

Spring 2019

Bondmania: Spy Films, American Foreign Policy, and the New Frontier of the 1960s

Luke Pearsons

Central Washington University, pearsonsl@cwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Cultural History Commons](#), [History of Gender Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pearsons, Luke, "Bondmania: Spy Films, American Foreign Policy, and the New Frontier of the 1960s" (2019). *All Master's Theses*. 1202.

<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1202>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

BONDMANIA: SPY FILMS, AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, AND THE NEW FRONTIER
OF THE 1960s

A Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

History

by

Luke Thomas Pearsons

May 2019

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Graduate Studies

We hereby approve the thesis of

Luke Thomas Pearsons

Candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Dr. Stephen Moore, Committee Chair

Dr. Daniel Herman

Dr. Chong Eun Ahn

Dean of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

BONDMANIA: SPY FILMS, AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, AND THE NEW FRONTIER OF THE 1960s

by

Luke Thomas Pearsons

May 2019

The topic of this thesis are spy films that were produced during the Cold War, with a specific focus on the James Bond films and their numerous imitators. The goal is to explore why these films were popular, particularly during the decade of the 1960s, and how these films and characters were used to address a number of anxieties that faced the United States in this period. The character of James Bond in these films established the dominance of a particular character type and provided a sense of wish fulfillment for a certain segment of the audience. His presence asserted that the fight of the Cold War and containment was in capable hands, and that those who fought it were having fun doing it. The Bond globetrotting superspy media figure was one that soon came to dominate the culture. Policymakers, politicians, and the CIA used the image of Bond to their benefit, as Bond's popularity coincided with Kennedy and Johnson's foreign policy strategy of flexible response, which favored elite strike forces rather than nuclear warfare as a way to address conflicts during the Cold War. Domestically, magazines from *Life* to *Playboy*, promoted the idea of the "Bond lifestyle," and the perceived benefits that came from modeling one's life after a superspy. The Bond media figure demonstrates that Cold War militarization took many forms and that characters from pop culture can have a significant impact on how people view themselves and the world around them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Historiography.....	3
	Organization.....	14
	Method and Using Films as Primary Sources.....	16
II	BOND AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY	18
	The Cold War Before Bond	19
	The President, the CIA, and James Bond.....	26
	Bondmania	33
III	BOND AND THE NEW FRONTIER	49
	Domesticity, <i>Playboy</i> , and Doris Day.....	50
	The New Frontier, James Bond, and Bond Girls	58
	Wanting to Be James Bond.....	67
IV	CONCLUSION.....	82
	Epilogue: Bond from Vietnam to Today.....	85
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	88
	APPENDIX.....	94

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Figure 1. James Bond Secret Agent 007 *SA Special Agent Automatic Pistol, Scope and Silencer	42
2	Figure 2. 007 gun shaped vodka pourer.....	43
3	Figure 3. 007 after shave advertisement	69
4	Figure 4. <i>The Silencers</i> (1966) poster.....	72

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

M: I think you're a sexist misogynist dinosaur. A relic of the Cold War, whose boyish charms, though wasted on me, obviously appealed to that young woman I sent to evaluate you.

James Bond: Point taken.

— *Goldeneye* (1995)

When James Bond returned to screens in 1995 in the film *Goldeneye*, it had been six years since the last Bond film—at that point, the longest hiatus in the film series' history—and the first since the end of the Cold War. The film's producers were aware that they faced a new challenge in the film series. One of the producers, Barbara Broccoli, later claimed that “the press was saying that Bond was a passé thing. [That] the world [had] changed. There are no enemies, so there's no need for James Bond.”¹ There was a genuine concern that the character would not survive in a post-Cold War climate. Before the film went into production, *The Wall Street Journal* speculated that the film was \$50 million gamble that was not worth taking.² The character was so tied to the Cold War and a distinct type of Cold War masculinity, there were fears that the character was destined to fade into history, as Mickey Spillane's private-eye Mike Hammer had before him. Some felt that if they were to make more films, there should be significant changes made to the character, to update and modernize him. However, the film's producers decided to go in a different route. The film's director, Martin Campbell, argued that “canceling out [Bond's] chauvinism would be a mistake. He must remain a womanizer.”³ The

¹ *Everything or Nothing: The Untold Story of 007*, directed by Stevan Riley (Epix, 2012) DVD (20th Century Fox, 2013).

² *Everything or Nothing*.

³ Quoted in Paul Duncan, ed. *The James Bond Archives* (Cologne: Taschen, 2015), 428.

film's thesis instead became a question: is a "sexist misogynist dinosaur," and a "relic of the Cold War," still relevant in the era of a "new world order?" The film's answer, as well as the audiences', was irrefutably a yes. *Goldeneye* was the fourth highest grossing film of the year and ever since the film franchise continues to consistently rank among the highest earners of the year.

Goldeneye's preoccupation with the Cold War and its legacy, and the producers' concerns about whether Bond would continue to be successful after the fall of the Berlin Wall pose an interesting question. If there was a fear that the fictional character of Bond personified the Cold War to such a great degree that he might not succeed after it had ended, what then can be learned about the Cold War through studying the Bond phenomenon? The answer to this question reveals many of the anxieties surrounding the Cold War context, and also how those fears were addressed.

This thesis focuses specifically on the popularity of James Bond in the United States. Though Bond is a British character, his popularity in the US was immense, and US critics and fans hardly, if ever, brought up his Britishness. Placing James Bond in the US Cold War context, demonstrates a variety of things in American life, in everything from foreign policy to shifting gender roles. More specifically, this thesis will focus primarily on the decades of the 1950s and 1960s, exploring the Cold War context before the introduction of Bond and then after in the decade for which the character's popularity was at its highest. More than just an examination of the character of James Bond, this thesis will explore how the vast amounts of spy media created in the wake of the popularity of James Bond that strove to capitalize on the "spy craze." This "Bondmania" took over the popular culture of the United States, invading corners of media that few scholars have explored in depth. This thesis argues that during the Cold War, US policymakers promoted and benefited from the popularity of spy media—and were also at times

informed by it—particularly in the case of James Bond, and that the popularity of this spy media reflect changes in US culture and perhaps assisted in shaping it.

Historiography

The historiography of James Bond, spy films, and the Cold War in the United States is vast, yet there still remain significant areas left unexplored. The aim of this thesis is unique in its goal to explore not so much the films by themselves or their production, but the world surrounding these films from how they were sold in trailers and in posters, to how they were discussed in magazines and newspapers, as well as how they were used by US policymakers to further their own agendas. This thesis aims to unite and expand three areas of historiography: James Bond and Cold War films, US cultural studies, and US Cold War foreign policy. The first, the historiography of James Bond and Cold War films, has a wide array of interesting and insightful investigations into the topic for which this thesis is indebted, yet there still remain noteworthy areas deserving examination. The literature of US cultural studies focused on the domestic Cold War provide a useful foundation for this thesis from which to analyze the cultural context of these films. Likewise, US Cold War foreign policy historiography will be used to explore how US foreign policy was conceived of and conducted during the Cold War, which in this thesis will be compared to the spy fiction that was produced at the same time.

First and foremost, there are a number of books and articles on James Bond and the James Bond phenomenon to which this thesis aims to add. There are three main schools of Bond scholarship. The first—and of least significance to this thesis—is production histories of these films. Books such as Matthew Field and Ajay Chowdhury's *Some Kind of Hero: The Remarkable Story of the James Bond Films* and *The James Bond Archives*, edited by Paul Duncan, while fun and interesting reads for film buffs, do not offer much in the way of

explanation or examination of the popularity of the Bond character and the cultural context for which the character was created in. The second area of scholarship on the Bond films are books such as *The Politics of James Bond: From Fleming's Novels to the Big Screen* by Jeremy Black which rely almost exclusively on the Bond novels and films as sources. Black examines how Bond's adventures have changed over time in response to shifts in the real-world politics, and argues that the films and the books strive to reflect real world espionage at the times of their creation. Books such as this can provide thought-provoking insights into how scholars "read" a film and examine its cultural significance. However, such studies do not highlight how people at the time interpreted these films or how the films were used to further a particular agenda. The third school—and the one to which this thesis closest adheres to—are books that aim to integrate primary sources that were produced around these films that firmly ground them in their cultural context. The two most significant works in this field are *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero* by Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott and *Licence to Thrill: A Cultural History of the James Bond Films* by James Chapman. Worth noting, is that both books focus on Bond's popularity and cultural significance to Britain and are not as interested in Bond's status in the US. However, the arguments and conclusions drawn from each are helpful to this thesis.

Bennett and Woollacott's book, published in 1987, examines the Bond phenomenon through the lens of cultural studies. They argue that Bond as a popular hero changes over time in response to broader cultural and ideological pressures. They identify three moments of Bond throughout his career as a popular hero. The first moment is when the Bond character of the novels, which were not initially successful, eventually became a household name in Britain through a James Bond newspaper comic strip. The second moment of Bond was in the mid-1960s when the early Bond films "both significantly broadened the social basis of Bond's

popular appeal in Britain and extended the horizons of his popularity internationally.”⁴ They argue the films changed Bond from the novels to better fit the social climate of the 1960s. The third moment is the period since the 1970s when Bond’s popularity shifted from that of a cultural phenomenon to an “institutional ritual” with the production of a new film on the regular basis every two or so years. They contend that Bond is a recognizable institution that is inactive for most of the time, but can be reactivated with the release of a new film.

Bennett and Woollacott provide an interesting, theoretically informed examination of the Bond phenomenon, but it is an incomplete thesis. First, it is not a contextual history of the Bond films, as the authors do not consider the films in the context of other films and popular heroes that existed at the time. Also, the US—which is the focus for this thesis—is not much considered in their examination of the Bond phenomenon, even though the films were widely successful there. Also, the Cold War context is given very little cultural weight in suggesting why Bond was popular when he was, not to mention that the book was written while the Cold War was still a going concern. Therefore, there remains much room for further historical analysis of the Bond films and the Bond phenomenon.

