefer if it wasn't selling secrets" (00:01:17). The implication is that M, in an almost all-knowing way, is aware of exactly what her station chief is doing – even while he believes he is acting in secret.

The only case of M's authority being questioned comes from 007 himself. He breaks into her home (something which she icily tells him never to do again (00:15:10)) and he hacks into her files to get her address and learn her real name (something which, if uttered, she threatens to have him killed for (00:24:00) – a moment of comedy for the audience in a rather tense scene between the two). Finally, when M tells him to, go and "stick your head in the sand somewhere" (00:24:50), Bond does exactly the opposite and pursues his lead anyway.

In their relationship one might be tempted to recall *GoldenEye*'s embattled matriarch who struggles with a rebellious 007. However, Brosnan's Bond was rebellious in *his* scepticism

of *M:* the "bean counter" that did not "have the balls for the job" (00:46:57). In *Casino Royale* Bond's rebelliousness is not critical of M. Rather *she* is continuously critical of *him*: whether it be while scolding him in her apartment as a "blunt instrument" whom it was "too early to promote" (00:23:00) or commenting on his emotional coldness in the Bahamas (00:57:20).

*Casino Royale'*s, M, then is by no means an embattled matriarch. However she does follow the second formulaic treatment identified in the *GoldenEye*: she subjects Bond's "absurd machismo" to an "ironic critique" while holding him in "a combination of affection, desire and scepticism" (Tincknell 2009: 105). While "desire" certainly does not enter into the equation of M's relationship with 007 affection and scepticism do. In the Bahamas M tells Bond that "I knew you were you" (00:57:40)**.** Her implication is that she trusted Bond's personality to follow the lead and open the investigation further, even though she forbade it. There is an element of maternal knowledge here, a mother knowing a rebellious child's nature. Such a maternal affection is reminiscent of how Garland (2009: 184) described the relationship of *GoldenEye*'s M to that film's 007. Furthermore, this affection is perhaps most poignant in the pen-ultimate scene of the film where M explains to a hardened and angry 007 that Vesper, while betraying him, sacrificed her own life so that the organisation manipulating her would spare his (starts: 02:18:00).

Casino Royale thus repositions the character of M as a matriarch firmly in control of her world and her agents – even hard-headed and rebellious 007. In this respect it deviates from the narrative ideology set out by *GoldenEye* which depicted an embattled matriarch. However M's depiction does align itself with the larger formulaic treatment of women in Bond which Tincknell (2009: 105) has identified by representing her critical of Bond while still holding him in

affection. This dichotomy makes the character of M something of an anomaly. In this she is alone. The other women in this film subscribe fully to the narrative ideologies mapped out before.

Solange, Dimitrios' wife, proves a fitting example of this. She serves only two purposes in the narrative: as 'eye-candy' or, in Mulvey's more academic words, as a "fetish object" (190: 35) and as a link to move the narrative forward. The sequence during which she rides a horse across the beach (starts: 00:30:12) accompanied by a swelling musical theme and a prolonged medium shot giving an ample view of her bikini clad body, has very little narrative importance but is certainly soft on the – masculine – eyes. Similarly the shot of her entering the casino in the Bahamas (starts: 00:32:48), the camera again following her in a prolonged medium shot, her body displayed beautifully in a form-fitting dress, serves a small narrative goal[43] but is prolonged for visual affect.

Solange serves to propel the plot forward but once this is done she is disposed of - both by Bond and the narrative. 007 seduces her with, even for him, astounding ease (starts: 00:35:20). After a few seconds of flirting he invites her back to his room for a drink; amuses her by spinning his newly won Aston Martin – formerly her husband's – through the parking lot; and then suddenly they are on his bedroom floor and she is undressing him. Bond uses her to obtain information about Dimitrios' travel plans and then disappears, leaving her with champagne for one. "Other Bond's might have found time for her, even for just one night" (Howard 2009: 45) but this Bond, having obtained what he wanted does not even stay for the sex. In the next – and final – scene in which Solange features, she is dead: having been

[43] While it does 'set-up' Vesper's later entry in the same manner one gets the impression that such a narrative set-up is not as important as the obvious visual pleasure derived from her beauty.

drowned for betraying her husband to Bond. While a minor matter in *Casino Royale*'s plot her death demonstrates an aspect of the patriarchal ideology described earlier: "the ultimate penalty for a woman in a Bond film—death—seems to accrue from promiscuity (often with Bond)" (Neuendorf *et al* 2010: 758). A woman who has betrayed a man (much less her own man) has threatened masculine dominance and must die. This ideology, of course, comes most starkly to the fore in the treatment of *Casino Royale'*s Vesper Lynd.

Vesper is arguably the most equal 'Bond girl' the franchise has ever created and certainly more so than any woman in *GoldenEye*. Indeed in describing her casting "the chairman of Columbia pictures, Amy Pascal, [argued] that: '[...] in casting Vesper we really needed to up the ante, *because this character is very much an equal to Bond* and central to our story'" (quoted in Tincknell 2009: 103; emphasis original). This equality is evidenced in a number of manners.

One is that, like M and Moneypenny, she is harshly critical of 007. Her criticism of Bond extends from the scene in which she is introduced aboard the train (starts: 00:57:50) – during which she gives a scalding and insightful review of 007's personality and motives, so much so that he alludes to himself having been "skewered" (01:01:50) throughout the following scenes. Shortly after arriving in the *Hotel Splendide* she refuses to ride an elevator with Bond as there will not be "enough room for me and your ego" (01:04:30). Of course, Vesper's criticism is laced with an obvious desire – though muted – from the beginning. She does, upon her 'skewering' of Bond on the train remark on his "perfectly formed arse" (01:01:38) for instance. Another example of Vesper's more equal footing with Bond is that she is "Working for the British Treasury and controlling the progress of Bond's mission" (Garland 2009: 186). Vesper

has sole discretion over authorising further funds for Bond's mission and, as such, becomes at least an equal, if not a superior, who must judge Bond's mind and ability.

Considering Natalya for a moment in *GoldenEye* it becomes evident that Vesper Lynd's representation was foreshadowed – albeit to a much lesser extent – in her. Her cheeky ordering about of Bond is echoed and amplified – also with a great deal of insight into his character – into Vesper's "knowingly mocking" (Tincknell 2009: 99) tones. Similarly Vesper's independence is foreshadowed by Natalya's street smarts, weapon handling and IT skills. Natalya's representation foreshadows Vesper's in a darker way as well. Just as Natalya was, for all her sassy independence, still treated in a manner which subjugated her to what Mulvey described as a "patriarchal order" (1998: 38) so, too, is Vesper Lynd.

Tincknell begins to hint at this when she writes that Vesper's,

> Role in the narrative [...] was *apparently* very different from that of the traditional 'Bond girl'. Lynd *seemed* in some ways to be a deliberately 'post-feminist' character in her social independence and her adult, knowingly mocking relationship with Bond. (Tincknell 2009: 99; both emphases my own).

What Tincknell outlines here is most important: that Lynd *seemed* to be a post-feminist character with social independence. This is evident from the aforementioned examples of her equality, wit and empowerment – what Tincknell has described as her "adult, knowingly mocking relationship with Bond" (ibid). If studied more closely, however, *Casino Royale*'s narrative, much like that of *GoldenEye,* proves to create a 'Bond girl' who, while seemingly more equal and empowered, is still subjugated to Bond and a patriarchal masculine ideology.

Vesper's first such subjugation is in moments and matters of violence:

> The sheer brutality of the violence Lynd is subjected to and witnesses works to emphasise her weakness. [...] In these scenes her inability to act like a man, to

> engage in physical violence that the film represents as both inevitable and essential to be an effective Secret Service agent, is what disqualifies her (Tincknell 2009: 110).

Despite her wit, her cold independent sass and her control over Bond's finances Vesper cannot equal 007 in the martial realm. In this, much as Natalya before her, she needs Bond's protection. Perhaps the most poignant example hereof occurs during and after the intense stairway brawl with the two Ugandans (starts: 01:19:50). While Bond attempts to engage a man wielding a massive and menacing machete Vesper merely scurries out of the way. Moments later, while 007 is strangling the man to death, Vesper looks on in shock, unmoving. The scene cuts quickly between close-ups of the menacing Ugandan's face, Bond's struggling grip on the man's neck, Vesper, and the pistol lying within her reach. The implication is that all she need do is pick it up and assist Bond – but the shock on her face is evident and she remains unmoving until Bond finally subdues the man. Not only is Vesper too inept to assist in this scene but subsequently she has what Garland terms "an emotional breakdown" (2009: 186; starts: 1:23:34) due to the trauma resulting from it. It is Bond in a "gesture of unaccustomed tenderness" (Tincknell 2009: 111) who must comfort and reassure her.

Vesper's subjugation to Bond in matters of violence however, is merely a small component of her formulaic treatment in the film.

> If we subject the 2006 film of *Casino Royale* to the same kind of structural analysis Eco performed on the original novel, we may well find, then, that Lynd's function in the narrative, far from representing a radical break with convention, is entirely consonant with it (Tincknell 2009: 106)[44].

[44] For the reader's convenience – but to avoid repetition which breaks the argument's momentum – Eco's formula is included here: "(i) the girl is beautiful and good; (ii) she has been made frigid and unhappy by severe trials suffered in adolescence; (iii) this has conditioned her to the service of the villain (iv) through meeting Bond she appreciates her positive human chances; (v) Bond possesses her but in the end loses her" (2009: 44)

Vesper clearly aligns herself with such a reading. She is certainly beautiful – a fact Bond comments on during their first meeting aboard the train (00:58:10). She is clearly frigid and cold towards him – her 'skewering' of him aboard the dining the car in their first meeting being merely one of many such examples. This coldness is the result not only of her distrust of Bond's ego and their mission – literally a gamble – but also of her past. In the pen-ultimate scene of the film the audience learns that the illusive Quantum organisation was holding her lover as threatening leverage over her.

Bond of course, true to the formula his audience expects, melts through her frigidity and makes Vesper fall in love with him. Their romance – following so close after their near-death encounters at the hands of *Le Chiffre*– certainly serves as an "appreciation of her positive human chances" (ibid). But Vesper, despite their love affair, is in the service of the villain and finally betrays Bond to them. This brings us to Eco's final point: that Bond "possess her but in the end loses her" (ibid). And it is this – Vesper's demise – which proves the ultimate assertion of a patriarchal ideology in *Casino Royale*.

Tincknell introduces this idea when she writes that the film "[illustrates and addresses] cultural anxieties about women's social and sexual freedom to 'betray' men" (Tincknell 2009: 99). Vesper engages in the quintessential rejection of Bond's masculinity and with him the patriarchal structure so intimately embedded within the Bond narratives – and Bon himself. While she does not kill him and thus invite her own death, and while she does give in to his sexual advances, she betrays him despite his genuine love for her. From a male perspective an

obvious villain like Xenia Onnatop descending from a helicopter and trying to crush Bond between her thighs is less frightening an adversary than a woman who lures Bond into falling in love with her – and then betrays him. Such a traumatic betrayal of – such a traumatic threat to – the masculine icon can only be dealt with using Bennett and Woollacott's "violent phallic solutions" (2009: 30): she must die.

Garland echoes this motivation – and Umberto Eco's original description thereof – when she writes that in *Casino Royale* "the "prearranged pattern" identified by Eco becomes a culmination of elements to reproduce the reassuring underlying logic of a Bond film" (2009: 187). The 'prearranged pattern' she is referring to is the detailed breakdown of the women's role in the Bond narrative which has already been discussed at length. According to Garland this pattern reproduces the "underlying logic of a Bond film". Namely, that women will be subdued by Bond into the patriarchal ideology – either through sex, or death.

Garland calls this logic "reassuring". This is exactly the word Mulvey used to describe disarming the threat of 'woman' in film to the "patriarchal order": "[she] becomes reassuring rather than dangerous" (1990: 35). It is therefore evident that Vesper Lynd, for all the autonomy granted her is still a site for the articulation of a patriarchal ideology in the Bond films – one which reflects a continuing patriarchal ideology in the real world.

This, in essence, is Tincknell's argument:

> The aggressive re-masculinisation of Bond as action hero here, however pleasurable in many ways, serves to remind us that the successes of feminism remain limited and can themselves be obliterated, recuperated or romanticised – as long as they are dead (2009: 113).

Her conclusion clearly spells out that not only can the perceived successes of feminism (also as they are reflected in popular culture) be "obliterated" (ibid) – but also, that the masculine hero

cannot exist if he allows the feminine traitor – or the feminist traitor, as she puts it – to survive. This, in different language, mirrors Bennett and Wollacott's notion of "phallic solutions" (2009: 30): the woman who cannot be conquered sexually poses a threat to the masculine order and thus must die.

It is clear that the James Bond films made in the mid 1990s and mid 2000s reflect the socio-cultural values and perceptions which these decades held about women. These values followed a continuing trajectory through the passing of the millennium both in culture and in popular culture. Women were granted far greater autonomy, skill and position; they became more 'active', both in the real world and on screen; something which the two Bond case studies neatly reflect. However this equality was only partial; women were still impeded by 'glass ceilings' in the corporate, financial and legal worlds[45] and hemmed in by a patriarchal ideology in the real world. The James Bond case studies analysed above demonstrate the same values. As equal and competent, as sassy and strong as the women of the 007 films are represented they are still not independent female characters but remain 'Bond girls'.

Unlike perceptions and treatment of women, the *zeitgeist* regarding conflict, geopolitics and, most poignantly, masculinity does not follow a continuing trajectory through the passing of the millennium. In this the two decades are very different worlds – as the Bond films they produced clearly demonstrate.

[45]Bellafante (1998); Elmuti *et al* (2003: 5); Goodman *et al* (2001: 3); Hull & Nelson (1998); Roth (2006).

Part Two: Socio-Cultural Values of Conflict, Masculinity and Geopolitics in Bond

Chapter 3: Contextualising the Times

While 1995 and 2006 seem to be fairly close in time they are far removed in social, historical and political terms. Understanding these two periods of history is essential to understanding how the respective James Bond films which were made – and enjoyed vast popular approval – in these decades drew on and reflected the very different *zeitgeist* of these two decades.

The 1990s: Clean Wars, Cold Wars and Technological Anxieties

Russia

The fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War have far-reaching geopolitical, military and economic implications. Some have described it as "an epochal turning point" (Kalantiz & Cope 2001: 21); others as "a historical watershed in interstate relations" (Knutsen 1999: 276). Perhaps the most sweeping description of its implications is given by Cushing and Clark who write that, "the end of the Cold War represents the most dramatic international change since 1945" (1993: 303). Toal describes perceptions of the event and its ramifications in more detail:

> To many the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of Communist rule in Russia signalled a new beginning in world affairs, an era of promise beyond the shadow of nuclear war. The world seems a much safer place with an absence of an overriding ideological confrontation between two heavily armed and hostile superpowers (2001: 4).

However, Toal's article continues to spell out a far worse nightmare scenario involving the weapons with which Russia was still so "heavily armed" (ibid) in the 1990s:

> The threat posed by weapons of mass destruction is one of the most immediate

> and pressing challenges to the common security of humanity in the twenty first century. […] this threat [is] a defining feature of the geopolitics of the post-Cold War world (2001: 5).

While the Soviet Union ceased to be a political and economic enemy to the Anglo-American world in 1989, the immense stockpile of warheads which it had amassed during the Cold War did not. The presence of these weapons under a new government and old military commanders who no longer had the faith in, or fear of, Soviet rule to keep them in check was a new focus for geopolitical fears. These fears were exacerbated by the corruption which scoured the country:

> The neoliberal dream of Russia's transition to market capitalism has become the nightmare of transmutation into the crony capitalism of oligarchic domination and mafia rule […] Co-opting the government of Yeltsin and silencing opposition to their conduct, the oligarchs used their newly acquired power to finance the re-election of Yeltsin and secure their political position close to the center of power […] Complimenting this 'top down' corruption is the 'bottom-up' corruption of local mafia groups in cities across Russia who operate through bribes and kickbacks in an alliance with local politicians, state officials and the law (Toal 2001: 16-17).

The power structures in Russia were being corrupted through official state sectors and through the back-alleys and shadow dealings of the mafia – neither of whom a Western power would want in control of the second largest nuclear arsenal *on the planet*. According to Toal as late as 2001 the "suspected estimate" of nuclear weapons held by the Soviet Union was between 12 000 and 19 000 (2001: 17) (the same estimate as the US; the next closest country was France, with an infinitesimal 482 (ibid)).

Meanwhile the people closest to that arsenal, those directly in charge thereof, were, as one could expect under the circumstances of the eroding morale and the failing economy of their country, perhaps the gravest threat. "Like others in the society, high-ranking generals

have sought to exploit their positions for personal gain, selling state equipment to arms merchants" (Toal 2001: 16). Toal's simple remark has chilling implications geopolitically. Chapter Four will demonstrate how *GoldenEye* articulated those very fears by envisaging a scenario in which weapons like these are put to illegal use by renegade generals and power-hungry terrorists. While the film depicts these events in fiction, they are described as potential threats in the real world as well:

> The danger of nuclear proliferation caused by the illegal commercial sale of Russian nuclear warheads to independent parties or states [was not unthinkable]. With economic times so desperate, possibility of black-market sales of Russian nuclear technology, material and expertise is considerable (2001: 18-19).

Boggs and Pollard confirm this when they write that "the notion that a terrorist could get hold of a nuclear device […] something barely thinkable in 1965, would be considered quite feasible by the 1990s" (2006: 337-338). And indeed, in 1995 *GoldenEye* drew very strongly on this "notion" (ibid) to propel its plot.

Boggs and Pollard introduce the second, but equally important facet of the geopolitical threats in a post-Soviet World. Not only was the immense stockpile of nuclear weapons in Russia a cause for anxiety; so was the idea of terrorism. Bowen and Dunn in *American Security Politics in the 1990s* argue that:

> Two of the major phenomena which have since [1990] come to dominate the post-Soviet security environment for the United States [are] first[ly] […] the regional as opposed to the global nature of Post-Soviet threats to American forces [...which represents a...] less threatening, but arguably more complex and uncertain, regional security environment (1996: 41).

Terrorists might not be able to cause nuclear Armageddon as easily as governments and agencies during the hair-trigger stand-off of the Cold War, but they are far more difficult to

hunt. Though belonging to organizations, they are not as easily defined, found and attacked. They are individuals, slippery foes who can spread across borders, into societies, throughout countries – including one's own. Thus, while being less threatening they are also far more complex.

It is therefore evident that the post-Soviet geopolitical environment for the Western world was dominated by two anxieties: the proliferation of unconventional weapons (the smuggling or sale of former Soviet warheads, for example, was a very real possibility) and the non-national, complex threat of terrorist groups. These geopolitical anxieties form the background of the narrative of the Bond film born from this era: *GoldenEye*. But several other geo- and socio-political factors influenced the making of this Bond film, not least the West's first great military engagement after the Cold War. The Gulf War would change the way the Anglo-American world saw warfare. So immediate and intimate would these images be, that they would alter the very experience their audience had of conflict. This shift in experience would also change the way conflict was presented and portrayed in the 1990s.

The Gulf War: Low-Blood, High-Tech, Super-Power.

> What is clear, therefore, is that very little of the death and injury that occurred in the war was actually seen on television. [...] it was reported, but simply not seen.
>
> David Morisson (1992: 92)

> The misperception is that the allied victory was primarily due to the performance of US high-technology weapon systems. […] that the continuing trend toward a

> high-tech military using primarily "smart" weapons will allow the United States to fight and win with minimal US casualties.
>
> Gene Rochlin & Chris Demchak (1991: 2)

The Gulf War was perhaps the most dramatic event of the 1990s and followed shortly on the heels of the fall of the Soviet Union (in 1989). It was also possibly the most widely televised conflict in human history until that time. According to Sakota-Kokot "since the Gulf War in particular, the world has been in the position to witness conflicts almost instantaneously in the comfort of one's own home" (2010: 16). She quotes Frederick Williams commenting on the moon landing by saying that "technology based immediacy [is] a preview of the shape of things to come" (ibid). In the Gulf War this prediction became reality. Baudrillard describes how the audience of the mid -1990s was overwhelmed by the "selected images" of the Gulf War which had been "broadcast worldwide" by CNN "and then became frozen into the accepted story of the war" (1995: 3).

What is important about these images, and about the story of the Gulf War which they froze into the minds of viewers worldwide, especially Western and Anglo-American viewers, is the perception of conflict and warfare it left in their minds. The Gulf War as shown on television was a "clean war" (ibid), devoid of excessive bloodshed and shocking death tolls (for the coalition forces). The actual numbers reflect this – according to Morisson:

> It is unclear how many people lost their lives in the war [in Kuwait in 1990], but the estimate is generally put at somewhere around 100, 000 Iraqi troops, 5000 civilians and less than 500 coalition forces (1992: 92).

These numbers articulate the truth on the ground, the reality, with shocking clarity. For every one coalition soldier that died *two hundred* Iraqis perished. That the Gulf War was an absolute

and overwhelming victory for the coalition is undeniable in the light of these numbers. Such a victory is explained by Rochlin and Demchak's account of United States military policy entering into the Gulf conflict:

> Having seriously overestimated both the number of Iraqi troops in Kuwait and their stamina and morale, the coalition forces geared up to fight a fearsome foe, accumulating military resources far in excess of what was eventually required. [...] The force structure and mix that the United States began to mobilize in August 1990 was the result of the policies of the previous decade which favoured using complex technologies to overcome [...] an assumed central conflict, probably in Europe, in which the Soviet Union was heavily involved. (1991: 9).

During the Gulf conflict the United States mobilised a military machine which was designed to face off against a fearsome and intimidating Soviet army in Europe. This prospective foe particularly worried the American analysts and generals after the "debacle" of Vietnam and in light of the "overwhelming" number of tanks and troops which the Soviets could mobilise in the European theatre of war (ibid). What the coalition forces and the war hammer of the United States military faced in Kuwait, however, was far less "fearsome" than they had expected. According to Captain Kelvin Davies of the First Marine Division: "I hate to say it, but once we got rolling it was like a training exercise with live people running around. Our training exercises are a lot harder" (ibid). Clearly, then, while the United States and its coalition allies were expecting a formidable opposition and perhaps dreading loss of life, they ran through the war with (relatively speaking) minimal casualties and maximum effectiveness.

This dissertation argues that this created a social perception and impression of warfare: something easy, something quick and relatively painless. When studying *GoldenEye*, which began production merely four years after this war, it will be demonstrated that this perception

of conflict as something "clean" and even "technological" was an intimate and inherent part of the way this Bond film depicts physical combat. It makes intuitive sense that popular culture would draw on the perceptions and depictions of the Gulf conflict because this war, more than any before it, was inherently part of the popular culture due to saturation news coverage (Baudrillard 1995; Sakota-Kokot 2010).

Not only was the conflict incredibly successful, but so was the televised representation thereof. In an extensive interview-based survey of United Kingdom viewers who followed the Iraqi war on television and an exhaustively thorough mathematical analysis of the footage broadcast on major news networks[46] about the conflict, David Morisson (1992) makes several observations. Firstly that

> Although the popular imagery of war may revolve around killing, in the case of the Gulf War only 105 schedules were completed for items containing scenes which portrayed the results of military action in terms of human casualties. These scenes added up to three and a half hours [...] representing only 3 percent of the total Gulf output, and amounted to 7 percent of the total time spent on Military Aspects.

If one translates Morisson's research into numbers, it becomes clear that for every one hour of footage carried by a major news network like CNN or the BBC of the action in the Gulf, *only one minute and forty-eight seconds* portrayed human casualties. That does not address the issue of the non-human casualties of course: scenes of devastated buildings, cars, or homes. But seeing an apartment building blown apart or a city block levelled – devoid of human casualties – just does not have the same emotional impact as seeing human beings bloodily murdered. It seems rational that such images, while they may be labelled 'destructive', are not 'brutal' in the way that human casualties are.

[46] In fact he covers BBC 1 and 2; ITV; C4; Sky and CNN (Morisson 1992: 7).

It can be argued that Morrison's findings are misleading, because his statistics can be misleading. It may be argued that only 3 percent of airtime devoted to the Gulf War displays images of human casualties, because the majority of news footage consists of interviews and on-camera reports. This format would weigh down the percentage of destructive scenes with very boring talking heads. But Morisson pre-empts this critique with his second statistic, saying that even if all non-military broadcast was cut from the sample, the percentage of footage showing casualties barely doubles. To put that in context, an hour of Gulf footage dedicated to "military aspects" (ibid), would now contain *less than five minutes* (four minutes twelve seconds) of images of human casualties. Morisson in fact spells out the almost baffling conclusion of these numbers when he writes that: "Considering that the sample period covered a range of attacks and full scale battles the amount of people shown to be injured is remarkably low" (1992: 90). All of this begs the question – if television audiences were not seeing human casualties, what were they looking at? They were watching the lasting heritage of the Gulf War: technology-centred warfare, virtually devoid of bloody, human casualty.

According to Jean Baudrillard the televised footage of the Gulf War showed audiences around the world,

> For the most part a "clean" war … including the amazing footage from nose-cameras of "smart bombs", and relatively few images of casualties … (1995:3). This was war stripped of its passions … its veils … its violence; war stripped bare by its technicians even, and then reclothed (*sic*) by them with all the artifices of electronics (1995: 64).

As Morisson's research has illustrated, the images which viewers saw, even where they consisted of "military aspects", were not bloody destruction but the famous – or infamous – footage of smart bombs destroying non-human targets like buildings, depots and vehicles.

Baudrillard captures, in sweetly poetic language, the effect which this had on viewers – conditioning them to a war devoid of violence and brutality, almost completely devoid of human suffering; war which seemed more like a computer game than real, true to life, bloodshed. Baudrillard articulates this saying that "this is not war but a simulacrum of war, a virtual event which is less the representation of war than a spectacle" (1995: 10).

Technology thus had a two-fold effect in the Gulf War itself, and in the perception it created of warfare. Firstly it was one of the factors which ensured the massively effective strike, secondly it allowed audiences around the world with satellite or cable news feeds to watch the war unfold with "technology based immediacy" (Williams in Sakota-Kokot 2010: 16), and lastly it presented a clean, violence-free depiction of war which resembled a spectacular video game more than a real-world conflict. In the study of *GoldenEye* it will become clear that these perceptions formed an intimate part of the way in which this film constructed Bond. Technology became an extension of his martial abilities, just as it extended the military abilities of the troops in the Gulf War. Additionally the depiction of violence itself, as in the Gulf War, was clean and 'video-gamish' rather than real. The film's obsession with technology as a weapon has roots in the thinking and understanding of the real world after the war.

The swift, relatively bloodless victory and incredibly low troop losses of the Gulf War resulted in technology-driven warfare being considered the ideal for future conflicts, not only by the military, but certainly by the news audiences around the world. Rochlin and Demchak argue strongly against this view from a military and strategic standpoint in *Lessons of the Gulf War, Ascendant Technology, Declining Capability* (1991). The argument about the virtues of

technology-centred conflict is not relevant for this study. What is relevant, is the *perception* of its virtue for an international audience. Rochlin and Demchak, even in making a military argument against it, acknowledge that:

> The first misperception is that the allied victory was primarily due to the performance of US high-technology weapon systems. The second is that continuing the trend toward a high-tech military using primarily "smart" weapons will allow the United States to fight and win with minimal US casualties. [...] Tomahawk missiles cruising the skies of Baghdad looking for their targets and patriot missiles rushing skywards in a great plume of fire and smoke [..] provide the drama of which televised news, and future military romances, are made. (1991: 2) (emphasis my own).

Towards the end of this quote the authors step out of the strictly military milieu in which their argument is being made to acknowledge that the globally-televised, techno-centred, violence-stripped images of the Gulf War have a far wider reach than merely military strategists. Looking at *GoldenEye,* a James Bond film created less than four years after their words were published, one sees exactly this: a technologically super-advanced spy, "a Bond of unlimited technological ability [with an] expert knowledge of applied science" (Willis 2009: 171). The two military strategist's statement foreshadows this representation of Bond when they write that "a heroic technology-bound notion of prowess is now most likely to guide future American military force structure decisions" (Rochlin & Demchak 1991: 2) – as well as future Hollywood depictions of masculine action-heroes.

A "technology-bound notion of prowess" (ibid) is an intricate part of *GoldenEye*'s Bond. However, this is not only because of the technological perceptions of the Gulf War. This Bond film was made in a time when technology was fast becoming an obsession across the globe and

specifically in the Anglo-(predominantly-)American world. The capabilities and mysteries of technology were fascinating. And they were interwoven with a fear of the end of a millennium.

Millennial Anxiety

> [Brosnan's] Bond can also be heralded as a saviour against millennial anxieties of technological domination. This should not shock: popular culture is often the site of contemporary social fears […] These […] have, since […] 1995, coalesced around several key questions brought about by the end of the millennium. What place is there for the human in an increasingly technological world? What power will technology wield in the future?
>
> Martin Willis (2009: 169 & 170)

Before the fall of the Soviet Union, perhaps the greatest fear overwhelming the Western (if not entire) world was the possibility of nuclear holocaust resulting from a face-off between the Super Powers; it "hung over our heads like a dark cloud" (Perry 1996: 64). At the dawn of the 1990s several new preoccupations began to spread through Western society, almost as if there was a need for a new narrative on which to hang a doomsday scenario. One such preoccupation was the threat of technology and the dawn of a new millennium. The possibility that the world's electronic systems would come to an abrupt halt at midnight on the 31st of December 1999 was one of the primary drivers behind the anxieties over technology. No doubt the Gulf War with its technological extension of action and stripping of violence had its part to play. Propelling all of this was the immense boom of communications technology. Partly this was simply one of several post-Cold War apocalyptic schools of thinking, as acknowledged by Bentley:

> With the end of the Cold War […] the most immediate vehicle of apocalypse – global nuclear war – seemed to have evaporated. Millenial anxieties were

> thereby channelled into a proliferation of alternative forms: from global warming to wayward asteroids to millennium bugs (2005: 6).

Bentley creates the impression that millennial anxieties over technology was something rather flippant, putting it in the context of "wayward asteroids", something more the stuff of Hollywood than the real world and deriding techno-centric fears by labelling them as "the millennium bug". The fact is, for all his flippancy, Bentley acknowledges this as a theme in British fiction of the 1990s (2005: 1-10) – and thus as a social preoccupation of the time. Toal, envisioning the dangers of a post-Soviet world, highlights the threat posed by technology when he writes that:

> Everyday life […] is […] surrounded […] by complex technoscientific systems […] that deliver short-term progress, development and growth but also long-term dangers […] The normalized and taken-for-granted functioning of ever more complex and pervasive formations of technoscientific modernization has produced a range of manufactured uncertainties […] like nuclear energy, hazardous chemicals, genetic engineering […all] systems with catastrophic potential (2001: 21).

Toal's description of the threat of techno-scientific systems paints a clear picture of how technology became ingrained in 1990s society – and, importantly, how much "uncertainty", anxiety and potential fear this evoked in a populace who did not always understand the technology they were dealing with – despite consuming it – and were suspicious of the potentially "catastrophic" consequences. Such uncertainty is identified by Leach as well, when he describes the 1990s with reference to the James Bond franchise:

> The bloody civil wars that followed the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from Eastern Europe, the Gulf War, the growth of global terrorism and even the [...] anxieties about the coming millennium created a sense of political instability (2009: 302).

Here, Leach outlines several elements which led to a sense of uncertainty and political instability, all of which have been touched on in the analysis above of the *zeitgeist* of the 1990s in the Anglo-American West. Clearly, millennial anxiety was one of those elements. "Millennial anxieties of technological domination" (Willis 2009: 169), as flippant or even comic as it may seem alongside other, more immediate events like the Gulf War, was clearly boiling in the socio-cultural psyche of the 1990s and found an expression, as did the other fears and preoccupations of the time, in *GoldenEye*.

Having established the *zeitgeist* of the 1990s, the question arises as to how the world changed in the 2000s. As mentioned before, while 1995 and 2006 are merely a decade apart, and while they do share similarities, the latter decade experienced events which left Western Anglo-American (especially American) audiences far removed from the 1990s, both socio-culturally and geopolitically.

The 2000s: **Violence Relived. War Disillusioned.**

9/11: Violence and Brutal Reality

The images of the terrorist attacks of September 11 2001 have been recycled and revisited so often throughout Western culture that familiarity may have dulled the impact of the events of that fateful day. As Finlan says, "it is easy to underestimate the reverberations of 9/11 on the American psyche" (2006: 150) - yet those "reverberations" were immense. As Finlan describes,

> Unlike other nation-states the US has enjoyed a peculiarly sheltered existence in which (excluding the Civil War) warfare has been at a distance for the vast majority of Americans. Even in the twentieth century, unlike the continental European powers, wars were fought in other people's lands while the American homeland remained safe (Finlan 2006: 150-151).

That changed – dramatically – on 9/11. Suddenly violence was brought into a domestic and very personal realm for America. Two things about that statement are important: firstly that conflict was brought into the personal realm, but secondly that the conflict they witnessed was incredibly, brutally, *violent*. Consider for a moment the analysis of public perception of violence after the Gulf War, something clean and stripped of brutality, and juxtapose it with the image of a plane crashing into the second tower and erupting in a fireball, men and women throwing themselves from the upper floors, actual human bodies falling to their death, and finally the cataclysmic collapse of the buildings. This was not the clean, filtered, video-game-like warfare of the Gulf War seen from the noses of smart bombs. This was real and brutal and violent. Violence subsequently became a large part of the American media machine and the popular culture consumed by Westerners. As one source puts it: "The Bush years [2001-2009] have witnessed the increased militarization of American society marked by […amongst other things] a media culture saturated more than ever with images and narratives of violence." (Boggs & Pollard 2008: 565). Violence was made suddenly and brutally real with the events of 9/11 – but it did not end there. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan soon followed – theatres of violence far more real and difficult to digest for viewers back home than the clean, techno-centric conflict of fifteen years earlier.

In *Weapons of Mass Persuasion* (2008) Paul Rutherford, a self-professed critic of the war, analyses the ways in which the Bush administration made the invasion of Iraq even more clean and media-digestible than the previous Gulf conflict. He illustrates that, initially, they succeeded. The invasion of Iraq was preceded by the "Shock and Awe" campaign which was even more spectacular than the smart bomb footage of 1990 and which caught the attention

and fascination of the world. Then the ground forces rolled in and within three weeks they had taken Baghdad. At this point it seemed as if the son's war was even cleaner, more media-effective, more spectacular and better directed for the press than his father's a decade and a half earlier. Despite being a critic, Rutherford acknowledges the smooth functioning of the public relations machine and the swift, (as before) almost overwhelming victory of the US. But that was before and during the invasion. Subsequently things started to fall apart.

After capturing Baghdad the *invasion* became the *occupation* and slowly the spectacle of military power – fuelled by careful PR process – began to deteriorate. Rutherford describes "how badly things had gone wrong in post-invasion Iraq":

> The persistence of guerrilla assaults in and around Baghdad, the failure to find weapons of mass destruction, the way American soldiers were increasingly viewed […] as occupiers rather than liberators, the continuing sad state of Iraqi oil and electric supplies. Perhaps the fall of Baghdad had not marked a victory; rather, the war had unexpectedly entered a new phase (2004: 194).

This was not a war of quick, easy success, driven by impressive, advanced military prowess and technology. This was a bitter slog, and it was fast leading to what Rutherford terms a new "mood of public disenchantment" (2004: 196) both with the war and its masters. But this disenchantment extended beyond merely the politics or the military strategy of the war. It extended to the Western world's perception of violence. In the Gulf conflict of the 1990s, one soldier was lost for every two hundred of the enemy – and less than 5 minutes out of every hour of media coverage showed human casualties (Morisson 2004: 92). During the Iraqi occupation the media was delivering a different, more violent and less victorious story to its audience:

> The ongoing wave of bombings, rocket attacks and deaths – of American soldiers and Iraqi civilians and UN foreign-aid personnel – this news proved irresistible [to the media] […] worrying [to the public and officials] was the cost of lives: by the beginning of November the number of soldier killed during the occupation topped the number slain in the invasion itself, with no end in sight (Rutherford 2004: 196-197; emphasis my own).