One scholar who aims to fill some of the gaps left by Bennett and Woollacott is James Chapman in his book *Licence to Thrill*. Similar to Bennett and Woollacott, his focus is exclusively on Britain, but he does examine the Bond films within a wider context of British cinema and British culture. In the British context, Chapman’s book is exhaustively comprehensive, providing a film-by-film breakdown of the source material, the film’s plot and characters, the politics of the film, and its critical reaction and box office in Britain. His main aim is to place the Bond films

⁴ Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott, *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero* (London: Routledge, 1987), 29.

“in the context of British cinema history and film culture.”⁵ He attributes the Bond films’ success to the creativity of the filmmakers and the action-packed nature of the films, which he says were much more exciting than other films at the time. He argues that the Bond films were the first real “action films” that later became one of film’s most successful genres. Elements such as impressive stunts, artistic production design, the popularity of the film’s stars, and the desire by the audience to escape into the world of these films are what drove the films’ successes in Chapman’s estimation.

Chapman’s book is well researched and full of interesting sources, yet it too leaves room for further research and analysis. Similar to Bennet and Wollacott, Chapman’s book is focused on Britain and Bond’s popularity there. Also, his goal of placing Bond within the context of British cinema is noted, yet he curiously does not compare them to the hundreds of derivative spy films that were produced following the popularity of James Bond. Also, Chapman does not consider the vast merchandise and product tie-ins that brought Bond into the real world for much of his audience. Lastly, and most significantly, Chapman contends that Bond’s Cold War context was not important to his success, as the character continued to be popular after the end of the Cold War. This conclusion is somewhat concerning as it assumes that the reasoning for Bond’s popularity in one cultural context must then be the same in another. Furthering his justification for this is that the Soviets were not often the direct villains in these films. While this is the case, it does not account for these films responding to other Cold War anxieties, most notably the threat of nuclear destruction. While Chapman’s claims that these films were popular because of how different they were from other films at the time is valid, this thesis aims to demonstrate that there were much larger factors at play that contributed to the success of these films.

⁵ James Chapman, *Licence to Thrill: A Cultural History of the James Bond Films* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 19.

Some of the most interesting research done on the Bond films and the James Bond phenomenon have been in scholarly articles and edited compilations. *Ian Fleming and James Bond: The Cultural Politics of 007* edited by Edward Comentale, Stephen Watt, and Skip Willman and *The James Bond Phenomenon: A Critical Reader* edited by Christoph Linder both contain thought-provoking and well researched investigations into the James Bond phenomenon. While most fall more under the category of film and literary scholarship rather than history, there are quite a few chapters by historians that examine Bond's popularity in a historical context. Historians and scholars have examined the Bond phenomenon in a variety of ways including the impact of the films' economic performance, the ethical contradictions found within the Bond character, the portrayal of women in the films, and how the Bond character relates to the global context and promotes a form of post-colonial imperialism.⁶

The two that are closest in their goals to this thesis are Skip Willman's "The Kennedys, Fleming and Cuba," which is similar in its topic to chapter one of this thesis, and Claire Hines "'Entertainment for Men': Uncovering the Playboy Bond," which is similar to chapter two. While both explore similar topics as this thesis does, they both do so in ways that leaves room for further scholarship. Willman's chapter explores how Kennedy's foreign policy decisions in Cuba at times appear to mirror moments from the Bond novels, which Willman suggests must

⁶ See, for example, Mark Baimbridge, "Movie Admissions and Rental Income: The Case of James Bond," *Applied Economics Letters* 4, no. 1 (1997): 57-61; Robert Arp and Kevin Decker, "'That Fatal Kiss': Bond, Ethics and the Objectification of Women," in *James Bond and Philosophy: Questions Are Forever*, edited by James South and Jacob Held (Chicago: Carus, 2006), 201-14; Kimberly Neuendorf, Thomas Gore, Amy Dalessandro, Patricie Janstova, and Sharon Snyder-Suhy, "Shaken and Stirred: A Content Analysis of Women's Portrayals in James Bond Films," *Sex Roles* 62, no. 11 (2010): 747-61; Cynthia Baron, "Doctor No: Bonding Britishness to Racial Sovereignty," in *The James Bond Phenomenon: A Critical Reader*, edited by Christopher Linder (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), 153-68; Vivian Halloran, "Tropical Bond," in *Ian Fleming and James Bond: The Cultural Politics of 007*, edited by Edward Comentale, Stephen Watt, and Skip Willman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 158-77; Travis Wagner, "'The Old Ways Are Best' The Colonization of Women of Color in Bond Films," in *For His Eyes Only: The Women of James Bond*, edited Lisa Funnell (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), 51-9.

have then shaped Kennedy's foreign policy. In contrast to Willman's work, this thesis explores the other side of this relationship and examines instead how Kennedy used Bond as a way to sell his foreign policy to the American public. Claire Hines' chapter explores the relationship between James Bond and *Playboy* magazine, as this thesis does as well, but she examines *Playboy's* use of Bond primarily in the 1980s and 1990s, whereas this thesis focuses on the 1950s and 1960s. While both of these studies, as well as others, are worthwhile and inform this thesis, they are often much too brief and do not provide the space or scope that the topic deserves. Also, almost all of these chapters and articles do not look at Bond in the wider context of the massive amount of spy media that was produced at the same time. Even though there is a large amount of scholarship on the Bond phenomenon there still remains many areas left to investigate.

Looking outside of scholarship specifically on Bond films and turning to larger movements in cultural film studies in the Cold War context is also worthwhile. Most books on Cold War cinema, such as Nora Sayre's classic thesis of Cold War film, *Running Time: Films of the Cold War*, only examines films up until the end of the 1950s. Historian Tony Shaw broadens that scope to include the entire Cold War in his book *Hollywood's Cold War*. He argues that Hollywood films throughout the Cold War voluntarily served as propaganda for the state to fight communism. He claims that this state-film network was fluid, working in close partnership at times, such as in the early fifties, widening tremendously during the latter days of the Vietnam War, and returning again to various degrees during the Reagan administration. Shaw demonstrates how the Cold War was fought culturally, as well as diplomatically, economically, and militarily.

Shaw argues that the Cold War was just as much a conflict over ideas and images as it was between bullets and bombs, and that film played a very important role in that war. He claims that film is a powerful vehicle of entertainment and propaganda and during the Cold War it showed the “reality” of what was for most American citizens an abstract conflict. For many Americans, film provided an avenue of escape and entrainment, while at the same time serving as an agent that reinforced deeply held beliefs that were central to Cold War ideology. As significant as Shaw’s book is to the historiography of the cultural Cold War, he interestingly does not include much examination of Bond and spy films in the 1960s—dedicating only a few paragraphs to these films—leaving a wide body of rich primary sources unexamined.

Broadening the scope of historiography that informs this thesis includes recognizing the contributions of cultural historians who study the US Cold War Homefront and Cold War culture. Two books are of particular importance to this thesis: Elaine Tyler May’s *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* and K.A. Cuordileone’s *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War*. In May’s seminal work she explores the culture of the Cold War in the United States and how it transformed family life, particularly in the immediate postwar years up until the late 1950s. May argues that Cold War ideology created a cult of domesticity in the US, noting that while the US practiced containment abroad, domestic containment was also practiced in the home. May claims that the baby boom’s origins can be found in a generation that retreated to the home to protect themselves from Communist paranoia and nuclear fallout. May argues that the 1950s marked a new generation unlike anything the US had seen before, in which many white, middle-class Americans strove to facilitate the creation of the traditional family—with traditional gender roles—which had been in varying degrees of flexibility during the Great Depression and World War II. May claims that the home functioned

as a way to contain elements that some feared would be destructive to the national character—sex, consumerism, and women’s aspirations—by refocusing them into the home as way to strengthen the family and in turn the nation.

May’s methodology of demonstrating Cold War ideology’s impacts on the domestic US, informs this thesis’ argument. Also, this thesis aims to be an extension of May’s work, providing another chapter in the ongoing scholarship of the domestic Cold War. This thesis argues that the Bond phenomenon and most of the spy films made during the 1960s, as well as how these films were lauded, contested, and debated, responds directly to the cultural context that May describes. The proto-typical Bond superspy provided a media figure that promised a liberation from domestic containment, while maintaining a sense of security that many craved in an era of anxiety.

Another important work in informing this thesis’ focus and goals is K.A. Cuordileone’s *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War*, which puts a spotlight on the gendered nature of US politics and the relationship between masculinity and the Cold War. Cuordileone argues that Cold War politics were inseparably linked to broader social anxieties about gender and sexuality. She argues that much of the rhetoric in the Cold War, from novels to films, to political speeches and popular articles, are united in a shared sense of a longing for masculine regeneration. She claims that this culminated in the election of John F. Kennedy whose rhetoric was similarly couched in hyper-masculinity and toughness. Cuordileone asserts that much of the “liberalism” in the politics of the Cold War was of style rather than substance, categorized not as one committed to reform, but by its rhetorical persuasiveness and its promise to not be “soft” on communism.

Cuordileone's work is an interesting and valuable addition to the historiography. She demonstrates the rhetoric and politics in the context of gender during the Cold War and its effects. This thesis will add to and expand many of Cuordileone's arguments. While Cuordileone's main focus is on politics and political and intellectual thinkers, this thesis aims to demonstrate how the proto-Bond superspy embodied this gendered Cold War masculinity. The superspy film genre came to represent a sight from which many of these themes were discussed and debated. This thesis argues that much of the Bond superspy's success is its connection to this new Cold War masculinity: one that was no longer bound to domesticity, yet still found a sense of security in the form extreme masculinity. Also, while Cuordileone's book is well researched and argued, she does not much consider the role women played in creating and supporting this brand of masculinity. As this thesis demonstrates, many women were often just as involved in building and promoting the lifestyle and character of Bond and his derivatives as men were. Also, the masculinity that Bond and other superspy came to represent, was not without its vocal critics, which this thesis also aims to display.

The final area of historiography this thesis draws from and aims to add to is US Cold War foreign policy and how it was depicted both domestically and internationally. The area of the international Cold War is perhaps the most written and discussed aspect of the era. Impressive works ranging from comprehensive overviews to extremely specific case studies continue to be published year after year. This thesis does not pretend to add significant contributions to such historiographical debates as who started the Cold War or who ended it. Yet, it does hope to build on previous scholars' work and expand how films produced during this era reflect, promote, and contradict US foreign policy.