The world was no longer watching a swift clean war, but a slow struggle in which real violence – no longer resembling a video game – was killing real American soldiers "with no end in sight". In stark juxtaposition to the Gulf War, American viewers were now being made aware of the "cost of lives". This seems to justify Boggs and Pollard when they describe the "two continuous, bloody wars of occupation in Iraq and Afghanistan" (2008: 565).

But violence is not only what the Americans were subjected to, it is also what they were actively pursuing in the wake of 9/11. Dalby, writes that:

> There are at least three crucial geopolitical formulations in the initial media discussion and official statements [after 9/11]. The first was that war was indeed the appropriate response [...] the script of a violent attack requiring a violent response was assumed even if there was no obvious assailant with a territorial base that could be attacked in response" (2003: 63; emphasis my own).

Evidently bloodlust and vengeance were powerful motivators in the 'war on terror' – and, as shall be demonstrated, in the Hollywood depictions of action heroes which were made thereafter. Such a "script of a violent attack" (ibid) aptly describes much of the conflict in *Casino Royale* – a film put into production merely four years after the events of 9/11 and during the height of the 'war on terror'.

Dalby's comment, however, introduces an important second shift in perception resulting from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan: "there was no obvious assailant" and no "clear territorial base that could be attacked" (ibid). In contrast to the Gulf War, in the 'war on

terror' 'the enemy' was no easy target – in fact, it was virtually invisible. Even when an entire country had been invaded in order to destroy it "Al-Qaeda ha[d] been denied its host state but, in disseminating more widely, the terrorist cells bec[a]me ever more elusive" resulting in an "impression" of America's "failure to defeat its enemies" (Buckley *et al* 2006: 10). This failure to defeat, or even to find, its enemies, presents another shift in perception from the mid 1990s. Despite America's "bloody wars of occupation" (Boggs *et al* 2008: 565) the enemy was not being decisively destroyed. And in the meantime the body bags of American soldiers were piling up, with, according to Rutherford "no end in sight" (2004: 197). Not only was there no victory in sight, but also no clear enemy.

9/11 and the subsequent conflicts in the Middle East had one more effect which altered the socio-cultural perceptions of the American and larger Western audience: technology suddenly became far less of an obsessed-over, reliable, trustworthy part of conflict. This tendency began with the attacks on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon when "the US military, for all its firepower and high-technology surveillance systems, had been spectacularly thwarted by boxcutters, basic pilot training and the grim determination to die for a cause" (Dalby 2003: 66). This impotency of the imposing technologically advanced American forces was similarly proved as war dragged on in Afghanistan and Iraq. Despite utilizing a great deal of technology – smart bombs, predator drones, UAV's (Rutherford 2004) – their tech-centred warfare could not find (all of) the enemy, decisively win the conflict or prevent the climbing death toll.

Tied into this combat-based disillusionment with technology was a consumer-based one. The first decade of the 21st century saw many of the technological anxieties in everyday

life peter out. The millennium passed without the feared meltdown of the world's information technology and a resulting information stone-age; the tech-bubble exploded in late 1998/early 1999, not only destroying fortunes, but also slowing down some of the madly obsessive IT start-ups and calming the technology sector somewhat. In general, from the Ipod to the Blackberry, from Skype to You Tube to Facebook, technology came down to earth, becoming simply integrated into our daily lives.

Filmic Footprints

Warfare and Heroes

The last decade of the previous millennium and the first decade of the present one were shaped by colossal events on the world stage, from the fall of the Berlin Wall to the fall of the Twin Towers, and witnessed two very different wars in the Middle East which met with very different results. All of this shaped disparate geopolitics and socio-cultural values in the two decades. These differences in values and perceptions fed, informed and produced different action films in each decade.

According to Tom Pollard "The 1990s witnessed a dramatic resurgence of conventional military films celebrating the rebirth of noble warmaking (*sic*)" (2002: 132). Reflecting on the multiple and massive victories of the Western (and specifically American) world during that time, this makes intuitive sense. First Capitalism defeated the Communist megalith of oppression; then coalition forces, in a clean and almost bloodless war, saved an innocent Kuwait from violent attack by the evil forces of the despot Saddam Hussein - or at least that is

how predominantly Anglo-American perceptions would describe it. In this context, war films which celebrate noble battles in service of noble goals seems fitting. Pollard acknowledges this when he comments that this resurgence was "tied in great measure to the cultural and political dictates of US Empire, which had become solidified with the breakup of the Soviet system" (ibid).

After September 11, however, two interesting trends emerge in Hollywood filmmaking. The first regards violence:

> The most successful and widely-viewed films of 2007–2008, including several Oscar candidates, embrace dark images of savage, often relentless violence, graphic depictions of killing […] Commenting on the 2008 Academy Awards, Patrick Goldstein, writing in the Los Angeles Times, observed that "the fallout from the war in Iraq seems to have inspired a new wave of violence-tinged films." (Boggs *et al* 2008: 565).

2007 and 2008 are slightly later than *Casino Royale* (2006), but not by much. It seems logical that the trends which shaped the Oscar and box office successes of those years would have been as applicable in the year before. After all, the momentous events which shaped those trends (9/11 and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq – specifically their prolonged and bloody occupations) had already happened and were happening when *Casino Royale* was made. It would seem then that Hollywood filmmakers, Hollywood's elite critics (in the Academy Awards) and the general public (responsible for the success of these "widely-viewed films" (ibid)) had all developed a taste for violence. In light of the earlier discussion about the harsh reality of violence in conflict which the Anglo-American world was experiencing during the 2000s, this trend seems logical.

The second trend that developed in Hollywood after September 11 is a resurgence in the popularity of superheroes. Strangely, a comment made about the latest *Rambo* film (2008, Sylvester Stallone) begins to explain this:

> Some cynical observers have commented that Rambo might well have returned in the nick of time, calculating that he is the one warrior persona able to deliver victory out of defeat in the latest catastrophic American imperial venture, Iraq (Boggs *et al* 2008: 569).

One can understand a "disenchantment" (Rutherford 2004: 196) with the military's ability in an era where the massive military might of the United States failed first to protect it from an attack on its homeland, and then to find and eliminate decisively an enemy abroad. Under such circumstances a hero who, like Rambo, can bring superhuman powers to bear in the solving of human problems becomes understandably attractive. Boggs and Pollard describe exactly this when they write that:

> The new superheroes recall earlier figures who, like [Bruce] Wayne [i.e. Batman] and Bond, could satisfy American viewers' fantasies of male heroes vanquishing terrible demons […] As the capacity of non-state terrorists to wreak real-life destruction increases—bolstered by possible access to weapons of mass destruction—so too has the power of hyper-masculine saviours in their anointed destiny to save the world from unspeakable horrors. (2006: 348-349)[47].

The above serves aptly to introduce the final, and far-reaching, shift in socio-cultural values which occurred after 9/11: a dramatic change in the representations of masculinity took place between the 1990s and 2000s.

[47] Boggs and Pollard's reference to the "hyper-masculine" is a rather important point which will be dealt with in more depth in the 'Re-envisioning masculinity' sections on pages 96-108.

Re-envisioning Masculinity: Hard Bodies become Soft Hearts

As discussed before, James Bond is perhaps one of the quintessential signifiers of 'the masculine' in society. Failing to address how the respective case studies remodel his masculinity would be an unforgivable oversight. Understanding this remodelling, of course, requires first a contextualisation of society's perception of 'masculinity' in the 1990s and 2000s respectively[48].

It should be noted that the idea of 'masculinity' which will be probed subsequently is defined by Hollywood and caters to a predominantly Anglo-American audience. The definition of 'masculinity' it constructs is drawn from, influenced by and reflects the experiences of a very small group of males – mostly middle- and upper-class white men in North America. Connell makes this point quite clearly:

> I mean the more startling ethnocentrism by which a discourse of "masculinity" is constructed out of the lives of (at most) 5 percent of the world's population of men, in one culture-area, at one moment in history [...]The limitations of our current approaches to masculinity are summed up by the startling ethnocentrism of most of the English-language literature (1993: 600).

This serves to demonstrate the shortcomings and limitations of the subsequent definitions of 'masculinity'. Nonetheless, this study seeks to investigate changing socio-cultural values represented by the Bond films, and for these films the primary audience, as discussed in the preface, is the predominantly Anglo-American viewer. Thus, limited as these definitions and conceptions are by "ethnocentrism" (ibid) they are perfectly suited to the group whose cultural values the case-studies reflect.

[48] The section which contains this discussion serves as something of a hybrid in the context of this chapter. It will draw simultaneously on socio-cultural values as well as on the "filmic footprints" thereof. As the section will demonstrate, theories about the conceptions of masculinity are, understandably, intricately interwoven with the representations thereof.

According to Hunter:

> The *uber*-male action films of the 1980s (think Schwarzenegger and Stallone) can be read (and often are) as a corrective response to the feminist boom of the 1970s, or the sagging US economy. (2003: 72)

Understanding the 1980s "*uber*-male" action films enlightens an analysis of masculine depictions in both the 1990s and 2000s. Hunter offers a concise and slightly comical summary:

> Analyses of the 1980s cinematic *uber*-male typically go something like this: demoralized by the Vietnam war, rattled by feminism, outsourced by post-Fordism, and squeezed by a recession, America [...] needed to shore up its traditional power structures (2003: 75).

This "shoring up" evoked a series of (very successful) images in popular culture of the 'man's man' – capable, masculine heroes. As Tasker puts it, these *uber*-male depictions have been termed by some as part of a "backlash against feminism serving as a 'sexist assertion of male dominance'" (Tasker 1993: 94). According to Hunter these were not only the roles of Schwarzenegger, Stallone, and Van Damme, but also the likes of Indiana Jones in *The Raiders of The Lost Ark* (Spielberg, 1981); the comic cop-duo in *Lethal Weapon* (**director** 1987) and Bruce Willis in *Die Hard* (1988, John McTiernan) (2003: 75-77).

> We call these "Reaganite" films, or "Reagan-era" films, not only because they were produced in or around his tenure as US president, but because they "portrayed many of the same narratives of heroism, success, achievement, toughness, strength, and 'good old Americanness' that made the Reagan Revolution possible" (Hunter 2003: 75)

An intrinsic part of the "toughness" and "strength" which defined the depiction of these heroes lay in their bodies – specifically in their musculature. Understandably, masculinity is interwoven with the male body, but a specific depiction of these bodies, centring on 'muscle', became popular with these heroes. According to Boyle

> Muscles have long been a leitmotif of national and racial supremacy in the cultural imagination of the United States (Dyer, 2002; Jeffords, 1994; Kasson, 2001; Montez de Oca, 2005; Vertinsky, 1999)[49]. Historically, cultural representations of muscle have appeared at times of perceived or real crises in the political, social, and economic power of White men (2009: 47)

According to Boyle (and the score of sources he cites) muscles are signifiers of power and as such are an intricate part of masculine perceptions. Describing the success of the autobiography of one of – if not *the* – quintessential muscle-bound *uber*-male in American culture, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Boyle writes: "the surprise popularity of his book underscores the power of mythologies about muscle, masculinity, and class that underpin the American Dream" (2009: 50).

When one matches these "mythologies about muscle" (ibid) to the socio-historic moment of the 1980s, the popularity of the "*uber*-male" becomes immediately apparent. In the 1980s, Reagan rhetoric was fuelling what Hunter has termed a "Reagan revolution" (2003: 75) in which a culture of toughness was propagated for the American male. This decade was 'tough' economically and geopolitically and even mentally for the American man, with feminism, Fordism, the post-Vietnam syndrome and a recession demoralizing men (ibid). These conditions spurred the call for tough men – and the success of their images in popular film. One might say that in the 1980s tough times called for tough men.

But then came the 1990s and all of this changed. As Part One has already discussed, action heroines were coming to the fore in droves (though still subjugated to a patriarchal order and gaze) and the muscle-bound tough men were falling out favour. The public appetite for masculinity had changed. This changing appetite was tied into a changing socio-cultural

[49] Boyle's references are included to give some feeling for the scope of the theory which agrees with this point about muscles and masculine supremacy.

conception of masculinity. So radical was this change that many have termed it a "crisis in masculinity"[50].

Davis *et al* describe that,

> The 'crisis' of masculinity has something to do with wider social and economic changes […] there would seem to be a broad agreement that the following are of significance […] Changes in the labour market and the patterns of work, which would include the decline of heavy industries and, hence, strong physical labour […] Changes in the family, which would include the rise of divorce rates […] and single parent households […] Changes in the positions of women in the labour market, politics [and] education (2005: 112).

In essence men were losing their traditionally held places in both the family, and the economic sphere. 'Work' was no longer 'a man's job' because jobs which necessitated muscle and strength were dwindling, replaced by intellectual fields from corporate banking to IT. 'Fathering' was being proven less essential to the success of parenting and women were showing that they could do a job just as well as men in many regards[51].

Not only were the traditional roles of men – both in the family and in the workplace – being changed and even usurped, the socio-economic moment was very different to that of the 1980s. The Soviet Union had fallen and the Gulf War had met with overwhelming success.

---

[50] This subject is investigated extensively by Malin (2005); for its driving causes see especially pages 12-14 and Briggs (2007: 8).

[51] This point about women proving themselves in the workplace needs to be contextualised in terms of the overwhelming evidence in Chapter One that women were not gaining access to top level employment and were still victimized by prejudice and discrimination. Connell (1993) addresses this issue very neatly when he acknowledges that "the distinctive feature of the present moment in gender relations in first-world countries is the fact of open challenges to men's power, in the form of feminism" (1993: 613). Echoing Davis *et al* above, he, too, sees feminism as challenging men and masculinity. However he continues: "We must distinguish between the presence of these movements from the operating power they have won, which is often disappointingly small" (ibid). This statement captures the nature of the moment exactly: The *ideas* and *rhetoric* that challenged masculinity were more imposing than the on-the-ground *changes*. Briggs echoes Connell's statement and Chapter One's findings when he writes that: "this form of "masculine mourning" [the 'crisis in masculinity'] obviously does not take into account the fact that most Fortune 500 jobs are still held by white men and that on average women still make less than men in most positions" (2007: 12).

Additionally the United States economy experienced formidable growth in the 1990s (Jorgenson 2008: 785[52]). Thus while the 1980s were a tough decade that relished tough men in both its politics and its films, the 1990s were a far easier, more confident time. One might say that in the absence of obviously tough times and in the presence of traditionally 'masculine' roles being changed, the demand for blatantly tough men dwindled.

Reflecting this, the films of the 1990s depicted much less 'macho' men. Hunter (2003: 72-73) describes a host of films from this period all depicting emasculated men who range from pathetic to normal – but never 'macho', never impressively manly. He terms these "'office man' movies" (ibid). *Fight Club* (David Fincher, 1999) and *American Beauty* (Sam Mendez, 1999) are the subjects of such a discussion by both Flook (2007) and Briggs (2007), who describe how the protagonists in these films represent the ways in which dreary, unimpressive men escape their corporate and boring consumer-driven, office-bound lives. Baker also investigates how "an increasingly commodified and consumerist organization in life" (2006: xi) affected the creation of male depictions[53].

Such depictions are not directly relevant to the creations of James Bond – 007 is the farthest thing from a middle-class male caught in the boring confines of a dreary corporate culture. However, mentioning these films and this widespread trend in 1990s films helps to illustrate the point that men of the 1990s were depicted very differently to the *uber*-males of the 1980s. They were much less obviously 'manly' and 'tough'. The aforementioned "office

[52] See also: Kozmetsky & Yue (2005) and Rhode & Toniolo (2006).

[53] In fact he argues that these oppressive, emasculating conditions leads, in films like films *Falling Down* (Joel Schumacher, 1993*), Fight Club* (David Fincher, 1999) *and American Psycho* (Mary Harron, 1999) to "a fragmentation of the (white) male psyche and a violent, quasi-psychotic reaction against the conditions of contemporary life" (2006: xi). That these films violently opposed the corporate, 'office' culture of the 1990s merely reaffirms the strength of its presence.

man movies" (Hunter 2003: 72) describe one end of the spectrum of the representation of masculinity in the 1990s, while Bond certainly lies at the other end. These examples serve to demonstrate that that spectrum had shifted overall to a much less 'macho' depiction of masculinity.

In fact, studying several of the most masculine depictions from the 1990s - the action heroes at the other end of the spectrum from the office clerks – this trend in physicality is immediately evident. These heroes, while being 'masculine' heroes – saving the city, their loved ones or even humanity – are not 'macho' men. Perhaps the best example is Neo, the protagonist of *The Matrix* (Andy and Larry Wachowski, 1999). Neo is by no means pathetic – anointed as the hero who will, literally, save mankind from destruction, he has the ability to fly, to fight scores of (virtually superhuman) enemies, and even to dodge bullets. However, despite having these superhuman abilities his body is not '*uber*' muscled but rather, one might say, 'lean and mean'.

Another example of this 'lean and mean' masculine physical ideal can be found in *Fight Club* (David Fincher, 1999). This film's protagonist is a perfect example of the emasculated 'office men' representations discussed above: insecure, weak and rather pathetic. However, he creates a psychological alter-ego for himself, Tyler Durden, who is his exact opposite – assertive, sexy, violent and very capable: an ultra-masculine man. According to Briggs, "the masculine ideal in this case takes the form of Tyler Durden or more specifically Brad Pitt" (2007: 32). Pitt's body is incredibly well developed, with defined abdominals and sculpted arms. However, Pitt is not a muscle-bound monster like Stallone, Van Damme or, most pertinently, Schwarzenegger. His body is 'ripped' and 'cut' but not massive – it is not the out-of-proportion

musculature of the 1980s heroes. In much the same way, the James Bond representation created during the 1990s is a lean and elegant body, rather than the "muscular vigilante played by Timothy Dalton" (Willis 2009: 167) in the 1980s.

The Bond of *GoldenEye* reflects the decade in which he was created psychologically as well as physically. The 1990s saw not only a change in the bodies of their masculine heroes but also a renewed perspective on their emotions and inner conflicts. According to Gates, "the cop action film [very much a masculine genre] has seen a shift from the 1980s to the 1990s as hard bodies gave way to soft hearts" (2006: 150). She makes this connection explicit with reference to Bruce Willis – a "hard body" (ibid) of the 1980s in films like *Die Hard,* whose persona altered to reflect the "soft hearts" (ibid) of the new decade: "Thus, Willis, played cop-action heroes in the 1980s and early 1990s but now plays less physical, more sensitive detectives that are still considered heroic" (Gates 2006: 6). Similarly Bainbridge and Yates trace the same tendency:

> Over the past decade, and in contrast to the more macho images of the 1980s as in the *Die Hard*, *Lethal Weapon* and *Rambo* cycles of film, more diverse examples of emotional masculinities can be found in Hollywood cinema than previously, where the interior lives of the characters are more fully explored (2005: 305).

Boyle, too, mirrors this argument; writing that there occurred:

> A shift in notions about masculinity between the 1980s and 1990s. Also known as the "sensitive new age guy" (or SNAG), the "New Age Man" emerged [...]his ability to be vulnerable and emotional [...] represented a shift in popular images of masculinity in the 1990s (2009: 51)[54].

Popular images of masculine heroes were shifting to more than buff bodies and hard hearts. The 1990s saw the arrival of leaner bodies and more fragile hearts. In addition, these hearts

[54] It should be added that Boyle (citing other scholars) makes it quite clear that this was only a superficial shift and that in fact this new image "smuggles old sexisms through its reliance on homophobic, racist and sexist discourses" (2009: 51). Nonetheless, that the popular images of masculinity shifted (albeit superficially) supports the reading that masculine heroes were portrayed with more depth and emotional vulnerability in the 1990s.

were explored in more depth by the narrative. The following chapter will demonstrate that the representation of James Bond created during the 1990s clearly mirrored the decade's socio-cultural perceptions of masculine physicality and psychology.

Beyond psychology and technology however, the 1990s saw one final change in the representation of the masculine: the ultra man became less physical and more technological. According to Briggs:

> Well into the 20th century, the essential image of a man was that of a person who worked hard, provided for and protected his family, defended his country. The 90's brought deep changes, among them a rising tide of prosperity. [thus] the masculine identity is more closely tied to consumption than work" (Briggs 2007: 10).

Briggs begins to outline the problem of the 1990s – that the traditional 'tough man' roles in society were being eroded. Economically, men were becoming 'consumers' rather than 'workers'. The image of steel workers or farmers or other hardened, physical labourers with grass-roots ideals was being replaced by bankers, brokers and other suited-types whose masculinity lay not in their toughness but in their wallets and the badges on their cars. And of course, in the millennial context of the 1990s and the technologically enthused socio-cultural atmosphere, a great deal of consumerism was centred on technological consumption. In a manner of speaking one's 'gizmo' began to define one's 'macho'. According to Briggs:

> In the wake of the increasing economic prosperity of the late 1990's, which was brought on by a low employment and the dot com boom, it seemed that men were made to curb their more aggressive, more primal tendencies to better function in a more technologically based society (2007: 12-13).

Not only were the 'masculine' men of the 1990s no longer massively muscled, they were also less physical and more material – specifically, more technological. Chapter Four will demonstrate that the James Bond created in the 1990s is most certainly less "primal" and

"aggressive" (ibid) with his body. In addition he does not merely "function in a more technologically based society" (ibid), he thrives on technology and often uses it to further his physical ability.

It should be noted that these last two tendencies of the 1990s – consumerism, and specifically technological consumerism, as masculine signifiers – have always been an integral part of 'the figure of James Bond'. He has always been seen as a site of consumption, whether it be with a rocket-launching Aston Martin[55] or a whistle-activated smoke grenade[56]. However, this dissertation argues (as will become evident in Chapter Four) that a fusing of masculinity, physicality and technology in the figure of James Bond was far more extreme in *GoldenEye* than in *Casino Royale*. While the Bond of 2006 certainly still has 'gadgets', his use of, and interaction with, them is very different. Thus, just as the 2000s did not share the 1990s' preoccupation with technology (as discussed earlier in this chapter) so the Bond of *Casino Royale* is not nearly as fused with devices and 'gizmos' as the Bond of *GoldenEye*. Instead, the later Bond was stripped of his technological assistance and turned into a much more physical hero with a visual, powerful body. This depiction, too, reflects the changing socio-cultural values of the 2000s.

Re-envisioning Masculinity: 'Tough Guys' for 'Tough Times'

The previous section suggested that when 'times are tough' – either economically or geopolitically and militarily – 'tough' images of masculinity enjoy great popularity. Furthermore, the section suggested that muscles are a metaphor for masculine strength,

[55] *Goldfinger* (Guy Hamilton, 1964)
[56] *Licence to Kill* (John Glen, 1989)

prowess and toughness. There can hardly be a better way to describe 'tough times' than the events of 9/11 and the hardened, prolonged military aftermath. It makes intuitive sense that films made thereafter would herald the return of the *uber*-male – and the public would welcome it. Abate describes how,

> In the wake of […] events of September 11th, 2001 […] America clung to notions and images of heroism in order to maintain a sense of stability and security. Between the photographs of the clean-up effort at Ground Zero and the constant news coverage of the events and the aftermath, one thing became clear: in America's eyes, its heroes were men. […] They are the welders, policemen and businessmen with can-do attitudes who are unafraid to tackle armed hijackers—even if it means bringing down an airplane […] The operative word here is men. Brawny, heroic, manly men (2010: 1 & 9).

"Brawny, heroic, manly men" (ibid) are words which can easily describe the *uber*-males of 1980s Hollywood. These were the "images of heroism" (ibid) which began to seep into the American consciousness as it was saturated with media representations of the aftermath of September 11. And Hollywood snapped them up. Briggs describes it clearly: "as a producer of cultural artefacts (*sic*), Hollywood is in a unique position to reflect these turns of the *zeitgeist* screw" (2007: 14).

As a result "Hollywood recognized this new nationalistic sense of masculine heroism" (2010: 1) and snapped it up to produce fittingly masculine heroes:

> The post-9/11 male hero was also expected to look like he had the ability to protect the weak against whatever threats he or the country would have to face. The heroes who emerged after September 11th embodied the epitome of traditional masculine imagery; they were tall, muscular, and sexually potent (Abate 2010: 12).

As shall be demonstrated in a moment, the heroes of the 2000s were powerful, strongly built men – men displaying muscles, that ideological signifier of the ultra masculine. They were the "traditional masculine image" (ibid) of tough men – needed for tough times. But there was a

qualification which differentiated these heroes from the hulking muscle-men of the 1980s: they were, despite their size, still human; they were approachably, believably real characters with whom an audience could empathise. According to Abate:

> What differentiated the heroes of September 11th from past notions of heroism was that these heroes were ordinary men. They were the firemen, policemen and citizens (also men) who risked and lost their lives on that tragic day in order to save others […] the everyman was the symbol of idealized masculinity, a position generally reserved for America's fictional heroes such as John Wayne and Superman (2010: 2 & 10).

These traditionally 'masculine' men might be muscular and powerful physically but they were also "real", "ordinary men" with whom the public could identify.

Abate draws these two physical and mental characteristics together aptly when writing that the heroes audiences saw on television following September 11 "were familiar; they were big, well built, and had the ability to protect, yet they were natural, recognizable, and identifiable" (2010: 19). One might say the heroic bodies of the 2000s were an amalgamation of the two decades which preceded them. They had the size of the hard-bodied *uber*-males of the Reaganite era – fittingly tough bodies for fittingly tough times. But they also had the new-found depth and emotional vulnerability which heroes of the 1990s had introduced.

The next chapter will demonstrate how the James Bond of the 2000s encapsulated both these traits. This Bond had a far more muscled body than his 1990s predecessor; one which was blatantly displayed by the film's aesthetic, thus showing off the new Bond's traditional masculine power. But he was also human and emotionally vulnerable; suffering not only believable mistakes and physical injuries but a harsh emotional blow.

Chapter 4: Comparing and Contrasting Representations of Bond

The 'figure of James Bond' created in the 1990s catered to the *zeitgeist* of the decade strongly influenced by the Gulf War and the fall of Soviet Union. The films create a Bond who is as infatuated with technology as society was in the 1990s and who, like the troops in Iraq, uses technology as an extension of his own martial abilities. Further the conflict which this Bond engages in is 'clean' – devoid of bloodshed and even brutality. His fight scenes, much like some of the perceptions of the Gulf War conflict, are largely devoid of human casualties.

This representation is in stark contrast to the Bond of the mid 2000s. Here technology is largely – though not totally – stripped away and replaced by a physical, muscular ability. This hero is brutally real – much as the striking images of 9/11 and the hard wars in the Middle East were brutally real. This Bond is also not nearly as superhumanly capable or informed as Brosnan's 007. Just as the 2000s were a time of geopolitical uncertainty – about the West's enemies and their friends; about the possible outcomes of two long and gritty wars – so too the Bond created during them is uncertain, unable always to tell friend from foe or see the big picture of political intrigues and espionage dangers. Each case study is a product of a time with differing socio-cultural views of geopolitics, conflict and masculinity – and they reflect this.

Sperb illuminates much of the differences between the two films when he writes that:

> *GoldenEye* attempted to reaffirm all the aspects of the franchise that had made the franchise so successful […] whereas *Casino Royale* attempts to create an alternate Bond (2009: 55).

The Bond of *Casino Royale* shows four marked differences to that of *GoldenEye*. The first is that Brosnan's Bond *is* 007. His depiction "negotiated all the generic expectations of the franchise

just well enough to stay interesting" (Sperb 2009: 55). Daniel Craig's depiction however *becomes* Bond during the course of the film by learning what Brosnan's Bond already knows. He grows to understand his enemies and the intricacies of their plots (what M dubs "the big picture"). But he also loses some of his humanity to a solid, inner coldness, the human James becoming the ruthless 007[57].

Secondly Craig's Bond is far more realistic and believable than Brosnan's. This realism, while manifesting in several ways, can be described overall as a 'stripping down' of Bond that takes him "back-to-basics" (Charity in Bernard 2009)[58] largely by removing his gadgets and representing him as more physical. This realism ties into the third difference: a "hypermasculinity (*sic*)" (Tramonte *et al* 2003: 189) in the remodelling of Bond. This Bond's fights are more gritty and real; his action sequences far more brutal and devoid of technological help and gadgetry. Additionally his body is more prone to damage, bleeding and bruising.

The representation of Bond's body in *Casino Royale* is the fourth marked difference between the two case studies. Not only is Daniel Craig's Bond far more muscular than his predecessor but the audience is made to see it. This reflects what Chapter Three discussed about 'tough men' being called upon in 'tough times'. While the 1990s produced a Bond who – like the masculine ideals of the decade – was not massively or overtly *uber*-male, the Bond of the 2000s was definitely a 'tough guy'. And, as demonstrated above, such notions of 'toughness' are intertwined with "mythologies about muscle" (Boyle 1990: 50). Thus *Casino Royale* presents a new, muscle-bound Bond whose body is repeatedly on display.

[57] This aspect is explored in more depth as part of the similarity between the two filmic depictions; see 'James Bond's Soul' on page 130.
[58] See also Cunningham & Gabri (2009); Chapman (2009); Bernard (2009).

There is, however, an interesting similarity between the two depictions. This lies in an investigation of Bond's psycho-emotional side. *GoldenEye* touches on Bond's psychological makeup; hints at the things driving him – and haunting him, but never dwells too deeply on it. *Casino Royale* goes much further along the same vein, making the "greater psychological depth" (Chapman 2009: 243) of Bond a central part of its plot and theme.

Understanding 'The Big Picture'

During their first confrontation in *Casino Royale* (starts: 00:20:57) M (Judi Dench) is furious with Bond for blowing up an embassy and killing a bomb-maker. While Bond feels that "one less bomb-maker in the world would be a good thing" (00:22:41) M's rebuke is that they are trying to understand how an entire network of terrorism is being financed and Bond has killed their only lead – "hardly the big picture wouldn't you say?" (00:22:48) followed soon after by "I knew it was too early to promote you" (00:23:10). A Bond who does not readily snap up the "big picture" of political meanings, evil intrigues and the interlaced networking of his enemies is also a novel turn. According to Howard:

> Bond is generally the best spy the British government has to offer […] Regardless of how complicated the scheme is Bond somehow manages to figure it all out […] but in *Casino Royale* Bond is hardly England's best, at least not yet (2009: 46-47).

By contrast Brosnan's 007 easily "manages to figure it all out" (ibid) – sometimes before even M and MI6. M's analysts say that the Goldeneye satellite project could not exist: "they had neither the finance nor the technology to implement it" (00:38:45) while Bond, disbelieving, suspects it, replying that "numbers were never my strong suit" (00:38:46). Later in the same scene he displays an in-depth knowledge of "the Russian failsafe systems. You don't

just walk in and ask for the keys, you need the access codes" (00:44:41) and moments later he predicts and identifies the "insider" (00:44:48) that allowed the theft to occur. Furthermore, he is the first one to see that the Tiger helicopter is the perfect "getaway vehicle" (00:44:36) for stealing such a weapon. Sometimes Bond does not even need to 'figure it out', but simply knows. When M asks him what they know about the Janus syndicate, Bond instantly rattles off a number of facts about them (00:45:32) that suggest an in-depth knowledge of the 'big picture' of terrorism and espionage. Arguably the greatest strategic *coup* that this Bond 'figures out' in *GoldenEye* is how to turn a longstanding enemy with great animosity towards him – Valentin Zukovsky – into an ally by bartering a tricky deal between Zukovsky and another arms dealer (start: 01:02:07) which involves Bond pulling strings to ensure the other man's agent gets apprehended whilst Zukovsky's "will make a miraculous escape with the money – your money" (01:01:41). This is a Bond who understands "the big picture" of Russian mobs, Russian missile defence procedures, terrorist cells and how to manipulate the players in the underground espionage world.

Daniel Craig's Bond, however, has yet to learn these lessons. His botched capture of the bomb-maker (starts: 00:16:24), resulting not only in the death of a contact but in a public affairs fiasco for MI6, demonstrates this. As does the poisoning sequence (starts: 01:34:20) where Bond, intent on the poker game, does not see or even consider that his drink might have been tampered with. While James Bond will always have near-death close-calls this is one which is allowed by his own negligence – a negligence Pierce Brosnan's 007 never demonstrates in *GoldenEye*.

Casino Royale ties Bond's lack of insight into a very brutal plotline. "He fails to anticipate that his government will protect *Le Chiffre*" despite the terrorist's sadistic torture – and perhaps even murder – of Bond (Howard 2009: 47). It is as Bond is being tortured, strapped naked to a chair (the worst and most vulnerable position the audience sees him in throughout the film) (starts: 01:49:00) that he boldly clings to one last conviction. Laughing despite his pain he tells *Le Chiffre* that "no matter what you do, I'm not gonna (*sic*) give you the password which means your clients are gonna (*sic*) hunt you down and cut you into little pieces of meat while you're still breathing" (01:52:16). But the terrorist banker viciously sets him straight: "but you are so wrong – because even after I slaughtered you […] your people would still welcome me with open arms; because they need what I know" (01:52:27). This realization hits Bond hard. His bold calm seeps out of him and for a moment there is genuine terror in his eyes as he grits his teeth and whispers "the big picture" (01:52:43) – finally beginning to see the greater net of intrigue M tried to open his eyes to.

Perhaps an even more brutal twist, though emotional and not physical, that Bond fails to anticipate, is Vesper's betrayal of him. "Where Bond is normally portrayed as being so wise in the ways of women and the world […] *Casino Royale* instead shows us a spy who […] is caught up in a relationship whose complexity largely escapes him" (Howard 2009: 46). This results in a painful emotional blow, one of the central turning points for Bond's character. Not only does he not anticipate her betrayal but he also fails "to realize Vesper's sacrifice" (Howard 2009: 55) – that she bargained her life in exchange that the mysterious organization running her and *Le Chiffre* would spare Bond's when they killed the banker[59].

[59] Something which M explains to him in the pen-ultimate scene (starts: 02:18:00).

Howard writes that Bond "needs to see 'the big picture'": that Mathis might betray him; that Vesper's sacrifice was part of a deal to let Bond live and that *Le Chiffre* would still be welcomed by Bond's own people despite his horrific actions; "in all three cases someone else has to explain to Bond what is going on" (2009: 46-47). *Casino Royale* thus offers an "alternate Bond universe" (Sperb 2009: 55) in which 007 must still learn the lessons "that he will need to be successful as a spy" (Howard 2009: 47) in order that the 'blunt instrument' M derides early in the film acquires a grasp of 'the big picture' of espionage intrigues, enemies' tactics and even his own lover's secret motives so that the fallible, human, man: James "*becomes* Bond", the mythic secret agent, "over the course of the two hour-plus narrative" (Sperb 2009: 52)[60].

A More Realistic Bond:

Can-you-top-this Action Sequences vs Gritty Bathroom Brawls

The second marked difference between the representation of 007 in *GoldenEye* and *Casino Royale* lies in how realistic and believable the two are. Bernard writes of Daniel Craig's film that "it eschews, for the most part, the gimmicks of the earlier films in favour of a more "realistic" treatment of Bond's early career" (2009: 14). This was a conscious decision according to executive producer Michael G. Wilson: "we felt audiences were getting tired of the over-the-top action sequences [of the Brosnan films]" (Arnett 2009: 10). The promotional discourse for *Casino Royale* advertises the producers' thinking with words like ""gritty", "realistic" and

[60] There is more to Daniel Craig *becoming* Bond, however, than just the acquisition of knowledge and insight into the spy-world. Part of his transformation is the way in which his emotional-psychological side develops during the film. This is explored in 'James Bond's Soul' on page 130.

"tough" [being] the most prominent adjectives" (Chapman 2007: 242). This realistic toughness can be seen by comparing the opening or pre-credit sequences of both Bond films.