There are a number of important historiographical works which this thesis will draw on in order to situate the spy films of 1960s into the international context. One such book is John Lewis Gaddis' *Strategies of Containment*, which even though at times overgeneralizes, it does provide a useful structure and vocabulary to use when analyzing US Cold War foreign policy. Gaddis investigates the nature and role of the US strategies of containment and how it formed and changed over time. He argues that there were five distinct geopolitical codes during the Cold War era: George Kennon's original strategy of containment; NSC-68 and the Korean War; the Eisenhower-Dulles "New Look"; the Kennedy-Johnson "flexible response" strategy; and the strategy of "détente" put forward by Nixon and Kissinger and continued through Ford and Carter until the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.⁷

Within this framework, Gaddis contends that there are two forms of containment, asymmetrical and symmetrical. Symmetrical containment, which Gaddis associates with NSC-68 and Kennedy and Johnson's flexible response strategies, gave policymakers a wide variety of responses, but also involved letting their adversaries select the nature and location of the competition. He argues that the United States never generated either the capabilities or the will that would have been required in order to support symmetrical containment for an extended period of time, and the attempts to do so ended in frustration, disillusionment and exhaustion such as in the cases of Korea and Vietnam. Nevertheless, the Kennedy-Johnson flexible response strategy which involved tailoring a response to a direct attack or limited war on the other side of the world on a case-by-case basis using small strategic strike forces recalls images of spy films from the era. Rather than Eisenhower's New Look strategy, this strategy allowed the US to

⁷ John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

become more involved in the developing world in limited, and sometimes not so limited, engagements. The US, or British, presence in the developing world is a hallmark of most spy films from this era. This thesis aims to demonstrate how these films—whether consciously or unconsciously—served as a vehicle for presenting this strategy of containment to American audiences.

The historiography of James Bond films, Cold War films, US culture in the Cold War, and US Cold War foreign policy is bountiful and full of rich and interesting studies. While the works in this field are many, this thesis aims to demonstrate that there still remains interesting avenues that have been left unexplored. In the case of the historiography of James Bond films, while a lot of worthwhile and insightful research has been done on the subject, it has been through the focus of its context within Britain and British cinema. Works that have placed Bond in the US Cold War context, are also frequently too brief and do not look at larger factors at play. Also, little to no serious research has been done on the hundreds of Bond-derivative films that were produced in this era which further reveal the potency and regularity of these images during this place and time. The historiography of Cold War film, particularly in the US context, curiously do not include these spy films in their discussions. The area of US society and cultural histories are well documented, and this thesis hopes to add a further dimension to these works in the context of how the spy films were used as a sight from which to discuss the anxieties of the day. This thesis' goal is to paint a fuller picture of how policymakers, journalists, columnists, directors, producers, scriptwriters, actors, and movie-goers portrayed, discussed, and understood these topics and the anxieties around them at the time. While much of the Cold War has been covered, there remains much room left to be explored.

Organization

The thesis is divided into two discussions. Chapter II explores how the US government used Bond and spy media in general to promote the value of giving the government the discretion to act in secrecy in matters of foreign policy. More specifically, this chapter examines how John F. Kennedy and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) director Allen Dulles used James Bond to sell the public on their foreign policy strategy of flexible response. Chapter III explores the effects that spy media had on US pop culture and the personal lives of Americans. The James Bond character, and his imitators, personified the male rebellion of *Playboy* magazine, that championed unrestricted bachelorhood above all else. This chapter argues that spy media in the 1960s facilitated in the marginalization of female-driven stories on the big screen and encouraged a cult of Cold War masculinity that had long term effects on the US, both at home and abroad.

Chapter II investigates why James Bond and fictional spies like him became popular in the 1960s, and how the US government benefited from their popularity. The chapter begins with an exploration of pre-Bond Cold War media. Contrary to how it is widely reported, films that specifically operated within a Cold War context such as anticommunist films, monster movies, and any film specifically related to “the bomb,” were by no means the most popular films of their day—that honor went to biblical epics, musicals, and romantic comedies. Generally, audiences and critics claimed that films that directly addressed Cold War anxieties either took themselves too seriously and were kind of boring—as in the case of most anticommunist films—or were too bleak—in the case of “bomb” films. With the arrival of James Bond, President Kennedy and CIA director Dulles, recognized that there was a figure that they could use to promote their foreign policy to the American public. Bond stories did not take themselves seriously and they were not

dour. They were fun, high-flying, over the top adventures. Kennedy and Dulles' public endorsement of Bond arrived around the time of the failed Bay of Pigs invasion when public support for the CIA was at an all-time low. However, with the popularity of James Bond, aided by his high-profile endorsements—along with the wave of imitators that flooded screens—public perception of espionage and Kennedy's flexible response strategy began to shift in their favor. Yet, this popularity would not last forever, and as public support turned on the government's use of secrets, particularly in the case of the war in Vietnam, spy media fell in popularity as more Americans criticized the policy of a flexible response strategy.

Chapter III explores James Bond's popularity in the context of Cold War gender politics in the US. Prior to James Bond's popularity in the US, the idealized image of masculinity was that of the father. Film and television was dominated by domestic families and father figures who were depicted as responsible and dependable. However, with the arrival of *Playboy* magazine, and the glorification of bachelorhood that it promoted, popular media in the US began to reflect this change, seen particularly in the immensely popular films of Doris Day. Rather than placing the Bond films in the context of action thrillers as scholars have explored before, this chapter argues that the Bond films are more in the tradition of these Doris Day films and respond to these films' ideas directly. In the Doris Day films, the playboy character realizes at the films end that he no longer wants that lifestyle and decides instead to marry Day and choose a life of domesticity. In the Bond films, for the first time in popular films in the US, the hero remained a bachelor long after the film's credits rolled. Spy films superseded Day's romantic comedies as America's new biggest box office earners which eventually led to the marginalization of female-led stories in American media. Chapter two also explores how Bond was tied to Kennedy's "New Frontier" image of masculinity that championed a cult of masculinity and toughness. With

Bond's connection to Kennedy and flexible response in the previous chapter, this chapter examines how Bond's image of masculinity had long term effects on gender dynamics in the US, and how it in turn affected how foreign policy was conducted, particularly in the case of Vietnam.

Overall, this thesis explores how spy media took over US culture in the decade of the 1960s. It examines how Cold War militarization took many forms and investigates how characters from popular culture can have a lasting impact on the public's perception of the world around them. It also demonstrates how the government can benefit from these favorable depictions and how they sometimes use them to further their own agendas. Ultimately, this thesis reveals how a "sexist misogynist dinosaur" became America's most popular hero, and examines what that says about the culture of the Cold War in the US at this time.

Method and Using Films as Primary Sources

Using film as the primary body of sources in order to understand the thoughts, feelings, and moods of cultural consumers in the past can be a tricky venture. Often historians and film theorists read symbolism and meaning into films that bear little resemblance to how audiences experienced those films at the time. Conversely, writers sometimes scoff at films that, from today's vantage, seem to be melodramatic or over-the-top. This line of thinking leads to such declarations as, "And to think they really believed it in those days." In response to these historical assumptions, one might refer to famed film critic Pauline Kael's musings on the subject, which she wrote in 1967, arguing that:

We didn't accept nearly as much in old movies as we may now fear we did. Many of us went to see big-name pictures just as we went to *The Night of the Iguana*, without believing a minute of it. The James Bond pictures are not to be "believed," but they tell us a lot about the conventions that audiences now accept, just as the confessional films of the thirties dealing with sin and illegitimacy and motherhood tell us about the sickly-sentimental tone of American entertainment in the midst of the Depression. Movies

indicate what the producers thought people would pay to see—which was not always the same as what they *would* pay to see. Even what they enjoyed seeing does not tell us directly what they believed but only indirectly hints at the tone and style of a culture.⁸

To arrive past the point of indirect hints of tone and style of a culture, this thesis uses box office numbers, advertisements, magazines, newspapers, critical reviews, and fan letters in order to demonstrate how audiences *did* feel about these films, or at least how they put their feelings of these films into their own words.

⁸ Pauline Kael, *Kiss Kiss Bang Bang* (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press Book, 1968), 221.

CHAPTER II

BOND AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

In June of 1983, television viewers across the United States who had tuned in to watch anything from *60 Minutes* to *The A-Team* were suddenly confronted by a startling interruption during a commercial break as the words “Now a special announcement from the President of the United States,” blanketed the screen.¹ As President Ronald Reagan appeared, sitting in the oval office, many may have wondered what this announcement could be about. Only a few months prior, the President had declared the Soviet Union to be an “evil empire,” that was destined to the “ash heap of history,” thus revitalizing and escalating the rhetoric of the Cold War.² Reagan was also in the midst of championing the increase of nuclear inventory as a way to prevent global conflict, consequently reigniting anxieties and fears of nuclear destruction that appeared to have somewhat lessened since the 1960s. As viewers watched with anticipation, and perhaps with bated breath, the “Great Communicator,” in his unmistakable voice, revealed the reasoning for his very important and special announcement:

I’ve been asked to state my feelings on a fellow named Bond. James Bond. Well, as I see it, 007 is really a ten. He’s our modern-day version of the great heroes who appeared from time to time throughout history. There were many like him in the past: pioneers, soldiers, lawmen, explorers. People who all went out and put their lives on the line for the cause of good. Bond is fearless, skilled, witty, courageous, optimistic, and one other thing, he always gets his girl. He meets up with some pretty terrifying enemies but somehow with his determination, skill, and yes, the help of a good script, he always triumphs over them. James Bond is a man of honor. Maybe it sounds old fashioned, but I believe he is a symbol of real value to the free world. Of course, some critics might say that Bond is nothing more than an actor in the movies, but then we’ve all got to start somewhere.³

¹ “TV Spot Uses Reagan to Promote 007,” *The New York Times*, June 30, 1983, 61.

² Ronald Reagan, “Address to the National Association of Evangelicals (“Evil Empire” Speech),” *Voices of Democracy: The U.S. Oratory Project*, <http://voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/reagan-evil-empire-speech-text/>.

³ brendan007, “Ronald Reagan James Bond,” YouTube Video, 0:54, December 30, 2010, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZLI1Sd3DPLQ>.