GoldenEye opens with an unknown man running along a dam wall in Soviet Russia and committing an astonishing bungee-jump from its heights (starts: 00:00:45). Moments later that same man drops into a lavatory of a Soviet weapons installation and Pierce Brosnan delivers his first line as James Bond with all the wit and cheek that are 007's trademarks: "beg your pardon, forgot to knock," (00:03:03) he says as he hangs over a Soviet soldier sitting on the toilet and then knocks him out with one blow. This recalls Sperb's comment that Brosnan "negotiated the generic expectations of the franchise" (2009: 55) – such a witty one liner introducing Bond fits the expectations of the 'figure' of 007 perfectly.

Minutes later Bond faces off against a host of soldier's armed with AK47s, keeping them at bay by hiding behind barrels of explosive weapons material (00:06:38). Yet when Bond leaps onto a rapidly moving conveyor belt – and is wheeled to cover – none of the hordes of henchman can place a single accurate shot (00:08:12). It should be added that at this point Bond has blown the locks on dozens of reels of barrels that are flung loose onto his assailants, thus, supposedly distracting (and flattening) them too much to allow a clear shot. Yet one must wander how "realistic" this really is; of a horde of trained soldiers all with automatic rifles aimed at Bond; what are the chances that not a single shot is loosed, even despite barrel-enthused-chaos, that hits the hero? Even if one forgives this lapse in realism what follows finally puts any hint of it to rest.

After this dubiously realistic escape Brosnan's Bond runs down an open runway pursued by numerous soldiers, all of them firing at him, none of them hitting him (starts: 00:08:17). The

final, and most daring, step in this action set-piece is Bond ramping a motorcycle off the runway (situated on a cliff face) to plummet downwards toward a falling plane; catch it and, just in the nick of time, pull it out of its dive and fly off – over the Russian weapons installation which explodes epically beneath him (starts: 00:09:34). This pre-credit sequence, from the astounding bungee jump off the dam wall to the physics-defying plane intercept at the end, is not believable. Neither, however, does it need to be. Howard describes the tradition of "can-you-top-this" opening action sequences for the Bond films and how each took explosions and stunts to a whole new level (2009: 33-35). *GoldenEye*'s audiences expected – and enjoyed greatly – exactly this kind of opening, because it satisfied "the generic conventions" (Sperb 2009: 55) of the franchise.

Daniel Craig's depiction, however, sought to break these. The opening of *Casino Royale* contains "a comparatively minimalistic scene, [in which] we bear witness to two gunshots and two kills […one of which occurs…] in a brutal, ugly bathroom brawl" (Howard 2009: 35). Cunningham and Gabri describe this brawl as one of several "acts of extreme violence" (2009: 86) in the film – this is both true and ironic. Brosnan's 007 kills, certainly injures, dozens of anonymous henchman in the first minutes of *GoldenEye* but the audience is not forced to deal with it – neither is Bond – he merely kills and runs, and the audience is carried with him. In *Casino Royale* both Bond and his audience are intimately present as he drowns a man in the washbasin (starts: 00:02:36); a scene which Tincknell describes as "brutally violent" (2009: 99). Tremonte and Racioppi describe a later action sequence in the film as "protracted and intimate" (2009: 194) as part of an argument that *Casino Royale* depicts "hyperreal violence" (2009: 197). This believable and real violence is part of the cocktail that makes for a more

realistic Bond. This is not the only part of the cocktail however, as Johnson says "this realism extends to the consequences of such [violent] actions as well" (2009: 119).

Durable but not Indestructible

A trademark of the Pierce Brosnan Bond is that despite his fight sequences, car chases and violent entanglements he is left virtually unscathed. "He is never injured in any lasting way and rarely shows any cuts, bruises or scrapes" (Howard 2009: 41). *GoldenEye* offers numerous examples of this; not least in the pre-credit sequence. Despite eluding a host of villains, getting shot at by dozens of soldiers and performing seemingly-unbelievable aerial stunts Bond is untouched. He has barely broken a sweat, much less sustained any injury. This Bond, with his perfect image, seems almost superhuman.

By contrast Daniel Craig's 007 not only sustains injuries (at times incredibly serious) but needs time to recuperate from them; "[Bond's] injuries do not disappear magically" (Johnson 2009: 119). Howard summarizes this shift in portrayal neatly when he writes that Daniel Craig's Bond, "while he is durable, is not indestructible" (2009: 41). The pre-credit sequence begins to hint at this: after his brutal bathroom brawl Daniel Craig is dishevelled and sweaty (00:03:14). But this is only the beginning. The "hyperreal violence" (Tramonte *et al* 2009: 197) of this film has hyperreal consequences. In his pursuit of the bomb-maker through Madagascar's construction site (starts: 00:11:16) and finally the embassy (starts: 00:16:24), Bond "is seriously seen to bleed" and "emerges plausibly cut and bruised" (Chapman 2009: 251). The next action sequence after this is Bond's thwarting the bombing of an airliner (starts: 00:46:30)[61]. This not

[61] Bond begins following the bomber through the airport far sooner than this but the action-packed pursuit which takes place on the runway outside and leaves him injured begins here.

only leaves him with several cuts across his face – a continuing novelty for the franchise – but "he still bears his wounds from Miami when M debriefs him in the Bahamas" (Howard 2009: 42; starts: 00:54:21).

Such instances of physical vulnerability re-occur repeatedly throughout the film. One example is Bond's poisoning by *Le Chiffre* during the poker game in Montenegro (starts: 01:34:20). The result is what Tremonte and Racioppi call the "protracted and intimate" (2009: 194) sequence wherein Bond struggles desperately to save himself. First by making himself throw up (01:35:09) – a very un-Bond-like manoeuvre in its vulgarity and its believability – and then by stumbling, already sweaty and intensely alarmed, towards the Aston where he battles to make the defibrillator work – and fails only to have Vesper save him in the nick of time (starts: 01:35:13). Daniel Craig's 007 manages to bounce back from this episode in typical Bond fashion with a witty retort to his surprised would-be killer when stepping back into the poker game (01:38:49). But the most poignant and striking instance of Bond's physical vulnerability comes towards the film's end in a scene which delivers on the film's promise to be more "gritty" and "tough" (Chapman 2009: 241) in brutal spades.

The torture scene (starts: 01:49:00) is a completely unconventional twist in the 007 *oeuvre* and "breaks the rules for the Bond formula" (Howard 2009: 42) not only because it subjects the supposedly indestructible Bond to incredible physical pain but because it "does not turn away from the torture […] but rather show[s] it in graphic detail" (ibid). The scene has become so controversial that Baker acknowledges it as "notorious" (2009: 170). Here Bond is portrayed as far more vulnerable than in any instance of *GoldenEye* – a vulnerability which lends him even greater credibility. He is at the mercy of his enemies, but where Brosnan's 007,

when captured in the final act of *GoldenEye*, is merely held at gunpoint by a few menacing thugs (starts: 01:49:50) Craig's representation in *Casino Royale* is stripped naked and tied down (starts: 01:49:00). Where Brosnan's Bond is threatened at gunpoint Craig's is brutally beaten – and not in any fashion, but in the most emasculating and painful way. As *Le Chiffre* explains "it is not only the immediate agony [and one can only imagine what agony such a beating must be] but the knowledge that if you do not yield soon enough, there will be little left to identify you as a man" (01:50:20). The closest *GoldenEye* comes to striking at James Bond's penis is the scene in which Valentin Zukovsky fires into the couch Bond is seated on trying to hit his knee, missing twice as Bond swings his knees out of the way, only to leave his legs spread with Zukovsky's pistol pointed at his groin (starts: 01:00:17). It is a comic moment for the film. Daniel Craig's, by juxtaposition, is a horrific one in which "the invulnerable hero [is] now presented at his most vulnerable, both as hero and as a man" (Howard 2009: 42).

Further, following the torture scene, "we also see Bond recuperate from the beating he sustain[ed] at the hands of Le Chiffre, a recuperation that is generally absent from the Bond tradition" (ibid). The Bond Brosnan portrayed seldom needs so much as a bandage[62] despite his antics and action set-pieces. The idea of seeing him recuperating in a hospital bed seems almost laughable if not impossible. The Bond Craig portrays, however, is not merely seen recuperating - he is so damaged after his torture that he is virtually an invalid. The image of him sitting on the hospital lawns, clothed in his pyjamas and seated in a wheelchair, a blanket over his legs (starts: 01:55:03) seems completely at odds with the virile, iconic, masculine figure

[62] Though in *The World is Not Enough* (Michael Apted, 1999) the matter of Bond's hurt shoulder is at issue first in his need to get medical clearance to go on his next mission and second in his enemies' knowledge and use of it against him.

of James Bond. Yet Craig's Bond pulls this off because he has exhibited a greater physical vulnerability thus far, adding to the realism of his character. Instead of this sequence making him seem weak his fragility here increases his humanity.

While these two depictions of Bond are very much at odds each makes sense when considered against the background of the geopolitical and socio-cultural perceptions of its time. After the Gulf War audiences across the world had witnessed a 'clean war' in which casualties were low and brutality was seen even less. During this 'clean war' the coalition troops sustained very few casualties. All of this compounds to create an impression of conflict which eschews the brutality and casualties of warfare. Such an idealistic, positive idea is bolstered no doubt by the fall of the Soviet Union – long the 'enemy' of the Western world – and the resulting 'victory' of the West. The end of this conflict, too, was bloodless and devoid of brutality. No images of death or execution permeated television screens when the Berlin Wall fell – merely touching and triumphant pictures of the Wall being torn down and families being reunited. In this context it is fitting that Brosnan's 007 satisfies generic expectations (Sperb 2009: 55) of the franchise by offering a virtually invulnerable Bond who pulls off superhuman stunts with an untouchable cool, not even sweating.

By the 2000s, however, the impression of combat has shifted dramatically. After 9/11 and during the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq – conflicts which were racking up casualties with no end to the battle in sight – it makes sense that a superhuman, seemingly indestructible Bond would not be popular. This must have been sensed by the new Bond film's producers. One can now recall Jarvie's description of the production ideology behind films[63]; saying that "the group

[63] Outlined in the introduction on page 10.

which makes a film" attempts to marry their portrayal of the subject matter of the potential film with the prospective audiences' understanding of that subject matter (1978: 105). This leads to the "extraordinary resonance with a contemporary mood" which Jarvie claims films can have (ibid). Such an ideology was clearly at work in the minds of production team behind the Bond film of the mid 2000s. In "the promotional discourse for *Casino Royale* [...]"gritty", "realistic", and "tough" were the most prominent adjectives" (Chapman 2009: 241). That the production team would consider such characteristics essential to the film reveal that a tough, gritty depiction of combat resonated with the mood of the 2000s. Thus it makes intuitive sense that Daniel Craig's presentation of the hero shifts to a far more realistic one; a man who sweats and pants; bleeds and bruises and who engages in violence which is not 'cleanly' devoid of blood or brutality but which displays it prominently.

The changing "mood" to use Jarvie's (1978: 105) term of the 2000s also heralded a new approach to technology. The Gulf War had been a spectacle of technological might which showed how such technology extended and enhanced the military's ability. In the 21st century's wars in Afghanistan and Iraq however these technologies, from predator drones to satellite imaging did not guarantee victory and the iconic images of smart bombs hitting enemy targets were nowhere to be seen. One might describe this as disillusionment with 'technology as an extension of martial ability'. This disillusionment is no doubt compounded greatly by the coming – and fairly eventless passing – of the millennium and thus the passing gently away of millennial anxieties about technology. In addition to this, as discussed in the previous chapter, not only did these millennial anxieties fade but technology was no longer as much of a novelty

but simply an accepted, everyday part of life. These changing perceptions of technology are reflected in the respective Bond films.

The Maestro and the Primitive Tool

> For each of the five actors playing James Bond there has always been an important link between technology and masculinity/sexuality
>
> Martin Willis (2009: 174)

Writing of Pierce Brosnan's first outing as 007, Willis states that "the new Bond was to be technological rather than physical, an expert rather than the muscular vigilante played by Timothy Dalton" (2009: 167). This statement is enlightening as well as incredibly ironic. It enlightens us as to the production staff's motives in their new presentation of 007: he was to be a "technological maestro" with an "expert knowledge of applied science [ie: technology and 'gadgets']" (Willis 2009: 170&171). Howard captures this quite eloquently when writing that throughout the franchise and especially in the Brosnan films,

> Bond's inventive accessories, courtesy of Q, have come to define him, along with his inherent ability to apply them so appropriately to inflict the most damage on his enemies, discover a central plot point and/or remove a woman's clothing (2009: 39).

Willis' statement is ironic, however, in that the reversal which he describes from Dalton to Brosnan is the exact opposite of what occurs from Brosnan to Craig. As part of its refusal to conform to the generic expectations of the franchise, *Casino Royale* purposefully repositions Bond in relation to technology. Though he does often use technology to glean essential information; often in these instances seeming a "technological maestro" Craig's 007 is stripped of gadgets during his fight scenes and even sometimes fails to use the very technology meant

for his assistance[64]. Instead his action sequences veer away from technology and take him back to something of a "muscular vigilante" (Willis 2009: 167).

This is in stark contrast to Brosnan's Bond of whom Willis writes that "[he] uses cutting edge technology to extend the capabilities of his physical body" (Willis 2009: 176). Various forms of technology (not always cutting edge, however) allow Bond to accomplish more *physically*. This ideology is embedded throughout the film. When tied down in the Tiger helicopter (01:11:04) – ironically also a cutting edge technological device, this time meant to *destroy* Bond – 007 does not escape through, for instance, untying his bonds and forcing his way from the chopper; instead he uses the technology meant to kill him to his advantage: hitting the eject button moments before the missiles impact. While the Tiger helicopter is certainly "cutting edge" (Willis 2009: 167) military technology, the tank which Bond drives through the streets of St Petersburg in pursuit of Natalya and general Orumov (starts: 01:21:31) is not. However it, also, serves to heighten his physical ability. He can now charge through walls, destroy statues (or drop them on pursuing police cars) and later gun down the Soviet missile train carrying Trevelyan (starts: 01:27:55). Similarly, in attempting to escape Orumov's troops in the library, Bond is again aided by technology: firing a repelling cable from his belt buckle (01:19:46). Perhaps the simplest but most poignant piece of "cutting edge" technology Bond uses to his physical advantage is the pen-grenade which allows him, building towards the film's climax, to blow up a section of Trevelyan's control centre, escape his captors and begin to thwart his villain's plans (starts: 01:55:44). Throughout *GoldenEye* it is clear that "central to

[64] Such as his failure to use the defibrillator to jump start his heart when *Le Chiffre* has poisoned him (starts: 01:35:13) or to control his Aston Martin resulting in a brutal crash (starts: starts: 01:46:22) as will be discussed on page 123.

Bond's power is his ability to master technology [*albeit* not cutting edge]. However fantastic, its importance to Brosnan's Bond cannot be underestimated" (Willis 2009: 171; emphasis my own).

Bennett and Woollacott, in fact, take this argument even further by claiming that "Bond's sexuality" including his physical prowess and masculinity "has become fetished onto machinery" (1987: 203). Willis extends this argument again by claiming that "Brosnan's Bond is not simply extending his sexuality through technology, he is transferring that sexuality from his own body onto the hardware itself" (Willis 2009: 174). In a similar vein O'Donnell has described Bond as a cyborg, "the merging of the human and the mechanic in the total subject" (2005: 63). Willis (2009), Bennett and Woollacott (1987) and O'Donnell (2005) all illustrate that Brosnan's Bond ties 007's martial and masculine prowess onto technology, gadgets and machinery.

Daniel Craig's representation of 007 could not be more different. In *Casino Royale* "the action set pieces emphasis[e] individual performance mov[ing] Bond away from the part of-the-machine imagery of the Connery/Moore/Brosnan films" (Arnett 2009: 6). There are no gadgets to assist this 007; no belt buckles, wrist watches or exploding pens help him in his uglier, brutal battles. They are contests of muscle and martial skill – physical contests for a physical Bond.

Poignant examples of how incredibly physical *Casino Royale*'s Bond is, are the aforementioned sequences in which he pursues the bomb-maker through a construction site (starts: 00:11:16) and then an embassy (starts: 00:16:24). These stunts, while seeming incredible are largely real as the "bomb-maker is played by Sébastian Foucan one of the originators and a leading exponent of *Parkour*" a sport in which "the exponent will jump,

hurdle, run or vault turning the urban environment into a kind of giant gymnasium" (Baker 2009: 153&154). Two moments characterise this tech-stripped, physical confrontation almost comically. The first occurs as the bomb-maker hurls a pistol at Bond, the magazine spent (00:13:50). Bond catches it with expert agility and then hurls it back, striking the villain clearly in the face (00:13:59). Here technology (the pistol) is not only useless (the magazine spent) but Bond overcomes it with keenly agile physical ability (catching it expertly). Another moment is the instance where the bomb-maker vaults through an opening high in a drywall with cat-like agility (00:00:15:35) only, moments later, to have Bond come crashing through it (00:15:38). Where Brosnan's 007 needs a tank to smash through a wall in St Petersburg, Craig's Bond simply does it with his own body.

Not only is Daniel Craig's 007 technologically "stripped-down" (Burns in Bernard 2009: 15) but where he does use technology he is often not nearly as in control of it as Brosnan's "technological maestro" (Willis 2009: 170). Two instances of Bond's "inability to fully make use of the technology at his disposal" (Howard 2009: 40) occur in *Casino Royale*. The first is when Bond attempts to use the defibrillator - and fails to connect something as simple as the correct wire (starts: 01:35:13); an amateurish mistake which the tech-savvy Brosnan-Bond would never make. The second is whilst Bond is in hot pursuit of Vesper in his Aston Martin "which, as Patrick O'Donnell reminds us, is the classic extension of Bond both sexually and professionally" (Garland 2009: 184; starts: 01:46:22). Craig's Bond fails to utilise this extension. While veering out to avoid Vesper, tied and gagged in the road, "he flips the car multiple times, leaving them both a wreck" (Howard 2009: 40; starts: 01:46:46). Bond's failure to properly manipulate his technology nearly costs him his life – twice.