The President's "special announcement," turned out to be no more than an advertisement for a television documentary on James Bond titled, *James Bond, the First 21 Years*. Pause for a moment and think about this strange moment in US Cold War history. Why would a sitting US president take time out of his day from policy meetings, and corresponding with foreign dignitaries, and consulting with trusted advisers over the potential for nuclear war, to publicly endorse, on television, a fictional British superspy with a license to kill who currently had a new movie out in theaters? To answer this question, and many others, one must return to the early days of the Cold War.

The Cold War Before Bond

In order to understand the Cold War, the fear, the paranoia, and the anxiety, one has to understand the significance of "the bomb." The dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki marked the end of World War II and the beginning of the Cold War, as well as a new and terrifying age in human history. Anne O'Hare McCormick, writing for *The New York Times*, two days after the first atomic blast and one day before the second, observed that the bomb "has caused an explosion in men's minds as shattering as the obliteration of Hiroshima."⁴ McCormick wrote that from "the dawn of creation until the turn of this century the atom was the indivisible unit of matter. The inhabitants of this planet rested, so to speak, upon a floor of solid particles, unaware that these infinitesimal paving blocks were dynamite, waiting to be blown up."⁵ A world thought solid, was now forever on the verge of explosion. McCormick noted that some may be comforted by the fact that the US was the one with the bomb, and not the Germans or the Japanese, yet she noted that this was still no time for adulation. Everyone, she explained, now

⁴ Anne O'Hare McCormick, "Abroad: The Promethean Role of the United States," *The New York Times*, August 8, 1945, 22.

⁵ McCormick, "Abroad," *The New York Times*, 22.

had to reckon with the fact that a force that “harnesses the fire of the sun,” was ultimately an “ultimatum to the human race. Make peace, it says, or perish.”⁶

McCormick was not alone in her apocalyptic prophecies that the bomb might bring. Historian Paul Boyer notes that “the bomb had transformed not only military strategy and international relations, but the fundamental ground of culture and consciousness.”⁷ The bomb was a paradigm shift, humans now had the capacity to destroy the entire planet with the push of a button. Exacerbating matters, the US now faced its former ally, the Soviet Union, as its new major foe. Both hoped to increase their ideological power and influence across the globe. For American leaders that meant promoting an American way of life that was presumably available to all that wanted it, a way of life that championed capitalism, affluence, and the domestic ideal of the nuclear family.⁸ These propaganda battles were designed as a way of uniting the particles of society that observers feared may too blow up like the atoms of the bomb, as well as a way of containing elements of society that were deemed undesirable. Yet, a fear even greater came true when the Soviet Union successfully detonated an atomic device in 1949, fifteen years before US scientists and policymakers believed they would acquire it. The nightmare of a nuclear war was now a potential reality. A Gallup poll in 1950 reveals that 53 percent of Americans believed there was a good or fair chance that their community would be bombed if there was another war, and most agreed that now that Russia had the bomb a war was likely.⁹

In 1953, Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected president, and the former war hero of World War II had a new strategy and a “New Look” for US foreign policy when it came to the bomb.

⁶ McCormick, “Abroad,” *The New York Times*, 22.

⁷ Paul Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), xxi.

⁸ Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 2008), 8.

⁹ George Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1935–1971*, vol. 3 (New York: Random House, 1972), 950, 929.

What came to be dubbed as massive retaliation or Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) was a policy in which full-scale nuclear weapons by two opposing sides could cause the complete annihilation of both the attacker and the defender. This horrific outcome would be so unfavorable that in theory it would lead to the deterrence of war. However, this policy led to a number of side effects including an arms race that led to thermonuclear weapons and, as Eisenhower biographer Jean Edward Smith argues, “the possibility of mutual assured annihilation scarcely made for restful sleeping.”¹⁰ Bomb drills in schools, bomb shelters in homes, and bomb movies in theaters all became a natural part of life. For many the fear of nuclear destruction did not seem abstract, but real. By 1956, nearly 63% of those polled believed that if there were to be another war, the hydrogen bomb would be used against the United States.¹¹

The US government rallied against these fears with all of its available weapons, as they turned to one that they used so successfully during World War II: film. During World War II the entire US film industry worked so closely with the War Department that their marriage produced more propaganda than ever before and forevermore linked popular art with national politics.¹² After the war, their relationship had a number of fits and starts as the House of Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) accused moviemakers as posing a communist threat to national security. Following this clash, Hollywood produced many anticommunist films which propaganda scholars Sara and James Combs describe as Hollywood getting caught up in the nationwide “Communist hysteria.”¹³ In these films communist spies who recalled figures like

¹⁰ Jean Edward Smith, *Eisenhower in War and Peace* (New York: Random House, 2012), 646.

¹¹ Gallup, *The Gallup Poll*, 1434.

¹² Thomas Doherty, *Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture and World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 5.

¹³ James Combs and Sara Combs, “The Postwar Agenda” *Film Propaganda and American Politics: An Analysis and Filmography* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1994), 84.

Alger Hiss and Klaus Fuchs—who had both been sentenced to prison, accused of being Soviet spies—were everywhere. In these films, spies are villains, not heroes. The heroes are often tough, hardboiled, somewhat sadistic, self-employed private detectives like Mickey Spillane’s Mike Hammer in *Kiss Me Deadly* (1955).¹⁴

At the same time that these anticommunist films were in theaters, the United States Civil Defense Administration (USCDA) began making short films that downplayed the threat of nuclear destruction. Examples of these films include *Duck and Cover*, which showed people hiding under a picnic blanket to protect themselves from an atomic blast, and *The House in the Middle*, which demonstrated that houses that were freshly painted and clear of garbage were more likely to survive nuclear destruction than dirty and unattended houses that you might find in “slum areas.”¹⁵ These films underplayed the danger of nuclear war in order to make it look survivable and manageable and, as one scholar argues, presented “cooperation with the government as the only route through which survival and safety could be achieved.”¹⁶

The films that arguably addressed Cold War anxieties more than any other in this era were the science fiction films of the 1950s. Films like *The Day the Earth Stood Still* (1951), *War of the Worlds* (1953), and *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956) all spoke to one way or another to fears of destruction and paranoia. The most blatant and financially successful of these films is *Them!* (1954) the “giant ant” movie, in which smart scientists and brave government men work together to destroy massive insect monsters created by atomic bomb testing in the desert. The last line of the film is haunting as the film’s heroes destroy the last of the ants and someone asks

¹⁴ It is worth noting that though Mickey Spillane’s Mike Hammer novels were some of the best sellers of their day, the film adaptation *Kiss Me Deadly* (1955) was not financially successful upon its initial release.

¹⁵ *The House in the Middle*, United States Civil Defense Administration’s National CleanUp, Paint-Up, Fix Up Bureau, 1954, <http://www.archive.org/details/Houseint1954>.

¹⁶ Tristan Abbott, “Bomb Media, 1953-1964,” *Postmodern Culture* 18, no. 3 (2008).

a scientist what is in store for the future. The scientist replies “Nobody knows, Robert. When Man entered the atomic age, he opened a door into a new world. What we’ll eventually find in that new world, nobody can predict.”¹⁷

Though tales of communist spies and mutant monsters speak to and reveal the Cold War anxieties of the filmmakers, as many historians have noted, it is important to examine the popularity of these films and how audiences understood them. In the case of the anticommunist films, when looked in isolation one would assume that these films were taken seriously. By and large, they were not. An excellent example is Samuel Fuller’s *Pickup on South Street* (1953). Nominally a crime film about a pickpocket who accidentally pickpockets government secrets from a communist spy and is thrown into a world of intrigue has been read by film historians and theorists as either an indictment of communism or of capitalism, or of both, or of neither. Whatever the case, film viewers did not much take to the film at the time. A reviewer for *Variety* wrote “if *Pickup on South Street* makes any point at all, it’s that there is nothing really wrong with pickpockets, even when they are given to violence as long as they don’t play footsie with Communist spies. Since this is at best a thin theme, *Pickup* for the most part falls flat on its face and borders on, presumably unintended, comedy.”¹⁸ The film, like most films about communist spies made at this time, was not financially successful. Similarly, while much attention has been paid to the monster films of this era, these too were by no means the most successful films of the era. *Them!* which is often cited as the most successful of all monster movies from the time, came in fifty-first in the box office for 1954.¹⁹ These monster films were seldom taken seriously and

¹⁷ *Them!*, directed by Gordon Douglas (Warner Bros., 1954) DVD (2002).

¹⁸ Quoted in Paul Duncan and Jürgen Müller, *Film Noir* (Cologne: Taschen, 2017), 502.

¹⁹ Michael Gebert, *The Encyclopedia of Movie Awards* (New York: St. Martin’s Paperbacks, 1996).

garnered very little press.²⁰ The true box office draws of this era were films that let people escape from the fears of the day such as biblical epics, light-hearted musicals, romantic comedies, and melodramas all of which addressed Cold War anxieties in one way or another, as the next chapter will explore, yet were much subtler in their dealings with communists threats or the bomb.

As the decade progressed, and the legacy of HUAC began to fade, Hollywood more directly began exploring the ramifications of a nuclear world. The most notable of these films is undoubtedly *On the Beach* (1959). The film, which stars Gregory Peck, Ava Gardner, and Fred Astaire (in a nonmusical role), is shockingly bleak as it explores the potential future and the repercussions of nuclear war. The film is set in Australia, in the aftermath of World War III in which nuclear weapons were used in massive retaliation. In a truly MAD outcome, everyone on earth has died except for the last inhabitants on the continent of Australia. They too know they are not long for this world as they wait patiently for the nuclear radiation fallout to drift on the winds and slowly kill them. Gregory Peck plays a US naval captain who travels back to the US to see if there is anyone left alive, peppering the film with a sliver of hope. However, he finds nothing. He returns to Australia as we watch every character we have grown to care for throughout the course of the picture, die. We watch a young couple take a handful of pills before the radiation comes, and die. We watch Fred Astaire, America's favorite musical star, commit suicide by locking himself in a garage while turning on a car and pumping the exhaust. Finally, Gregory Peck and his crew decide if they are to die, they would prefer to do it in America and head home to meet their doom on their own terms. The film ends by showing scenes of empty and abandoned city streets which earlier in the film had been shown bustling with people. The

²⁰ These films did become popular eventually, but it was only after they began running on television in the 1960s onward.

last shot zooms in on a banner that was created for a religious revival earlier in the film that reads “There is still time...brother.”

The film’s incredibly bleak ending and sharp message reveals much of the anxieties surrounding Eisenhower’s MAD policy and offers a searing critique of it.²¹ In a world with nuclear weapons and opposing forces, the only outcome is the complete destruction of the human race. No one will be saved, not young lovers, not children, not Fred Astaire. The film’s plea is the same as McCormick’s after the first bomb was dropped on Hiroshima: make peace, or perish. There was no individual, no one hero who could save the day. It would take the whole world to save the world or destroy it.

Despite significant press, fanfare, positive critical response, as well as being perhaps the most talked about film of the year, *On the Beach* recorded a loss of \$700,000 at the box office.²² Historian Tony Shaw claims, “*On the Beach* was talked about by more people than actually watched it.”²³ Opinion polls reveal that most Americans claimed the film’s content was just too bleak.²⁴ This is not to say that the film did not have an impact. Quite the contrary, it reveals just how scary the film’s images were to its potential audience. *On the Beach*’s loss at the box office also informed film producers as to what audiences wanted to see on screen. Many producers concluded that viewers did not want to sit through an apocalyptic vision of a potential future, when instead they could laugh with Doris Day and Rock Hudson in *Pillow Talk* (1959). Audiences wanted something hopeful, someone they could cheer for, someone who could perhaps lead them to a “New Frontier.”

²¹ It is unlikely that it is mere coincidences that Gregory Peck’s character, symbolically the last American alive, is named Dwight.

²² Tino Balio, *United Artists: The Company That Changed the Film Industry* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press 1987) 144.

²³ Tony Shaw, *Hollywood’s Cold War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 158.

²⁴ Shaw, *Hollywood’s Cold War*, 158.

The President, the CIA, and James Bond

John F. Kennedy attached a great importance to putting distance between himself and Eisenhower. Kennedy wanted to be seen as man of youth, vitality, and action, going so far as to be reluctant to be photographed playing golf, for fear that he might be compared to his more leisurely predecessor.²⁵ One of the areas Kennedy was most set on distancing himself was in US foreign policy, as he anchored his campaign for president on a pledge to abandon the doctrine of massive retaliation.²⁶ Instead, Kennedy championed what came to be known as “flexible response,” which gave policymakers a wide variety of options for engagement around the world, that was not limited to threats of nuclear war. The flexible response strategy involved tailoring a response to a direct attack or limited war throughout the world on a case-by-case basis using small strategic strike forces to contain communism and protect national security. Kennedy’s biographer Robert Dallek claims that the idea of nuclear war was abhorrent to Kennedy, “but the idea of patriotic men prepared to sacrifice their lives for the freedom of their country was an entirely different matter. [Kennedy] saw no higher recommendation for someone than patriotic courage.”²⁷ Perhaps that is why, as a profile in *Life* magazine wrote, Kennedy had a particular “weakness” for Ian Fleming’s “under cover man, James Bond.”²⁸

James Bond first appeared in print in 1953, in the novel *Casino Royale*, and arrived on the market to moderate success, primarily in the UK. Ian Fleming, a former naval intelligence officer himself, wrote the book from his vacation home in Jamaica that he had named Goldeneye, drawing inspiration from some details from his own experience and most from his

²⁵ John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 153.

²⁶ Smith, *Eisenhower in War and Peace*, 646.

²⁷ Robert Dallek, *John F. Kennedy: An Unfinished Life, 1917-1963* (Boston: Back Bay Books, 2004), 362.

²⁸ Hugh Sidey, “The President’s Voracious Reading Habits,” *Life*, March 17, 1961, 59.

imagination. Fleming continued writing novels and short stories starring his superspy hero, and with each book the character slowly became more popular. However, Fleming's rise in popularity was greeted by a strong and vocal critical backlash, best articulated by critic Paul Johnson who described the character of Bond as encapsulating "the sadism of a schoolboy bully, the mechanical, two-dimensional sex-longings of a frustrated adolescent, and the crude, snob-cravings of a suburban adult."²⁹

And yet, in 1961, when *Life* magazine asked President Kennedy to list his top ten favorite books of all time, he listed Fleming's Bond novel *From Russia with Love*.³⁰ The article also mentioned that Allen Dulles, then the current director of the CIA, was a big fan of Bond. Dulles claimed that Jacqueline Kennedy gave him his first Bond novel, telling him that it was a book he in particular should have, and that he had been a fan ever since.³¹ Such high-profile endorsements sent Bond book sales in the US through the roof, instantly making Bond a household name in the US.

The character of James Bond was practically the antithesis of Eisenhower's "New Look" policy. He is brash, headstrong, and a man of action. He shoots first and thinks later. Deterrence is rarely his style. He stops nuclear war not by strong words and thought-out policy decisions, but by facing the villain head on in thrilling, two-fisted combat. Bond has license to engage the enemy, wherever they are in the world, in small-scale warfare as a means to protect the "free world." Bond adjusts his techniques on a case-by-case basis when confronting his enemies, sometimes employing small armies to help him contain evil villains from threatening the world with nuclear destruction. In essence, Bond is flexible response.

²⁹ Paul Johnson, "Sex, Snobbery and Sadism," *New Statesman*, April 5, 1958, 430.

³⁰ Sidey, "The President's Voracious Reading Habits," 59.

³¹ Sidey, "The President's Voracious Reading Habits," 59.

While Bond is the opposite of “New Look,” he is also by no means in line with the critique of massive retaliation found in films like *On the Beach*. *On the Beach* depicted a world that could not be saved by any one person, a world that was doomed unless the people of the earth worked together to denuclearize and prevent a horrific version of the future from coming true. Bond, on the other hand, represents a figure who alone prevents *On the Beach* from coming true. With his determination and skill Bond, the individual, a modern-day gunslinger, stops maniacal villains and re-establishes the status quo. The superpowers often learn nothing and return to normal Cold War relations. Bond’s adventures end not with a call for denuclearization, but instead an excitement for Bond’s next mission which undoubtedly will involve the bomb in some form or another.

Bond’s adventures are also very different from the earlier anticommunist films Hollywood made in the early 1950s. There is no hysteria in Bond’s world. He is always calm, cool, and collected. Also, and perhaps most importantly for the audience, Bond stories do not take themselves too seriously. Above all else, the goal of a Bond story is to be fun and entertaining, not address the anxieties of the day. Yet the intention of the storytellers and how the story gets used are often very different things. The stories, though conceived as adventure novels for a mass audience, were widely read and used by very influential people in the government. When Ian Fleming was asked about why Bond appealed to Kennedy and others like him he theorized that “many politicians like my books, I think perhaps because politicians like solutions, with everything properly tied up at the end. Politicians always hope for neat solutions, you know, but so rarely can they find them.”³²

³² “Playboy Interview: Ian Fleming,” *Playboy*, December 1965, 106.

Bond's arrival on the scene in America, aided by his presidential endorsement, also came at a very useful time for Kennedy, Dulles, and the CIA. One month after Kennedy and Dulles had sung the praises of Ian Fleming's spy hero, The Bay of Pigs Invasion in Cuba very publically failed. The invasion had become a fiasco that cost more than a hundred lives and deeply embarrassed Kennedy and the CIA.³³ Kennedy reportedly asked his brother and attorney general, Robert Kennedy, "Why couldn't this have happened to James Bond?"³⁴ The CIA was now under the microscope and was getting dissected from a variety of angles. *The New York Times* a few days after the failed invasion reported that the CIA was under review by General Maxwell Taylor. The article stated that "[w]e have long supported" that "Congress should have greater control over the CIA, which, though it spends vast sums of money, is virtually a law unto itself, subject only to Presidential direction."³⁵ Cartoons mocked the CIA as blind fools; groups picketed the CIA headquarters on a hunger strike; and the public criticisms continued.³⁶ One writer proclaimed that "the fault for one of the great blunders in the history of [US] relations with Latin America" lies with the CIA, and that the "CIA, therefore, needs re-examination in its personnel, methods, functions and authority."³⁷ If these measures that were being called for were to go into effect, the President would have much less power when it came to the CIA, which in turn would make his ability to make quick foreign policy decision less flexible.³⁸ Despite calls to

³³ Dallek, *John F. Kennedy*, 366.

³⁴ Quoted in Evan Thomas, *Robert Kennedy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000), 123.

³⁵ "Reappraising the CIA," *The New York Times*, April 26, 1961, 38.

³⁶ "Four Impressions of the CIA Controversy," *The New York Times*, April 30, 1961, 168; "Group Pickets CIA," *The New York Times*, May 1, 1961, 3.

³⁷ "CIA Under the Microscope," *The New York Times*, May 9, 1961, 38.

³⁸ It is worth noting that after the failed Bay of Pigs invasion, Kennedy was reportedly furious with the CIA. However, his misgivings over the agency eventually subsided over time and none of the major restructuring he called for occurred.

reform the CIA, sales of Bond novels, a superspy with little to no oversight, continued to rise in the US at this time, based in large part on Kennedy's recommendation.

Then starting on October 16, 1962, the US entered what came to be known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. For thirteen terrifying days, the fears of massive retaliation, of MAD, and of the potential future of *On the Beach* returned in full force and with even greater intensity. With ballistic missiles in Cuba aimed at the US, children practiced duck-and-cover drills in schools, clergymen exhorted their congregations to stand with the President and pray for peace, and those fortunate enough to have bomb shelters readied themselves for the worst.³⁹ Fortunately, the crisis was averted and Americans were able to breathe a sigh of relief as they took a step back from the brink. However, they had seen just how close nuclear war could come. The potential threat had seemed more real than ever before. A Gallup poll that surveyed Americans a few months after the Cuban Missile Crisis asked what they thought their chances of survival were in the event of a nuclear war: 37 percent said their chances were just 50-50, while 52 percent said their chances of survival were poor.⁴⁰

Many scholars have explored the effects of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Jerome Shappiro argues that the Cuban Missile Crisis rattled American self-confidence and “dispelled the myth of American omnipotence, invulnerability, and isolation from an otherwise chaotic world.”⁴¹ Soon a group of anti-nuclear war films such as *Ladybug, Ladybug* (1963), *Fail Safe* (1964), *Seven Days in May* (1964), and *Dr. Strangelove or: How I learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* (1964) went into production, all of which ridiculed the excesses of the Cold War. On television, *The Twilight Zone* and *The Outer Limits* explored the possibility of nuclear war and the monsters

³⁹ “Heads Down—But Not the Spirit,” *Life*, November 9, 1962, 38.