Despite the lack of technology (or failure to utilise it fully) during his action sequences "Bond is not as unsavvy (sic) as one might expect" (Howard 2009: 39) when pursuing *information*. He is able to trace the incoming call off the bomb-maker's phone (starts: 01:21:53), leading him to the Bahamas where he expertly manipulates the video surveillance of the hotel to reveal exactly when and where Dimitrios received the call (00:27:58) – thus revealing the next link in the chain of the mysterious organisation he is investigating. Later Bond seems completely at ease manipulating his cell-phone to follow the tracing device planted on *Le Chiffre* to the banker's hotel room (starts: 01:18:07).

What *Casino Royale* delivers, then, is a "technological maestro" (Willis 2009: 170) when it comes to the pursuit of information but a "primitive [highly physical] tool" (Ghelawat 2009: 135; emphasis my own) when engaging in violence, who occasionally fails to "fully make use of" (Howard 2009: 40) his technology. "The lower tech aesthetic functions as part of the franchise's move towards realism" (Johnson 2009: 119). When 007 fights with his fists not his wristwatch, when he flips his Aston Martin or forgets the last wire on the defibrillator, it makes him a more human Bond.

Such a human empathy in Bond ties into Chapter Three's assertion that "what differentiated the heroes of September 11th from past notions of heroism was that these heroes were ordinary men" (Abate 2010: 10). Daniel Craig's Bond makes mistakes and gets hurt, he is not superhuman, but human. And as such he resonates with the socio-cultural values of audiences in the mid 2000s. Bond's reflection of these values can be seen not only in his humanity but in his body.

Remodelling the Masculine Bond

James Bond is a signifier of masculinity – perhaps one of the most famous in the Western world. Thus the body of James Bond is an integral part of the representation of masculinity. Chapter Three described how the bodies of masculine heroes changed between the 1990s and 2000s to reflect changing socio-cultural attitudes, from the less muscular, rather lean and athletic bodies of the 1990s to the return of *uber*-muscled *uber*-males in the 2000s. This shift is quite clearly demonstrated in the two Bonds under investigation.

Brosnan's Bond is shirtless twice in *GoldenEye*; in neither of these instances is a great deal of focus given to his body. During the indoor-pool sequence (starts: 01:03:45) he is framed, floating in the water in a wide shot; he walks off, towel in hand, in a medium shot that cuts off above the waist; finally, during the ensuing fight with Xenia Onnatop (starts: 01:04:32) no attention is lavished on Bond's body, his musculature or his strength – it is a fight sequence framed in a medium to wide shot. Later, when Bond is in bed with Natalya the night before their flight to Cuba (starts: 01:39:03) he is shirtless but instead of the camera languishing on Bond's body he is in a simple medium shot, covers drawn up to mid waist, with a silver watch prominently on his left wrist. It is almost as if the gadget takes precedence over (or is at least essentially part of) the body of Bond[65].

Casino Royale offers a very different representation of 007's body. According to Omry:

> A key component of Daniel Craig's Bond is the utter physicality of his screen presence. <u>There is a distinct shift here.</u> Certainly film audiences from the beginning of the series were awarded the view of many-a-shirtless Bond […]

[65] Recalling the earlier discussion of the merging of sexuality and technology in Brosnan's Bond on page 122.

> However, unlike these glimpses, Craig's physique is made into a spectacle as it is explicitly put on display (2009: 168 emphasis my own).

Omry's description serves as an apt bridge between a discussion of the two Bond bodies under scrutiny here. Her mention that previous Bond audiences were given "glimpses" (ibid) of 007's body is a particularly apt description of how *GoldenEye* represented Bond. Whether in a bathing suit, or in bed with a woman, Bond's body is something glimpsed, as if in passing. Even during a prolonged fight scene with Xenia in the hotel spa his body is not a focus of the aesthetic, the camera does not linger on it. In Craig's depiction, however, this changes dramatically.

Barring the torture scene, perhaps one of the most widely mentioned moments in the film is Bond's emergence from the ocean in the Bahamas (starts: 00:30:30)[66]. The scene illustrates elegantly what Tremonte and Racioppi term the "hypervisiblity (*sic*) of Bond's body" (2009: 198). It becomes a central focus of the aesthetic throughout *Casino Royale*. "Gloriously specularised" it "is ripped and desirable [and] gets comparable screen time to the Bond girls" (Tremonte *&* Racioppi 2009: 192 & 190). In fact, in the sequence on the beach Bond's body becomes a very definite heir to the female bodies of earlier Bond films:

> [Bond's] appearance as he emerges from the water in this sequence closely recalls that of the first iconic 'Bond girl' in *Dr No*. […] Craig makes this connection explicit in an interview […] 'Yeah, I tried on quite a few pairs of swimming trunks. Ursula Andres, that was me.' (Tincknell 2009: 125).

Craig's body is "prominently displayed" (Sperb 2009: 52) throughout the film, whether it be checking a computer in his Bahamas villa (starts: 00:31:30), collecting himself after the fight in

[66] Tincknell (2009); Tremonte and Racciopi (2009); Arnett (2009); Lindner (2009)

the stairwell[67] (starts: 01:21:52) or, most notably, in the beach scene (starts: 00:30:30) and later in the torture scene (starts: 01:49:00). In fact, before beginning his torture *Le Chiffre* remarks to his opponent, all taught and hardened muscle on naked display, "you've taken good care of your body" (01:49:33) – an understatement. Even clothed the body of Craig's 007 is far more pronounced than Brosnan's. Where the latter opts for three piece suits complete with a handkerchief in the pocket Craig's is seen in golf shirts which hug at the defined muscles of his torso.

This dramatic shift of visual focus onto the body of Bond can also be seen in the title sequence. "The title sequence is the first of its kind not to be centred on an objectification of the female body […]" (Sperb 2009: 52) and rejects the usual cocktail of "nearly all of the Bond films" before it which used "women during their title sequences and increasingly stepped up sexual innuendos" (Howard 2009: 36). Instead it is "Craig himself who is the object" (Sperb 2009: 52). During *Casino Royale*'s credits an animated version of Bond, fully clothed, is engaged in brutal, largely hand to hand, combat. As such these animations serve as a fitting metaphor for how the film repositions 007's body at the centre of its aesthetic and remodels his fight scenes into grittier, more believable combat. This shift onto Bond's muscled and powerful body makes absolute sense from the perspective of creating a more realistic aesthetic and film. David Katz writes that unlike previous Bonds who "looked vaguely menacing […] Daniel Craig looks like he could actually hurt you" (Johnson 2009: 119).

Such a visual shift also makes intuitive sense when considering the *zeitgeist* of the respective decades in which these two films were made as well as the earlier discussion of a

[67] More on this scene on page 130.

stripped-down masculinity. The 1990s present a Bond who is lean and capable but not lavishly so and whose body does not enjoy primary focus. This extends into his masculinity being defined largely also by technology – the gadgets and consumer 'gizmos' which 1990s culture associate with masculinity. In contrast the 2000s called for a 'tough' Bond – and interwoven with the perception of 'tough' masculinity are "mythologies about muscle" (Boyle 2009: 50). The previous sections of this chapter have demonstrated how the Bond of the 2000s was more believable, gritty and tough, something emphasised by the 'stripping down' of his technological gadgets. The final and logical extension of this hyper masculinisation is that muscles become prominently part of the new 007. These muscles make the stunts he performs and the fights he wins seem more believable; making Bond more *believably tough*. Like the fireman and the policeman whom television audiences saw as heroes in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11 (Abate 2010: 2).

In closing then, *Casino Royale* remodelled James Bond to make him more realistic and believable through four primary shifts in presentation. Firstly, the violence 007 engages in is scaled down, becoming "hyper real" in its presentation (Tremonte *et al* 2009: 197) through acts of simple but "extreme violence" (Gabri *et al* 2009: 86) such as bathroom brawls and brutal rope torture. Secondly, "this realism extends to the consequences of such [extreme violence]" (Johnson 2009: 119). The audience sees Bond bruise, bleed, hurt and needing to recuperate; his "injuries do not disappear magically" (ibid). Further the film employs a "lower tech aesthetic […] requiring that Bond's body be physically involved" (ibid) as part of a move towards realism, scaling down from the "technological maestro" (Willis 2009: 170) of the Brosnan films.

As part of this aesthetic both Bond and his body are remodelled to be far more threatening, muscular and capable of physical action.

For all the differences between them, there is one similarity between the two filmic representations of 007.

James Bond's Soul

> Brosnan was tough like Connery, but not too tough like Connery […] he was brooding like Dalton, but not too brooding like Dalton.
>
> Jason Sperb (2009: 55)

> Rarely, if ever, has the Bond film dealt with the psychological burden behind the licence to kill or shown us the price Bond must pay to earn it.
>
> Douglas L. Howard (2009: 35)

Casino Royale is widely acclaimed for the "greater psychological depth" (Chapman 2007: 243) which it gave to the character of 007[68]. The film investigates and exposes much of Bond's psyche – indeed transforming it as an essential part of the narrative.

The instances in which Daniel Craig's debut as Bond dwell on this psychological element begin in the pre-credit sequence. In the opening moments of the film Dryden, M's corrupt station chief, asks: "made you *feel* it did he?" (00:03:19); referring to Bond's assassination of Dryden's contact. This sets up the narrative journey which Bond's psyche will go on during the film: "the psychological burden behind the licence to kill" (Howard 2009: 35).

[68] Arnett (2009: 9); Charity in Bernard (2009: 15) Bernard (2009: 15-18); Howard (2009: 35)

This psychological twist is again hinted at throughout the lyrics of the title sequence-song: “if you take a life do you know what you’ll give; odds are you won’t like what it is” (*Metrolyrics*: online). The price paid for taking a life is a central theme in the film. Perhaps the most striking example of this occurs in Montenegro. After the “bloody, harrowing ordeal” (Cunningham *et al* 2009: 93) of fighting the Ugandans in the stairwell (starts: 01:19:50),

> We see a distressed Bond, covered in his opponents’ blood, standing before his bathroom mirror […] tending to his wounds, while trying to calm his shaken nerves with swigs of whiskey. […] the scene’s lack of music, quick cuts and jarring close-ups give it a sense of sudden urgency, marking it as a pivotal moment in the narrative (ibid; starts: 01:21:53).

This scene reveals that Bond finds the price for taking a life particularly bitter and harrowing.

So high is that price, in fact, that Bond finally decides he cannot pay it. While he is recovering from his horrific torture he says to Vesper “You do what I do for too long and there won’t be any soul left to salvage. I’m leaving with what little I have left” (01:57:13). The issue of James Bond’s soul seems to be a completely novel connotation to the ‘figure of Bond’ often dismissed by critics as a “hero of comic book sex and violence" (Lindner 2009: 2). Yet this is the issue which lies at the heart of *Casino Royale*. The promotional material for it proclaimed “discover how James... Became Bond” (Sperb 2009: 55). When Sperb writes that “Daniel Craig *becomes* Bond throughout the course” of the film (2009: 52) he is not merely referring to Bond rectifying his lack of ‘spy-savvy’ in seeing the ‘big picture’ but also to the greater psychological issue of coming to terms with what it means to be 007 – where ‘00’ indicates a licence to kill. Daniel Craig’s Bond undertakes a human journey – from the man in the opening credit sequence who seeks to earn double ‘0’ status, and stomachs the price he must pay for his kills; to the man who proclaims to Vesper that he is leaving the secret service with whatever soul he

has left to “find an honest job” (01:57:00). However that journey does not, of course, end there. Vesper’s betrayal and the resulting bitterness, pain and passion for vengeance catapult James on the final leg of the journey to becoming Bond – and embracing the cost of taking a life and being 007. This is poignantly and poetically obvious in the last moments of the film. Having brutally shot Mr White, Daniel Craig stands over him, attired for the first time in the kind of immaculate, three piece designer suite that 007 is famous for, a massive machinegun in hand, and proclaims to White, and to the audience, that he has finally made the transformation with that iconic line: “the name’s Bond... James Bond” (02:20:22).

The narrative backbone of *Casino Royale* is intimately combined with a psychological evolution of ‘James’ to ‘Bond’ or human to ‘007’. This provides for a “rare” (Howard 2009: 52) look into the psyche of James Bond. However, while it is rare, and unprecedented in its depth – it is by no means completely new. *GoldenEye* hinted at the same themes, though only scratching the surface thereof.

Sperb’s observation that “Brosnan negotiated the generic expectations of the franchise” drawing in part on the “brooding” nature of Timothy Dalton’s Bond, though careful not to be “too brooding” (2009: 55) aptly describes how Brosnan does indeed deliver suggestions of a psychological side to the character – but is careful not to dwell on it ‘too’ much, lest it upset the expectations of the franchise (while Craig’s quite insistently set out to break those same expectations.) Such brooding is indicative of Bond’s inner landscape and of a more emotional hero.

When referring back to the changes in masculine perception and depiction which occurred in the 1990s one can recall Gates' comment that in the "1990s [...] hard bodies gave way to soft hearts" (2006: 150) or Bainbridge and Yates' writing that this decade saw "the interior lives of the [male protagonist] characters [...] more fully explored [creating] emotional masculinities" (2005: 305). *GoldenEye's* Bond reflects this *zeitgeist,* hinting at an "emotional masculinity" (ibid). In fact Jutting writes that Brosnan's Bond exhibits "a trend in deep feelings" (2005: 53)[69]. This is evident in *GoldenEye.* While not nearly as pronounced as in *Casino Royale,* here Bond's interior landscape is certainly central to the film: his nemesis is also his former best friend. This makes for a number of moments which allow the "emotional masculinity" of 007 to surface.

The first such moment occurs in the graveyard scene where Trevelyan is first revealed as the film's true villain (starts: 01:07:30). Ironically these insights are not given by Bond but articulated through Trevelyan. It begins as he asks James whether he ever questioned the clandestine missions they were sent on. 007's reply, however, does little to explore those motives, he dismisses the question with a solid-faced gaze: "it was the job we were chosen for" (01:09:00). The former 006 pushes on, laying out some of Bond's motives where he will not do so himself. "Of course you'd say that; James Bond, her majesty's loyal terrier, defender of the so called faith" (01:09:02). While these hints may seem superficial they do begin to scratch at the surface of Bond's psyche. The more potent statement comes shortly after. 007, pistol trained on Trevelyan, slowly lowers it and says, in a tone that seems part accusation part hurtful exclamation, "I trusted you Alec" (01:09:23). The use of the first name and the potency

[69] Jutting uses "trend" because he is describing all four Brosnan films.

of the confession (no matter how coolly delivered) adds an intimacy to this meeting between old friends. Moments later 006 remarks that he and James are both orphans (01:09:42), furthering the idea of an intimate connection between these two men and adding another small hint of humanity to Brosnan's 007. Brosnan attempts to cut such intimacy short, remarking, "am I suppose to feel sorry for you?" (01:10:21) but one cannot help but wonder what empathy, and even guilt, he is hiding beneath that cool exterior. That guilt is illustrated a moment later as Trevelyan remarks that "007's loyalty was always to the mission, never to his friends" (01:07:46). While Bond has no verbal reaction the camera cuts to a close up of his face; tightened in an expression of control – a hint of pain beneath it.

A later scene with Natalya explores these feelings of guilt and pain much more explicitly. Describing this scene Jutting writes that, "Natalya in *GoldenEye* cuts through Bond's 'cold-hearted' act to touch on the vulnerable man underneath" (2005: 53). Sitting on the beach the night before going to face his nemesis Bond is joined by Natalya (starts: 01:37:21). She begins the conversation saying that "He was your friend: Trevelyan" (01:38:08). Bond refuses to react but Natalya pushes on "and now he is your enemy and you will kill him - [there is still no reaction from James, though the camera cuts to his pensive, almost sad face] it is that simple." (01:38:17). James is pensive a moment longer and then with a rueful, pained smile nods "in a word: yes." (01:38:20). While it is subtle, James acknowledges here that going to kill a man who was once a friend is not easy, it is not "simple" (ibid). Here too, like *Casino Royale* describes, there is a price to pay for taking a life. And Bond does not take it easily. The scene ties off with Natalya, angrily questioning him: "how can you act like this? How can you be so cold?" Bond's reply: "It's what keeps me alive." "No. It's what keeps you alone." (01:38:30-42).

While these scenes by no means make their investigation into 007's psyche as pronounced – or his inner journey as intricately part of the narrative – as in *Casino Royale* the investigation is certainly there; subtle, slight hints. It thus becomes apparent that, for all their differences in the presentation of Bond both films acknowledge a 'psychological depth' in the character.

James Bond's World

It has been demonstrated that both women in Bond as well as the hero himself were 'remodelled' to reflect socio-cultural values in the decades of the case studies under inspection. There is a third element to how these films captured their respective *zeitgeist*: the world in which the narrative takes place. In both cases the Bond films reflect the geopolitics of their times.

Chapter Three has already demonstrated how one of the foremost fears of the Western world was the massive arsenal of weapons which Russia still had power over despite the fall of the Soviet Union coupled with the raging corruption in the military and state – institutions which were responsible for safeguarding those weapons. The chapter also illustrated how technology was both a preoccupation and a site of anxiety for 1990s audiences. *GoldenEye* draws explicitly on these anxieties. In fact Dodds writes that:

> As David Cannadine's recent essay on James Bond recognised, 'the end of the Cold War, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the rise of international terrorism brought into being a wholly new geopolitical world', which in turn shaped subsequent plots and film locations [for the franchise] in the post-Cold War era (2003: 127).

Both *GoldenEye*'s plot and its film location draw extensively on the 1990s geopolitical and technological fears.

The 'Goldeneye' weapons for which the film is named are exactly the kind of threat the Western imagination feared: a nuclear bomb manufactured by the Soviet Union during the Cold War; now in the hands of possibly corrupt Russian officials. But Goldeneye is also more than merely a nuclear weapon it is a highly *technological* weapon. Residing in space (the final frontier of technological innovation) when detonated it causes an electro-magnetic pulse which destroys everything with an electronic circuit. In creating a weapon which is explicitly technological *GoldenEye* draws overtly on the technological anxieties discussed in Chapter Three which preoccupied the Western world in the 1990s. Additionally the Russian who allows the Goldeneye weapons to be stolen, "General Orumov, a renegade military commander who plots his own personal conspiracy" (Chapman 2009: 217) is the very epitome of the fears which the West had about corrupt Russian military personnel in command of deadly weaponry.