⁴⁰ Only 5% said their chances of survival were very good, and 6% said they had no opinion. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll*, 1808.

⁴¹ Jerome Shapiro, *Atomic Bomb Cinema: The Apocalyptic Imagination on Film* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2001), 150.

it may create, both human and otherworldly. Scholars have pointed to these films and television shows as examples of Americans losing faith in their institutions and their government.⁴² Though this may have been the case for some, in order to draw the conclusion that this is how everyone felt at the time, one would have to ignore the most famous film character that arrived in this era: James Bond.

The first James Bond film *Dr. No* was released in the United States in May of 1963, seven months after the Cuban Missile Crisis. The film starred Sean Connery as the cool, collected, and urbane hero James Bond. The film's main locale is Jamaica, and portrays the hero-spy's confidence in his ability to exert his role as a secret agent and protect the "free world." His success in thwarting an evil missile based plot in the Caribbean recalled the Cuban Missile Crisis, only here stopping the bad guys looked like a lot of fun. Film critic Bosley Crowther wrote that "this lively picture," is "not to be taken seriously as realistic fiction or even art," and was instead "pure, escapist bunk."⁴³ Crowther's summary was in line with most of the critical reception for the film. Like the novels, the film was viewed as fun, silly, a little over the top, but a good way to escape for a few hours. *Dr. No*, performed well at the box office in the US, but was not a smash hit. However, President Kennedy did arrange for a private showing of the film in the White House.⁴⁴

Three months after the film's release Ian Fleming published his next Bond novel *On Her Majesty's Secret Service*, which quickly reached *The New York Times* best seller list and remained there for over six months.⁴⁵ Reviews of the book consistently made a point to highlight

⁴² Paul Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light*, 535.

⁴³ Bosley Crowther, "'Dr. No,' Mystery Spoof," *The New York Times*, May 30, 1963, 15.

⁴⁴ Klaus Dodds, "Screen Geopolitics: James Bond and the Early Cold War Films (1962-1967)," *Geopolitics* 10, no. 2 (2005): 271.

⁴⁵ Raymond Benson, *The James Bond Bedside Companion* (London: Boxtree, 1988), 24.

that President Kennedy was a fan of the character, further linking national politics with the hero.⁴⁶ Even more so, Allen Dulles—who had now stepped down as the head of the CIA—in his book *The Craft of Intelligence*, published the same year as Fleming’s new novel, made a point to highlight “Ian Fleming’s hero, the unique James Bond, in *On Her Majesty’s Secret Service*, which I read with great pleasure.”⁴⁷ Dulles emphasized that Bond’s adventures bore little resemblance to the life of an actual spy, but that his adventures were so thrilling they were worth reading for the fun of it. Also, Dulles at this point had struck up a correspondence with Fleming, that had started while Dulles was still head of the CIA. Dulles wrote that he “kept in constant touch,” with Fleming and on a few occasions consulted with him on matters of espionage.⁴⁸ Fleming in return, Dulles noted “kindly kept sending me his books.”⁴⁹ Perhaps in a post Bay of Pigs, Cuban Missile Crisis context, when the accountability of the CIA and to a certain degree the capability of the government was being challenged, Dulles and others like him saw value in promoting and aligning themselves with a popular figure who represented the best the government had to offer and the importance of a flexible response strategy when it came to foreign affairs. That the books and the films were highly unrealistic was not a problem. In fact, it was actually a benefit. In the past when Cold War films took themselves seriously, by and large audiences did not respond. But when they were big, colorful, action-packed extravaganzas the subtler message of the necessity of spies intervening throughout the entire globe was able to sneak through.

⁴⁶ A typical example: “Nothing this review can say is going to keep a few million American readers (including our President) from reading the latest adventure of James Bond.” Anthony Boucher, “On Assignment with James Bond,” *The New York Times*, August 25, 1963, 135.

⁴⁷ Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 199.

⁴⁸ Allen Dulles, “Our Spy-Boss Who Loved Bond,” *Life*, August 28, 1964, 19.

⁴⁹ Dulles, “Our Spy-Boss Who Loved Bond,” 19.

The next Bond film released was based off of Kennedy's favorite of Fleming's novels, *From Russia with Love* (1963). According to Theodore Sorensen, Kennedy's speechwriter and trusted advisor, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. was able to secure a screening for Kennedy to watch *From Russia with Love* before the film was officially released in the US.⁵⁰ It was November 1963. The next day Kennedy was to head for Dallas, Texas. It was the last film John F. Kennedy ever saw.⁵¹

Bondmania

The nation was in mourning after the assassination of Kennedy, as Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in to office. Johnson, who differed with Kennedy on a variety of issues, was a strong believer in flexible response and continued the policy, perhaps even more than Kennedy himself would have done.⁵² Particularly in an area with which many Americans were becoming more and more familiar: Vietnam. Meanwhile, *From Russia with Love* was finally released in the US in May of 1964. Perhaps out of some nostalgia for the fallen President and his favorite hero, or because audiences wanted to watch a confident hero provide some security in an increasingly anxious time, or merely because more people were becoming familiar with the character and wanted to escape into a fun action film, *From Russia with Love* proved to be much more successful at the box office than *Dr. No*.⁵³ Later that year the film was re-released on a double-bill with *Dr. No* and both films performed even better than before, as more and more people in

⁵⁰ Theodore Sorensen, "Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., 1917-2007," *The American Prospect*, last modified March 18, 2007, <https://prospect.org/article/arthur-m-schlesinger-jr-1917-2007-0>.

⁵¹ In a strange coincidence, a few days after the shooting, it was reported that Lee Harvey Oswald had checked out several of Ian Fleming's novels from the library just prior to the assassination. Fred Powledge, "Clues to Oswald Traced in Books," *The New York Times*, November 28, 1963, 23.

⁵² Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 180; Another thing Kennedy and Johnson had in common was their appreciation for James Bond. According to list compiled by the LBJ Library staff, though Johnson did not watch many movies, the James Bond films were among the few of his favorite films.

⁵³ *From Russia with Love* was the fifth highest grossing movie of 1964 in the US. Matthew Field and Ajay Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero: The Remarkable Story of the James Bond Films* (Stroud: The History Press, 2015), 97.

the US began flocking to theater to watch the super spy contain villains' evil plans in exotic locations throughout the developing world.

In the interim between *From Russia with Love* and the now highly anticipated follow-up, *Goldfinger*, Bond's creator Ian Fleming died of a heart attack at the age of 56. Allen Dulles wrote his obituary for *Life* magazine. In it, Dulles made reference to Kennedy's influence in the popularity of Bond in the US, but he also argued that "[t]his generation seems to be attuned to spy stories and I wonder why. It is true that, as never before, great governments have gone into the spy business...large organizations have been built up and they are engaged in a kind of conflict that seems to intrigue people."⁵⁴ Dulles went on to re-assert as he did in his book that Bond bore very little resemblance to real spies, yet he then wrote that "I often said when I was director of Central Intelligence that I would be glad to hire several James Bonds."⁵⁵ Dulles then explained that in particular he was attracted to Bond's gadgets, and that he tasked his people at the CIA with developing many of them into gadgets for the real world, some which worked and others that did not. Despite claiming that Bond was unlike real spies, Dulles did not do a very good job of convincing readers otherwise.

Coinciding with the rise in Bond's popularity, criticisms of the CIA that had been extremely hot following the Bay of Pigs invasion were now beginning to cool. Now instead of calling for more accountability, some writers and journalists were pleading for more secrecy and leniency for the CIA. One editorial stated that although "no organ of government can or should be exempt from public scrutiny in a democracy, an agency like the CIA can at least ask that such

⁵⁴ Dulles, "Our Spy-Boss Who Loved Bond," 19.

⁵⁵ Dulles, "Our Spy-Boss Who Loved Bond," 19.

secrecy as is essential to its function be respected,” and that “in our judgment, the CIA to date deserves the confidence of the nation.”⁵⁶

In January of 1965, the eagerly awaited next installment in the Bond franchise was released in the US. To call *Goldfinger* a financial success would be putting it mildly. *Goldfinger* broke box office records everywhere.⁵⁷ *Variety* frantically reported that “*Goldfinger* isn’t just big. It is, to use the word advisedly, incomparable. In the first fourteen weeks of its domestic release it has racked up rentals for United Artists of \$10,374,807 in 1,409 play dates. No other film in the memory of film historians has ever performed with such speed for such a volume.”⁵⁸ By early 1965, the film had entered *The Guinness Book of Records* as the fastest grossing film of all time.⁵⁹

Explanations for the film’s success soon became a mainstay of newspaper columns and popular magazines. One of the more interesting interpretations of Bond’s success came from French movie critic Claude Mauriac, whose review was translated and examined for American audiences in *The New Yorker*. Mauriac claimed that the Bond character was successful because he “is one of the archetypes that Jung discovered in the collective unconscious—the strong man, the all-powerful one who triumphs over evil incarnate in the shape of dragons and monsters,” and Bond’s dragons, he argued, came in the form of “the bomb.”⁶⁰

At the same time that Bond was enjoying success with filmgoers, spy novels began to take the literary world by storm. John le Carré’s *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* had just enjoyed a nine-month run as the number one *New York Times* best seller, the marketing of which

⁵⁶ “Let’s Stop Baiting the CIA,” *Life*, March 6, 1964, 4.

⁵⁷ Field and Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero*, 119.

⁵⁸ Vincent Canby, “United Artists’ Fort Knox,” *Weekly Variety*, March 31, 1965.

⁵⁹ Field and Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero*, 118.

⁶⁰ Genêt, “Letter from Paris,” *The New Yorker*, March 20, 1965, 166.

heavily leaned on presenting “the real” life of a spy, in contrast to the fantastical world of Bond. Len Deighton’s *Funeral in Berlin*, Adam Hall’s *Quiller Memorandum*, and Donald Hamilton’s Matt Helm series all featured spies as their heroes and were all financially successful. Even Mickey Spillane, the creator of the private eye Mike Hammer and who was often written about as the popular torch bearer before Ian Fleming, took a break from his most famous character to write a series of novels starring a new character, Tiger Mann, a secret agent tasked with keeping the nation safe and liberty alive in the developing world.

In 1965, book critic Conrad Knickerbocker attempted to examine why this wave of spy fiction was taking over the literary market. He wrote that the “key to their popularity rests in the yearnings of their readers. Baffled by Vietnam, angered by sonic booms, they feel increasingly overwhelmed by the vast forces that now shape events.”⁶¹ Knickerbocker argued that the “spy craze is not rooted in the ‘bloody realities’ at all but in our yearning for a time when courage and honor, doubt and sorrow, pride and betrayal moved history, a time when the individual deed counted for more than it does now. Rogue-saints make the complex front page seem simple, and one can sleep nights, ignoring the megatons aimed in our direction.”⁶²

Making the front page appear even simpler, and inspired by the success of *Goldfinger* and the recent wave of popular spy fiction, television producers quickly organized a fresh slate of espionage themed shows. *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.*, which debuted to weak ratings in 1964, soon rose to one of the most watched television shows in 1965, with over 12 million American homes watching each week.⁶³ The show starred Robert Vaughn as Napoleon Solo (a name which Ian Fleming contributed to the show before he passed away) and David McCallum as Illya

⁶¹ Conrad Knickerbocker, “The Spies Who Come in from Next Door,” *Life*, April 30, 1965, 13.

⁶² Knickerbocker, “The Spies Who Come in from Next Door,” 13.

⁶³ Anthony Enns, “The Fans from U.N.C.L.E.: The Marketing and Reception of the Swinging ‘60s Spy Phenomenon,” *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 28, no. 3 (2000): 126.

Kuryakin as two suave super spies who prevent the evil forces of THRUSH from taking over the world. The show soon amassed a very large and dedicated fan base. *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.*'s savvy marketing team created an U.N.C.L.E. fan club that included an official membership card. The membership cards were in such high demand MGM claimed that it sent out 70,000 cards a month.⁶⁴ A profile on the show's high-tech gadgets that appeared in *Popular Mechanics* chronicled how the show's star Robert Vaughn was at an event with Vice-President Hubert Humphrey and was approached by one of the members of Humphrey's Secret Service detail. According to the article the agent said to Vaughn "I'd like to ask you for U.N.C.L.E. membership cards for myself and the other agents assigned to the Vice-President."⁶⁵ The article went on to say that as "a result of his request, there are now a number of card-carrying U.N.C.L.E. agents among the Secret Service."⁶⁶ Whether the story is true or a clever publicity story, is not as important as the fact that increasingly, the government and real agents were more and more aligning themselves and being compared to these fictional heroes that were growing exponentially in popularity.

The Man from U.N.C.L.E.'s loyal fan base routinely wrote fan letters to the show which reveal how audiences viewed and took inspiration from the show. Most fans wrote in saying that they loved the show for its escapist entertainment such as one who wrote "no matter how tough life gets I can look forward to my weekly retreat from the civilized (?) world, into my world—the wonderful world of...mysterious (and oh! so wonderful!) agents... you have made my life worth living."⁶⁷ Others saw the show not as a place to escape, but something to be inspired by.

⁶⁴ W. Stevenson Bacon, "Crazy Gadgets of 'The Man from U.N.C.L.E.," *Popular Mechanics*, December 1965, 186.

⁶⁵ Bacon, "Crazy Gadgets of 'The Man from U.N.C.L.E.," 186.

⁶⁶ Bacon, "Crazy Gadgets of 'The Man from U.N.C.L.E.," 186.

⁶⁷ Quoted in Enns, "The Fans from U.N.C.L.E.," 124.

One young fan wrote in to say that “*The Man from U.N.C.L.E.* has influenced my whole life. I now do better in school, I want to be an agent for the CIA in a few years,” just like the characters on the show.⁶⁸ An article in *TV Guide* claimed that the UN was inundated from teenage and adult fans of the show requesting applications to become agents. An unnamed source from the UN in the article claimed that “One guy was so intent on becoming a secret agent we suggested that he get in touch with Interpol.”⁶⁹ Organizations that dealt in espionage that were being publicly criticized for failed operations and bad intel only a few years prior, were now, through the help of fictional heroes, depicted and written about as an exciting and desirable place to work.

The Man from U.N.C.L.E. was not alone in its positive depictions of spies on television. Quite the contrary, 1965 saw a slew of spy show join the airwaves. *I Spy* starred Robert Culp and Bill Cosby as tennis bums who were actually undercover agents for the CIA. *Amos Burke* and *Honey West*, which both were private detective shows, were converted to spy shows in 1965. *The Wild, Wild West* blended the western with the new spy craze, as US agents in the Old West used futuristic gadgets to save the day. The British television show *The Avengers*, which first aired in the UK in 1961, premiered in the US for the first time in 1965 becoming one of the first British series to air in prime time in the US. The show starred Patrick Macnee and Diana Rigg as two supremely capable and confident secret agents who never lose their cool under any circumstance. Another British television show *Danger Man*, starring Patrick McGoohan, had debuted in the US in 1961 directly after the Bay of Pigs Invasion and was soon cancelled. However, on the heels of this new wave of spy media the show was revived, and retitled *Secret Agent*, in 1965. A year later, *Mission: Impossible* premiered which featured episodes that often centered on the

⁶⁸ Quoted in Enns, “The Fans from U.N.C.L.E.,” 129.

⁶⁹ H. Harding, “The United Nations Gets Inquiries about *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.*,” *TV Guide*, January 8, 1966, A-1.

overthrowing of a government in a small communist country that was causing problems for the “free world.” That same year, the U.N.C.L.E. spinoff *The Girl from U.N.C.L.E.*, starring Stefanie Powers as secret agent April Dancer, premiered. There were enough spy shows to warrant a popular spoof, in Mel Brooks and Buck Henry’s *Get Smart*, which starred Don Adams, as an inept secret agent whose gadgets rarely work, and Barbara Feldon, as his much smarter and more resourceful partner. With the bombardment of spy shows *Life* magazine ran a feature titled the “Great TV Spy Scramble,” which noted while all these shows were “flagrant imitators” of James Bond they all seemed set for success.⁷⁰

Never to be outdone by television, film producers rushed to put hundreds of Bond imitators into theaters. James Coburn starred as Derek Flint in two films, *Our Man Flint* (1966) and *In Like Flint* (1967), which were marketed as the American version of Bond. Dean Martin played swinging secret agent Matt Helm in four films, *The Silencers* (1966), *Murderers’ Row* (1966), *The Ambushers* (1967), and *The Wrecking Crew* (1969), which were goofy light-hearted romps that featured Helm preventing crazy villains from destroying the US with nuclear bombs. Both the Flint and Helm films were very successful: in 1966 *Our Man Flint*, *The Silencers*, and *Murderers’ Row* all ranked within the top 20th highest grossing films for the year. On the more serious side of espionage Michael Caine starred as Harry Palmer in three films: *The Ipcress File* (1965), *Funeral in Berlin* (1966), and *Billion Dollar Brain* (1967). John le Carré’s best seller *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* was adapted into a film in 1965 starring Richard Burton as a disenfranchised and world-weary spy. Other popular spy films included *The Quiller Memorandum* (1966), *The Deadly Affair* (1966) and *Arabesque* (1966). Following in the footsteps of *Get Smart*, a wave of spy comedies deluged theaters across the US with entries as

⁷⁰ “Great TV Spy Scramble,” *Life*, October 1, 1965, 118-19.

varied as the Dean Martin and Jerry Lewis rip off starring Marty Allen and Steve Rossi in *The Last of the Secret Agents?* (1966), the comic strip inspired *Modesty Blaise* (1966), and the odd *Dr. Goldfoot and the Bikini Machine* (1965) which combined Vincent Price horror films with Frankie Avalon beach party movies, and mixed them together with a Bond inspired spy plot.⁷¹ On top of all these films, hundreds of Bond rip offs came pouring in from overseas from Japan, France, West Germany, and the ever-prolific Italy. These films did not receive wide releases in the US, but did play on double-bills and in drive-ins during this period. The strangest of all of these is certainly the Italian produced *Operation Kid Brother* (1967) which starred Sean Connery's real-life brother Neil, as a Bond inspired hero. To make matters stranger, Bernard Lee, who played M in the legitimate Bond films, Lois Maxwell, who played Moneypenny, as well as Daniela Bianchi, Adolfo Celi, and Anthony Dawson, all of whom had starred in Bond films, all appear alongside Neil Connery in *Operation Kid Brother*.

Despite the wave of imitators, the most famous spy of all remained, James Bond. The follow up film to *Goldfinger*, *Thunderball* (1965), was released to even greater anticipation. In expectation for the film's release, images of Sean Connery as James Bond along with various women from the film were featured on the covers of *Esquire*, *Life*, *Look*, *Photoplay*, *Playboy*, *Modern Man*, *True*, *Popular Science*, and *Skin Diver* magazine, which eagerly awaited the film's underwater scenes. The profiles in these magazines ranged from tales of the film's production, to ranking the desirability of the actresses in the films, to the plausibility of the gadgets in the film being used by the real CIA. Posters and advertising material promised "the biggest Bond of all!" which turned out to not be an exaggeration.⁷² The film opened to remarkable success, with some

⁷¹ The film was successful enough to inspire a sequel the following year, *Dr. Goldfoot and the Girl Bombs* (1966).