Orumov is not the only character who reflects the geopolitical *zeitgeist* of the time. The film makes Valentin Zukovsky a key supporting player in Bond's plans. The former KGB agent turned mobster – very successfully and, one deduces from his time on camera, quite ruthlessly – is an epitome of the anxieties which Toal describes in Chapter Three when he writes that "the neoliberal dream of Russia's transition to market capitalism has become the nightmare [...] of Oligarchic domination and mafia rule" (Toal 2001: 16-17).

Beyond its characters *Goldeneye* also situates much of its action in Russia, again drawing on fears about the danger of the unstable former superpower. According to Black, "*Goldeneye* linked themes traditional to the series, not least megalomania and rogue space vessels, and

provided a new site for much of the action – post-Soviet Russia" (2004: 301). This identifies two narrative elements which the film clearly drew from contemporary fears: both a post-Soviet Russia and technology as threats to the (specifically) Anglo-American world. While "space vessels" (ibid) are certainly a theme seen before in the series they are also an epitome of technology – and spaced based weapons of technological anxieties. Thus the use of these "themes" (ibid) draws not only on the mythology of previous Bond films but also on the contemporary *zeitgeist.*

Chapman has a different perspective on the use of 1990s Russia as a setting for a majority of the film:

> For all that the old Communist regime has fallen, the threat still emanates from Russia. [...] In a sense it could be argued that *GoldenEye* does not really modify the ideological content of the Bond narrative to any degree. It still belongs squarely in the generic lineage of the British spy thriller in which Russia had always been presented as a mysterious and sinister enemy [...] It could be argued that for all its contemporary references to powerful Russian mafia which had emerged after the fall of Communism, *GoldenEye* simply represents a continuation on the tradition of Russian villains (2009: 217-218).

Chapman seems put out by Russia being "a mysterious and sinister" place from which "the threat emanates" (ibid). One gets the impression he finds this "generic" treatment of the plot unimaginative. This dissertation would argue that, imaginative or not, *GoldenEye* draws explicitly on dominant fears about Russia in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union. Uncertainties about Russian rule, Russian military integrity and the control of Russian weapons made the country a very "mysterious and sinister" (ibid) place from which a "threat" (ibid) to the (especially) Anglo-American world, was still very much palpable.

Leach writes that "*GoldenEye* called itself 'a contemporary action film reflecting the world in which we live'" (2009: 302). From Tiger helicopters to corrupt Russian generals; from

nuclear satellites to powerful St Petersburg mobsters; it is clear that the film does indeed reflect the dominant geopolitical fears of its time and, as Leach puts it, *GoldenEye's* "commercial success suggests the audience were convinced" (ibid).

Casino Royale just as fittingly captures the *zeitgeist* of its time. It does so by drawing on obvious geopolitical anxieties of the decade to form its plot, as does *GoldenEye*; but it also reflects something of the *zeitgeist* of the post 9/11 world through more nuanced mechanisms.

The obvious mechanisms the film uses are its overt pursuit of terrorist threats. From the bomb-maker Bond chases through Madagascar to the attempted destruction of the Skyfleet plane to the capture of Le Chiffre, all of these are pursuits of a global network of terrorists. Such a network seems eerily like the one which Osama Bin Laden used to execute September 11. However, in its use of terrorism as a central motif *Casino Royale* is by no means doing something new for the James Bond franchise. The previous films (and books)[70] had been using terrorists as their arch-villains virtually since 007's creation. In fact, after the events of 9/11,

> Journalists in Britain and North America [noted] how the figure of James Bond/007 was being used to make sense of contemporary political events [...] Osama Bin Laden and the Al-Qaeda network were compared to Blofeld and the criminal network SPECTRE, which featured in the 1960s films [...] Attention was drawn to the fact that the figure of the 'evil genius' and the trans-boundary network of terror and crime in the Bond films bore an uncanny similarity to the activities of Bin Laden in Sudan and later Afghanistan/Pakistan (Dodds 2006**:** 117).

Dodds' commentary reminds one that the majority of villains in the Bond films (and books) were depicted as some kind of maniacal terrorist long before 9/11. This makes intuitive sense as terrorists can be constructed according to the needs of the narrative. Their international

[70] As regards the books, however, *Casino Royale* was Fleming's first; in this regard one should rather say "subsequent books".

links; evil and often destructive goals; and potentially wide variety of backgrounds make them suited to almost any narrative which needs a bloody and destructive enemy[71]. Thus *Casino Royale*'s use of terrorism as its central plot is by no means novel to the franchise; though such a pursuit does mirror contemporary fears about terrorism.

What "the first "true" post-9/11 Bond film"[72] (Bernard 2009: 14) does to reflect the socio-cultural values of a post-9/11 world is something far more nuanced and very accurate. *Casino Royale* is an uncertain film leaving its narrative open-ended despite a suggestion at closure.

Sperb writes that "evil here [in *Casino Royale*] is a rhizome, elusive, shifting, fleeting" (2009: 63). To some degree this has already been illustrated in Bond's failure to grasp 'the big picture' of who his enemies really are: his inability to read Mathis as an enemy or, more powerfully, Vesper. But evil's "elusive, shifting, fleeting" (ibid) nature extends far beyond these characters. It is personified in the unsolved puzzle of the organization behind Mr White. (Even Mr White's name is "mysterious, deliberately blank" (Sperb 2009: 51)). In previous Bond films – specifically *GoldenEye* – Bond is given a mission; slowly works his way toward finding the enemy; then discovers his plot and finally thwarts it and destroys the villain. In a word, these films give narrative closure. *Casino Royale* does not.

[71] In fact, Boggs and Pollard (2006) describe exactly this with regards to Hollywood as a whole. According to them "many years before the events of 9/11, terrorism was already a central focus of Hollywood filmmaking [...] with its international intrigue, exotic settings, graphic violence, and the putative conflict between good and evil [...] scenes of terrorist and counterterrorist activity have a natural cinematic appeal" (2006: 335).

[72] *Casino Royale* was not the first film made after 9/11; *Die Another Day* (Lee Tamahori, 2002) was. Bernard argues – as would this dissertation – that this film, made so quickly after 9/11, does not truly "deal with" (ibid) the new geopolitical and socio-cultural *zeitgeist*. *Casino Royale*, however, does.

The immediate villain, *Le Chiffre* is certainly thwarted and killed[73] as are a number of minor villains in the first act of the film. But the far greater foe, the organization behind *Le Chiffre,* responsible for terrorist financing, bomb-making and, most poignantly, Vesper's betrayal and death, remains an unsolved mystery and a very real danger. Certainly James captures one of their own in the end (in the final scene which so eloquently marks his having 'become Bond' (starts: 02:19:03)) but the answers Mr White have are not divulged in *Casino Royale* neither is his organization identified or terminated. According to Sperb:

> There is no narrative resolution in the end. Even Mr White's wounding or Vesper's death raise more questions than they answer [...] The trail of clues and half-clues never really ends for [Bond], even when the film does. (2009: 51 & 53).

A world in which the "clues never really end" (ibid) is unique in the Bond universe and certainly differs greatly from the films of the past, a point made by Howard when he echoes Sperb's findings almost verbatim:

> Bond doesn't resolve the entire mission, "*Casino Royale* leaves both Bond and the audience with more questions than it answers. […] He never finds out exactly what *Le Chiffre* knows. He never finds out exactly what organization is behind the banker […] as M notes at the end 'the trail's gone cold', and the real villains, whoever they might be, are still out there, beyond him. The world may be enough for the other Bonds, but, for this one, it is too much, too complex to understand, too confusing to navigate (2009: 48).

Howard's last comment solidifies the notion that this unresolved turn of affairs is something unique to Daniel Craig's film when he refers to "other Bonds" (ibid). But it is not something unique to the post-9/11 *zeitgeist*. In the absence of a definitive victory over terrorism and haunted by the ongoing threat that the enemy – mysterious, uncertain, manifold organization that it is – may still strike at the Anglo-American world such an unresolved ending seems only

[73] Though not by Bond. It is the enigmatic villian, Mr White, who kills *Le Chiffre* – and saves Bond's life in the process.

natural. And the world of Bond, mobile signifier that he is, remodels to reflect that. Howard describes it quite eloquently:

> Our sense of Bond's heroism after 9/11 and the 'war on terror' certainly must be different than it was before. Could we, in good faith, go to a Bond film where he insightfully broke up a terrorist cell and captured its leader single-handedly before the popcorn got cold […] when such success beyond the theatre has been so hard to come by (2009: 49).

Both *GoldenEye* and *Casino Royale* reflected the *zeitgeist* of its time through the incorporation of several key geopolitical issues into its narrative. The former made this incorporation obvious by drawing on an unstable post-Soviet Russia, technological anxiety and the danger of uncontrolled Russian weapons to form its narrative. *Casino Royale* reflected the *zeitgeist* of a post 9/11 world in a more subtle manner. Its obfuscation of the narrative's enemies – even, if not especially, those who stand closest to Bond – reflects the uncertainties of a world haunted by the spectre of terrorism.

Conclusion

This dissertation proves that two James Bond films, *GoldenEye* (1995) and *Casino Royale* (2006), reflect the socio-cultural values and perceptions of the decades in which they were made. 'The figure of James Bond' is a particularly apt case study for such an investigation because of the shifting nature of his presentation, making him what Bennett and Woollacott have termed 'a mobile signifier' (2003: 31). Applying de Saussure's semiotic model to 007 it is evident that the connotations of 'James Bond' remain fixed, though their denotations – or representations – change[74]. Thus, irrespective of which actor dons the role, the connotations of 'James Bond' always remain the same.

This fluid-but-fixed nature of Bond's connotations has led to him becoming what both Bennett and Woollacott (in Arnett 2009: 2) and Linder (2009: 5) describe as a "mythic figure" in popular (Anglo-American) culture: "the man every man wants to be and every woman wants to have". This 'mythology of Bond' is neatly described by the semiotic theoretician Barthes who writes that a combination of denotation and connotation create myth – and that these myths articulate cultural ideologies (Chandler 2002: 145). Thus Bond has become, over his varying reincarnations in popular culture, 'the mythic figure of Bond' – a site which articulates popular Anglo-American ideologies about masculinity (and with it capability and desirability), geopolitics and women. This dissertation is structured according to these sets of connotations.

Part One explores the way in which the Bond films represent women – and how this reflects dominant socio cultural values of the Anglo-American world in the 1990s and 2000s

[74] However, because the mind cannot separate representation and connotation cleanly, changes in the former do affect the reading of the latter. Changes in Bond's representation merely change the *combinations* of his connotations without ever negating or terminating any of them. Thus his connotations are not changed but 'remixed' – giving the same ideas new meaning through new representation (Bennet & Woollacott (2003).

respectively. In order to do so an investigation into what these values and perceptions was, is required. The dissertation argues that from the 1990s to the 2000s the perceptions and treatment of women follow an unchanging trajectory. Enjoying a greater degree of freedom and autonomy than in the previous century (if not far longer) women articulate their autonomy in a variety of ways, many of them sassy, witty and fun, all of them reclaiming their bodies and their lives as sites of personal power and possible success (Krolokke & Sorenson (2006); Mann & Huffman (2005); Bellafante (1998)). Despite this picture of female autonomy, however, women are still by no means *equal* to men and exist in a patriarchal, male-dominated society. This is illustrated through references to the legal (Hull & Nelson (1998)), financial (Roth (2006)) and generally socio-corporate environments (Bellafante (1998); Elmuti *et al* (2003); Goodman *et al* (2003)) – all of which exhibit a 'glass ceiling effect' where women are still discriminated against based on gender. While they certainly enjoy *more* equality in the 1990s and 2000s, women are still not fully equal to men.

An analysis of films and television programmes from these two decades further demonstrates such values. One of the cornerstones of feminist film theory, Laura Mulvey, articulated in the 1970s how the "ideology of the patriarchal order" controlled "its favourite (*sic*) cinematic form – illusionistic narrative film" (1990: 38). Such a "patriarchal ideology" (ibid) remains clearly apparent in the popular film and television of the 1990s and 2000s – and most especially in the Bond films selected from these decades.

It must be acknowledged that Mulvey's description of women as "passive" objects and men as "active agents" (ibid) is refuted in the early 1990s by the surge of strong, pro-active action heroines in film and television (Enns (2009)); something which follows logically from far

more empowered women in the Anglo-American world. However these characters are still subjugated to a controlling male gaze and ideology. Tasker describes a "hierarchy of knowledge and skill" (1998: 74) in many of these films empowering their action heroines but never positioning them 'quite as equals' to the males; maintaining the relationship of an "amateur" (female) to a "professional" (male) (ibid).

Similarly, Mencimer (2001) and Neroni (2005) describe the few cases where these stereotypes are broken and female characters are granted a greater autonomy than their male counterparts. Both find that "women are still only allowed to be violent [read: independent] within certain parameters largely prescribed by what men are willing to tolerate" (Mencimer 2001: 18; parenthesis my own) thus demonstrating how the "ideology machine" of Hollywood cannot "integrate" women who are as, or more powerful than, men into their narratives (Neroni 2005: 85). These sources serve to neatly map out the socio-cultural values and perceptions of women in the 1990s and 2000s.

Analyses of the two James Bond case studies demonstrate that the representation of women in these films reflect these values. The 'Bond girls' of *GoldenEye,* and even more so of *Casino Royale,* may *seem* far more 'equal' to 007 in their interactions with him but they are still packaged for the "male gaze" which Mulvey (1990: 33) describes. Not only are the 'Bond girls' desirable and sexy but editing and camera work lavish much attention on their beauty – recalling Mulvey's assertion of women being treated as "fetish objects" (1990: 35).

The representation of these women within a "controlling patriarchal ideology" (Mulvey 1990: 38) extends beyond the visual into their narrative representation in three ways. Firstly, in matters of violence the treatment of 'Bond girls' recalls Tasker's assertion that women were

"amateurs" and the male hero a "professional" (1998: 74). These 'Bond girls' are, as Tincknell has described "inept" or even "imbecilic" in matters of violence (2009: 106). Secondly, 007 invariably ends up sleeping with his 'Bond girl'; sex becoming a poignant way in which the narrative integrates these women into a patriarchal ideology. The third way is the most extreme. Where women attempt to kill Bond they are killed – by 007. Thus, in the end, James Bond – the iconic masculine figurehead – always retains absolute power over his 'Bond girls'. This concludes the enquiry into how the case studies reflect the popular socio-cultural values about women in the decades in which they were made.

Part Two argues that the case studies' representation of Bond and his world reflect changing socio-cultural values of masculinity, conflict and geopolitics. In order to do so, it is first required to determine what these values were in the Anglo-American world in the 1990s and 2000s.

The dissertation finds that the *zeitgeist* regarding these issues changed dramatically between the two decades. It is proposed that, firstly, the 1990s demonstrated an obsession with, and anxiety about, technology, which was fuelled by the overwhelming growth thereof, coupled with millennial anxieties (Bentley (2005); Toal (2001); Willis (2009)). Secondly, that in this decade warfare was perceived as something "clean": devoid of brutality and bloodshed (Baudrillard 1990: 64). This was partly the result of the largely bloodless portrayal of the Gulf conflict on television (depictions which often seemed more like video games than real-world warfare (ibid)) and further spurred on by two colossal victories for the Anglo-American world: the end of the Cold War and the success of the Gulf War – neither of which had, had very high death tolls (Morrisson (1992); Rochlin & Demchak (1991)). These successes gave rise to what is

proposed to be the decade's third characteristic: a perception not only of 'clean' conflict but of villains who were easy to find and defeat.

The *zeitgeist* of the 2000s – specifically due to the events of September 11 – is found to be very different. This decade witnessed a harrowing incident on American soil which brought brutality very much home to the witnesses and countless viewers around the world (Finlan 2006: 105-106). In addition to this the decade saw two ongoing and brutal wars in the Middle East which, unlike previous conflicts, had no clear outcome and growing death tolls (Rutherford 2006: 194). Both the 9/11 bombings and these wars were events in which technology could not play nearly as key a role as in the previous decade – or deliver as bloodless victories.

This dissertation argues that these vastly differing decades present vastly differing socio-cultural values about masculinity, conflict and geopolitics. Filmic depictions reflect this. The 1990s saw an increase in films about noble warfare and others which depicted conflict (be it warfare or hand to hand battle) as violent but generally not brutal or bloody (Pollard (2002)). The 2000s saw an advent in films, many of them critically acclaimed, which depicted acts of violence and brutality (Boggs *et al* (2008)). Conflict, in the 2000s became something very real and very ugly.

In addition filmic depictions also demonstrate how perceptions of masculinity changed between these decades. The 1990s saw a much 'softer'; 'gentler' and often even pathetic trend in male depictions (Briggs (2007); Flook (2007); Hunter (2003)). Even the most masculine depictions of this decade – the action heroes – are softer and more emotional (Gates (2006)). The 2000s saw a harking back to the 1980s' depiction of 'tough' capable men (Abate (2010)). It is argued that this is because the 1990s had been a far easier decade, with a booming United

States economy, the end of the Cold War and the success of the Gulf War. The subsequent decade was a 'tough time' geopolitically which called for the return of 'tough men'. This is especially clear in the aesthetic of masculinity demonstrated by muscle. The men of the 1990s are smaller, leaner and more athletically built than the bigger, muscular protagonists of the early millennium. These latter 'muscle men', however, still keep the emotional depth which the 1990s had introduced, and remained human and believable.

The James Bond films of these two very different decades demonstrate these radical socio-cultural changes. *GoldenEye* presents a Bond who is incredibly proficient technologically and whose gadgets become a virtual extension of his body. The violence in which this Bond is involved, although plentiful, is more about spectacle than brutality. This Bond is slick, his body lean and athletic and much of his stunts thrilling but unbelievable: a clean fighter for a clean, confident decade. Additionally the film does, to a limited but undeniable degree, investigate the inner landscape of 007, thus reflecting the decade's trend in protagonists with emotional depth.

Casino Royale presents an uncouth, unsophisticated Bond who is as brutal as the conflicts which his decade witnessed – and as real. While his action set pieces are smaller and less spectacular they are largely plausible and very violent. This Bond's body is much more muscular than his predecessor's, making him both more real and more masculine – as the 2000s wanted its heroes to be: 'tough men' for 'tough times'. Additionally this body is greatly stripped of technology. He is a primitive tool, capable of real and rough action. Despite the brutal, stripped down approach which makes this Bond hyper-masculine he is far more

empathetic than the 1990s' depiction. This Bond makes mistakes, falls in love, has his heart broken, and suffers, in icy solitude, because of it.

Finally the two Bond films also demonstrate very different geopolitical worlds each of which clearly draw on the geopolitical reality of their decade. *GoldenEye* reflects Anglo-American fears and anxieties about the uncertainties of a post-Soviet Russia – fears which were very much apparent in the post-Cold War Anglo-American culture of the 1990s (Toal (2001)). Further, the film's narrative presents enemies who are conclusively identified and disposed of – reflecting the success the Anglo-American world enjoyed in both the Cold- and Gulf Wars. In contrast *Casino Royale* presents a narrative in which Bond's enemies remain, even at the film's conclusion, illusive and undefeated, much like the terrorist spectre which haunted the real world of the 2000s.

Having studied the *zeitgeist* of the decades in which *GoldenEye* and *Casino Royale* were made and then investigated how the two case studies reflect those values, it becomes undeniably clear that Mr Kiss Kiss Bang Bang, the man with the licence to kill, is far more than merely a popular filmic hero. He is a mythic figure in popular culture; he is a fluid remixing of representations which maintains the same connotations; he is a mobile signifier who reflects the changing socio-cultural values of his time; he is, we all know the immortal line: Bond... James Bond.

Reference List:

Abate, R. C. 2010. *The Superman Exists and He is American: Graphic Novel Film Adaptations and Masculine Heroism in Post-9/11 Culture.* Unpublished Honours Thesis. New London: Connecticut College.

Jorgenson, D.W. 2008 "Accounting for Growth in the Information Age" in Aghion, P. & Durlauf, S.N. (eds.) *Handbook of Economic Growth Volume One*. Amsterdam: Elsevier: 743 – 815.

Andrade, J. 2003. *The Gender Politics of Female Action Heroes in Television Films*. Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis – Women Studies. Washington: University of Washington. Available online: https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/handle/1773/2099 (last accessed: 08/12/2010).

Arnett, P. 2009. "*Casino Royale* and Franchise Remix: James Bond as Superhero" in *Film Criticism*, 33(3): 1-17.

Bailey, C. 1997. "Making Waves and Drawing Lines: The Politics of Defining the Vicissitudes of Feminism" in *Hypatia,* 12(3): 17-28.

Bainbridge, C. & Yates, C. 2005. "Cinematic Symptoms of Masculinity in Transition: Memory, History, and Mythology in Contemporary Film" in *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 10(3): 299-318.

Baker, B. 2006. *Masculinity in Film: Representing Men in Popular Culture, 1945-2000.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Baker, B. 2009. "Gallivanting Around the World: Bond, the Gaze and Mobility" in Lindner, C (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 144-159.

Banet-Weiser, S. 2004. "Girls rule!: Gender, Feminism, and Nickelodeon" in *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 21(2): 119-139.

Baudrillard, J. 1995. *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Baumgardner, J. & Richards, A. 2000. *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and The Future*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Bellafante, G. 1998. "Feminism: It's All About Me!" in *Time,* 151(25): 54-60

Bennett, T. & Woollacott, J. 1987. *Bond and Beyond: The Political career of a Popular Hero.* London: Macmillan.

Bennett, T. & Woollacott, J. 2009. "The Moments of Bond" in Lindner, C. 2009. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 13-34.

Bentley, Nick. 2005. (ed.) *Fiction of the 1990s.* New York: Routledge.

Bernard, M. 2009. "Christ I Miss the Cold War" in *The Projector,* 9(2): 13-20.

Black, J. 2000. *The Politics of James Bond*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing, Inc.

Black, J. 2004. "The Geopolitics of James Bond" in *Intelligence and National Security,* 19(2): 290-303.

Boggs, C & Pollard, T. 2006. "Hollywood and the Spectre of Terrorism" in *New Political Science,* 28(3): 335-351.

Boggs, C. & Pollard, T. 2008. "The Imperial Warrior in Hollywood: Rambo and Beyond" in *New Political Science,* 30*(*4): 565-578.

Boyle, E. 2010. "The Intertextual Terminator: The Role of Film in Branding 'Arnold Schwarzenegger'" in *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 34(1): 42-60.

Bowen, Q.W. & Dunn, H.D. 1996. *American Security Policy in the 1990's*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited.

Brabazon, T. 1999. "Britain's Last Line of Defence: Miss Moneypenny and the Desperation of Filmic Feminism" in *Women's Studies International Forum*, 22(5): 489-496.

Briggs, G.V. 2007. *White Masculinity in the American Action Film Pre and Post 9/11*. Published MA dissertation. Athens, Ohio: University of Ohio.

Buckley, M & Singh, R. (eds). 2006. *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism; Global Responses, Global Consequences.* New York: Routledge.

"Casino Royale" The Internet Movie Database. 1990-2010. Internet Movie Database Ltd. Available online: http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0381061/ (last accessed: 8/12/2010).

Casino Royale Total Lifetime Grosses. The Internet Movie Database. 1990-2010. Internet Movie Database Limited. Available online: http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=jamesbond21.htm (last accessed 08/12/2010)

Chandler, D. 2002. *Semiotics: the Basics.* Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Chapman, J. 2009. *Licence to Thrill: A Cultural History of the James Bond Films.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Connell, R.W. 1993. "The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History" in *Theory and Society,* 22(5): 597-623.

Cunningham, D.A. and Gabri, R. 2009. "'Any Thug Can Kill': Rewriting the Masculine Bond" in Lindner, C (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 81-99.

Cushing, R.G. & Clark, E.A. 1993. *The Challenge of NAFTA: North America, Australia, New Zealand and the World Trade Regime.* Melbourne: CEDA.

Dalby, S. 2003. "Calling 911: Geopolitics, Security and America's New War" in *Geopolitics,* 8(3): 61-86.

Davis, K & Evans, M & Lorber, J. (eds.) 2005. *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Denning, M. 2009. “Licence to Look: James Bond and the Heroism of Consumption” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 56-76.

Driscoll, C. 1999. “Girl Culture, Revenge and Global Capitalism: Cyber Girls, Riot Grrls, Spice Girls” in *Australian Feminist Studies*, 14(29): 173-195.

Dodds, K. 2003. “Licensed to Stereotype: Geopolitics, James Bond and the Spectre of Balkanism” in *Geopolitics*, 8(2): 125-126.

Dodds, K. 2006. “Popular Geopolitics and Audience Dispositions: James Bond and the Internet Movie Database (IMDB)” in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 31(2): 116-130.

Eco, U. 2009. “Narrative Structures in Bond” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon.* Manchester: Manchester University Press: 34-55.

Elkin, F. 1955. “Popular Hero Symbols and Audience Gratifications” in *The Journal of Education Sociology,* 29(3): 97-107.

Elmuti, D. & Lehan, J. & Harmon, B. & Xiaoyan, Lu *et al*. 2003. “Inequality Between Genders in the Executive Suite in Corporate America” in *Equal Opportunities International,* 22(8): 1-20.

Enns, A. 2009. “Review of *Violent Femmes: Women as Spies in Popular Culture*” in *Modern Fiction Studies,* 55(4): 874-876.

Erens, P. 1990. *Issues in Feminist Film Criticism.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Finlan, A. 2006. “International Security” in Buckley, M & Singh, R. (eds). *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism: Global Responses, Global Consequences.* New York: Routledge.

Flook, C. 2007. *A Critical Analysis of Masculinity in Portrayals in Film: Definition, Ideal and Possible Solution*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Muncie, Indiana: Ball State University.

Frith, H. (2001) “Young Women, Feminism and the Future: Dialogues and Discoveries” in *Feminism Psychology,* 11(2): 147-151.

Garland, T.W. 2009. “The Coldest Weapon of All: The Bond Girl Villain in James Bond Films” in *The Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 37(4): 179-188.

Gates, P. 2006. *Detecting Men: Masculinity and the Hollywood Detective Film*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gehlawat, M. 2009. “Improvisation, Action and Architecture in *Casino Royale*” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 131-144.

Goggin, J & Glas, R. 2009. “It Just Keeps Getting Bigger: James Bond and the Political Economy of Huge” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 67-81.

“Goldeneye” The Internet Movie Database. 1990-2010. Internet Movie Database Ltd. Available online: http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0113189/ (last accessed: 8/12/2010).

GoldenEye Total Lifetime Grosses. The Internet Movie Database. 1990-2010. Internet Movie Database Limited. Available online: http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?page=main&id=goldeneye.htm (last accessed 08/12/2010)

Goodman, J.S. & Fields, D.L. & Blum, T.C. 2003. “Cracks in the Glass Ceiling: In What Kinds of Organizations do Women Make it to the Top?” in *Group & Organization Management*, 28(4): 475-502.

Hayward, S. 2006. *Key Concepts in Cinema Studies*. London, New York: Routledge.

House, J. 2004. “Sweeney Among the Archetypes: The Literary Hero in American Culture” in *The Journal of American Culture,* 16(4): 65-71.

Howard, D. 2009. “Do I Look Like I Give A Damn: What’s Right About Getting It Wrong In *Casino Royale*” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 33-50.

Hull, E.K. & Nelson, L.R. 1998. “Gender Inequality in Law: Problems of Structure and Agency in Recent Studies of Gender in Anglo-American Legal Professions.” in *Law & Social Inquiry*, 23(3): 681-705.

Hunt, T.C. & Thomas, J.L. & Raisch, D.C. (2010) *Encyclopaedia of Educational Reform and Dissent, Volume 1*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hunter, L. 2003. “The Celluloid Cubicle: Regressive Constructions of Masculinity in 1990s Office Movies” in *The Journal of American Culture*, 26(1): 71-87.

Hutchinson, J.R. & Mann, H.S. (2006) “Gender Anarchy and the Future of Feminisms in Public Administration”. *Administrative Theory & Praxis,* 28(3): 399-418.

Inness, S. A. 2004. *Action Chicks: New Images of Tough Women in Popular Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jarvie, I.C. 1978. *Movies as Social Criticism.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

Johnson, A.D. 2009. “Male Masochism in *Casino Royale*” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 114-131.

Jütting, K. 2005. *Grow Up 007! - James Bond over the Decades: Formula vs. Innovation*. Published MA Dissertation. Munich: GRIN Verlag.

Kalantzis, M & Cope, B. (eds.) 2001. *Transformation in Language and Learning: Perspectives on Multiliteracies*. Altona: Common Ground Publishing.

Knutsen, T.L. 1999. *The Rise and Fall of World Orders.* Manchester and Oxford: Manchester University Press.

Kozmetksy, G & Yue, P. 2005. *The Economic Growth of the United States, 1950-2000* Purdue: Purdue University Press.

Krolokke, C. & Sorenson, A.S. 2006. *Gender Communication Analyses: From Silence to Performance*. London, New Delhi, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Ladenson, E. 2009. "Pussy Galore" in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 184-202.

Leach, J. 2009. "'The World has Changed': Bond in the 1990s – and Beyond?" in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 301-312.

Leeming, D. 2003. *Myth*. Oxford, New York, Bangkok: Oxford University Press.

LeGates, M. (2001) *In Their Time: A History of Feminism in Western Society*. London, New York: Routledge.

Lindner, C. 2009. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Macey, D. (2001). *Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory*. London, New York, Ontario, new Delhi: Penguin Books.

Malin, B.J. 2005. *American Masculinity Under Clinton: Popular Media and the Nineties "Crisis in Masculinity"*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Mann, S.A. & Huffman, D.G. (2005) "The Decentering of Second Wave Feminism and the Rise of the Third Wave" in *Science and Society*, 69(1): 56-92.

Marshall, G. 1998. "Zeitgeist" in *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Available online: http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O88-Zeitgeist.html (last accessed 27/01/2011).

Mencimer, S. 2001. "Violent Femmes". *The Washington Monthly,* 33(9): 14-19

Metrolyrics. 2004. *You Know My Name. A*vailable online: http://www.metrolyrics.com/you-know-my-name-lyrics-chris-cornell.html (last accessed 21/09/2010).

Morisson, D.E. 1992. *Television and the Gulf War*. London: John Libbey & Company Ltd.

Mulvey, L. 1990. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” in Erens, P. *Issues in Feminist Film Criticism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press: 28-41.

Neroni, H. 2005. *The Violent Woman*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Neuendorf, K.A. & Gore, T.D. & Dalessandro, A. & Janstova, P. & Snyder-Suhy, S. 2010. “Shaken and Stirred: A Content Analysis of Women’s Portrayals in James Bond Films” in *Sex Roles*, 62(1): 747-761.

O’Donnell P. 2005. “James Bond. Cyborg-Aristocrat” in Commental, P.E. & Watt, S. & Willman, S. (eds) *Ian Fleming and James Bond: The Cultural Politics of 007.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 55-71.

Omry, K. 2009. “Bond, Benjamin, Balls: Technologised Masculinity in *Casino Royale*” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 159-173.

Perry, W.J. 1996. “Defense in an Age of Hope”. *Foreign Affairs,* 75(6): 64-79.

Pollard, T. 2002. “The Hollywood War Machine” in *New Political Science,* 24(1): 121-139.

Rhode, P.W. & Toniolo, G. (eds.) 2006. *The Global Economy in the 1990s: A Long Run Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rochlin, G.I. & Demchak, C.C. 1991. *Lessons of the Gulf War: Ascendant Technology and Declining Capability.* Berkley: University of California.

Roth, L.M. 2006. *Selling Women Short.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rutherford, P. 2004. *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War Against Iraq.* Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.

Sakota-Kokot, T. 2010. *My War Your War: Understanding Conflict in Africa and the Middle East through Fiction Film*. Unpublished PHD dissertation. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Sanchez, R. 2000. “It’s Time Again for Heroes – or Were They Ever Gone?” in *The Social Studies*, 91(2): 58-61.

Simpson, P. 2002. *The Rough Guide to James Bond.* London: Penguin Books.

Sperb, J. 2009. “Hardly The Big Picture: The Ellipsis and Narratives of Interruption in *Casino Royale*” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 50-67.

Stanley, T.L. 2005. “Super Heroines Fly into Glass Ceiling” in *Advertising Age,* 76(50): 3-5.

Stock, P. 2009. “Dial “M” for Metonym: Universal Exports, M’s Office, Space and Empire” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 251-268.

Tasker, Y. 1993. *Spectacular Bodies: Gender, Genre and the Action Cinema*. London, New York: Routledge.

Tasker, Y. 1998. *Working Girls: Gender and Sexuality in Popular Cinema*. London, New York: Routledge.

Taylor, V. 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance" in *American Sociological Review*, 54(1): 761-775.

Tincknell, E. 2009. “Double-0 Agencies: Femininity, Post-Feminism and the Female Spy” in Lindner, C (ed.) *Revisioning 007*. London: Wallflower Press: 81-99.

Toal, G. 2001. “Post Cold War Geopolitics: Contrasting Super Powers in a World of Global Dangers” *Geographies of Global Change,* 2(1): 1-28.

Tremonte, C.M. & Racioppi, L. 2009. “Body Politics and *Casino Royale*: Gender and (Inter)National Security” in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 184-205.

Willis, S. 1997. *High Contrast: Race and Gender in Contemporary Hollywood*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Willis, M. 2009. "Hardwear: The Millenium, Technology and Brosnan's Bond" in Lindner, C. (ed.) *The James Bond Phenomenon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: 151-169.

Referenced Films

Alien (Ridley Scott, 1979)

Alien (James Cameron, 1986)

Alien 3 (David Fincher, 1992)

Alien Resurrection (Jen-Pierre Jeunet, 1997)

American Beauty (Sam Mendez, 1999)

American Psycho (Mary Harron, 1999)

Bad Boys (Michael Bay, 1995)

Bond Girls are Forever (John Watkin, 2002)

Broken Arrow (John Woo, 1996)

Charlie's Angels (McG, 2003)

Charlie's Angels: Full Throttle (McG, 2000)

Die Another Day (Lee Tamahori, 2002)

Die Hard (John McTiernan, 1988)

Die Hard 2 (Renny Harlin, 1990)

Die Hard with a Vengeance (John McTiernan, 1995)

Dr No (Terence Young, 1962)

Eraser (Chuck Russell, 1996)

Falling Down (Joel Schumacher, 1993)

Fight Club (David Fincher, 1999)

Goldfinger (Guy Hamilton, 1964)

La Femme Nikita (Luc Besson, 1990)

Lara Croft: Tomb Raider (Simon West, 2001)

Lethal Weapon (Richard Donner, 1987)

Licence to Kill (John Glen, 1989)

Point of No Return (John Badham, 1993)

Rambo (Sylvester Stallone, 2008)

Speed (Jan de Bont, 1994)

Terminator 2 (James Cameron: 1991)

The Living Daylights (John Glen, 1987)

The Matrix (Andy and Larry Wachowski, 1999)

The Peacemaker (Mimi Leder, 1997)

The Raiders of The Lost Ark (Steven Spielberg, 1981)

The Rock (Michael Bay, 1996)

The Siege (Edward Zwick, 1998)

The World is Not Enough (Michael Apted, 1999)

Tomb Raider: Cradle of Life (Jan de Bont, 2003)

True Lies (James Cameron, 1994)

You Only Live Twice (Lewis Gilbert, 1967)

Referenced Television Series

Alias (JJ Abrams; 2001-2006)

Buffy the Vampire Slayer (Joss Whedon, 1997-2003)

Xena: Warrior Princess (John Schulian & Roger Tapert; 1995-2001)