⁷² Alastair Dougall, *James Bond: 50 Years of Movie Posters*, (New York: DK Publishing, 2016), 74.

theaters running 24 hour screenings to meet the demand.⁷³ Like *Goldfinger* before it, *Thunderball* broke box office records and ended up becoming the highest grossing Bond film to date.⁷⁴

More than anything that happened within the film, by far the most influential aspect of *Thunderball* was its massive roll-out of Bond related merchandise that brought flexible response into the home in a visible and tactile way. An article titled “There’s Gold in That 007 Label” explained to readers how prevalent the Bond brand had become.⁷⁵ The article noted that the “biggest thing going for agent 007 was that he fit into both the children’s and the adult markets.”⁷⁶ Advertisements for Bond toys appeared in comic books and children’s magazines like *Boys’ Life* which promised young readers that they would “spend hours of fun chasing enemy agents underwater with the new James Bond 007 Underwater Kit.”⁷⁷ The kit included products such as the 007 H2O Snorkel-Blasters, a snorkel that doubled as a water pistol, and the James Bond 007 Body Builder Kit which stated that to “compete in the Secret Service, a young agent must stay in top-notch shape. The 007 Body Builder Kit—with chest pull body conditioner and hand grips does the job.”⁷⁸ Perhaps the most popular of all of the Bond toys was the James Bond Secret Agent 007 *SA Special Agent Automatic Pistol, Scope and Silencer, a toy gun

⁷³ Vincent Canby, “Bond Films Keep Their Deadly Allure,” *The New York Times*, December 22, 1965, 23.

⁷⁴ If adjusted for inflation *Thunderball* remains the highest grossing Bond film of all time.

⁷⁵ Walter Carlson, “Advertising: There’s Gold in That 007 Label,” *New York Times*, March 11, 1965, 53.

⁷⁶ Carlson, “Advertising: There’s Gold in That 007 Label,” 53.

⁷⁷ “James Bond 007,” *Boys’ Life*, May 1966, 54.

⁷⁸ “James Bond 007,” 54.

which is displayed in Figure 1.



Figure 1. James Bond Secret Agent 007 *SA Special Agent Automatic Pistol, Scope and Silencer (Multiple Toymakers, US/Canada, c.1965). Source: “Guns,” Toys of Bond, last modified 2019, http://www.toysofbond.co.uk/Toys_and_Games/james_bond_toy_guns_ppk.html.

The back of the box claimed that “007 is the undercover identity of the most feared yet most respected of all Secret Service operative—the daring James Bond,” who “pursues those bent on tyranny and evil to every corner of the globe.”⁷⁹ These children’s toys were linked explicitly to the Cold War context and encouraged junior spies to act out their own flexible response scenarios. A decade earlier, suburban kids were likely to be seen running around the neighborhood pretending to be Davy Crockett on the wild frontier. Now they were imagining themselves as secret agents employed by the government, in service to the New Frontier, in adventures that stretched to every corner of the globe.

⁷⁹ “Guns,” Toys of Bond, last modified 2019, http://www.toysofbond.co.uk/Toys_and_Games/james_bond_toy_guns_ppk.html.

For adults, there were a wide variety of products that could help them live out their Bond fantasies. There were neckties, dinner shirts, overcoats, and shoes so one could dress like Bond. There was aftershave, cologne, and perfume so one could smell like Bond. There were the movies' iconic soundtracks so one could sound like Bond—John Barry's brassy score for *Goldfinger*, which featured Shirley Bassey singing the title song, rocketed up the charts in the US to number one and remained there for three weeks.⁸⁰ There were 007 lighters, jewelry, and stationary to give that extra touch of Bond. There was even a 007 gun shaped vodka pourer depicted in Figure 2 so one could drink like Bond.



Figure 2. 007 gun shaped vodka pourer (Maker unknown, US, c. 1965). Source: "Food & Drink," Toys of Bond, last modified 2019, http://www.toysofbond.co.uk/Consumables/james_bond_007_food_drink_smirnoff.html.

Taken together, all of these products reveal a striking and thought-provoking form of Cold War militarization. Both children and adults who purchased these items, in order to be

⁸⁰ Jon Burlingame, *The Music of James Bond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 46.

James Bond in one form or another, were also saying they wanted to be a spy for the government and fight to save the “free world.” In a way, these products promoted American foreign policy and endorsed the government’s right to keep secrets and use spies and soldiers wherever they believed there was a threat to freedom. In the 1950s, anticommunist spy movies made it seem like evil spies were everywhere. Now spies were everywhere. They were in movies, on television, in novels, in comic books, on magazines racks, in toy stores, in clothing shops, in record stores, on vodka pourers, and on lunchboxes. To varying degrees, many wanted to be spies, or at least live what they imagined to be the spy lifestyle that Bond represented. Much of the films that directly addressed the Cold War in the 1950s which were often not successful with audiences took themselves so seriously they would sometimes border on “presumable unintended, comedy.” Most of the successful spy media in the 1960s was the opposite. The Bond films were not to be taken seriously. They were “pure, escapist bunk.” Most of the Bond inspired media that was successful, the Derek Flint films, the Matt Helm films, *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.*, and *Get Smart*, had a distinctly comedic bent to them. This spy media, as one U.N.C.L.E. fan put it, meant that “no matter how tough life gets” one could look forward to their “weekly retreat from the civilized (?) world” into the world of “mysterious (and oh! so wonderful!) agents.”

However, this retreat into the fictional world of spies, was not too far from reality. True there were not maniacal, patch-eyed, cat stroking, Nehru jacket wearing, super-criminals who planned to sink the world into the ocean or some such plot. But there were spies and soldiers employed by the US who were being sent, as the back of the box for the James Bond toy gun put it, “to every corner of the globe” to retrieve information, topple governments, and contain communism. Unlike 1950s propaganda that so often came from a top down approach, with the

government producing films through the USCDA that depicted the downplayed effects of nuclear bombs, the spy films from the 1960s came from a variety of places and was taken on eagerly by the American public. Perhaps without realizing it, people were so into this spy media they may never have thought how strange it was to be serving drinks with a gun that was licensed to kill for the government. US foreign policy had become engrained in the daily lives of Americans, in a way, flexible response was being practiced and promoted when children pretended to play spies in the pool, when someone turned on the television to watch *Mission: Impossible*, or when they used their 007 drink mixer. The Cold War context had become so apart of peoples' everyday lives that this routine interaction with espionage seemed normal.

Perhaps John F. Kennedy and Allen Dulles recognized the value a figure like Bond could have in providing a popular figurehead for flexible response, and that is why they were so vocal in their recommendations of his stories, or maybe they just enjoyed them for the same reason thousands of others claimed they did, because they were fun stories. Whatever the case, most agree—Ian Fleming included—that without Dulles and Kennedy's recommendations Bond would not have become the success he did in the US.⁸¹ However, it was not their recommendations alone that made him popular. In the famous *Life* article where Kennedy first recommended James Bond, he also recommended David Cecil's biography of Lord Melbourne—which he claimed to be his favorite book—and to the chagrin of Lord Melbourne fans everywhere, there were no long running series of films and spin-off, and toys, and drink pourers featuring Lord Melbourne following the President's recommendation. There was something about Bond and spy stories that appealed to Americans at this particular moment in time. Perhaps

⁸¹ In fact, the films may not have been released in the US without the President's recommendation, as a United Artist executive later recalled, the producers of the Bond film "walked into a situation in which they were really going to receive a favorable ear [from the US distributors at United Artists] because the President of the United States had been reading the books." Field and Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero*, 51.

it was a conflict that intrigued people, perhaps it was a comforting story in a time of fear, or perhaps it was one “of the archetypes that Jung discovered in the collective unconscious.” Whatever the reasons, the particular, tangible, visible effects that the Bond phenomenon manifested was a society that was obsessed with spies, supported spies, and on some level wanted to be spies. It encouraged allowing the government more secrecy, less accountability, and more flexibility. It maintained that in order to keep the “free world” safe, spies and soldiers would have to go to “every corner of the globe,” and take matters into their own hands. And perhaps above all else, unlike the films of the 1950s with their fifth-column communist spies, and their mutant monsters, and the prophecies of *On the Beach*, it made fighting the Cold War look fun.

This form of Cold War militarization, however, was not to last for much longer. On television, increasingly, fighting the Cold War did not look fun, but horrific, as images of the war in Vietnam were broadcasts to Americans across the country. Kennedy, Johnson, and their advisers regarded Vietnam as a fair test ground for the strategy of flexible response. Historian John Lewis Gaddis claims that the assumptions policymakers made about Vietnam “that the defense of Southeast Asia was crucial to the maintenance of world order; that force could be applied in Vietnam with precision and discrimination; that the means existed to evaluate performance accurately; and that success would enhance American power, prestige, and credibility in the world,” were all in line with the goals of flexible response, which in practice ended up producing “just the opposite,” of these goals.⁸² Domestically, the war polarized American society, as substantial opposition to the war rose slowly. By 1968, disapproval was strong enough to persuade Johnson not to run for re-election. The Vietnam War ultimately

⁸² Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 180.

enlarged widespread doubts about the capacity—and the honesty—of government leaders, and led to what came to be known as the credibility gap.⁸³

In the wake of disenfranchisement with the government, its lack of honesty and transparency at the expense of a costly and bloody war, spy media went into a downward spiral. In 1968, *I Spy*, *Secret Agent*, and *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.* were all cancelled. The ABC network chose to cancel the British export *The Avengers* in the US in 1969. *Get Smart* was canceled the following year. *Mission: Impossible* continued, however instead of toppling governments in the developing world, the show switched to domestic issues centering around secret agents thwarting big city crime and the mob. In film, the wave of Bond rip offs fizzled away. There were no more Derek Flint films, no more Matt Helm, and no more Dr. Goldfoot. Even Sean Connery himself left the Bond franchise following *You Only Live Twice* (1967). The gargantuan and chaotic Bond spoof *Casino Royale* (1967), though financially successful, was by and large reviled by audiences and critics. Both films made less money at the box office than *Thunderball*.⁸⁴

For the next Bond film, Australian model George Lazenby was cast to play James Bond in *On Her Majesty's Secret Service* (1969) costarring alongside *The Avengers*' own Diana Rigg. Despite signing on to appear in more films, Lazenby was convinced that a man in a suit who worked for the government, in the era of Vietnam and *Easy Rider* (1969) was an outdated and antiquated figure that was soon to fade into obscurity. Lazenby later said, "People weren't into James Bond. Out of vogue, it wasn't current. Make love not war. [People were] smoking marijuana on the streets... Even Wall Street had taken off their ties. I'd go into a restaurant and

⁸³ James Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945—1974* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 600.

⁸⁴ Field and Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero*, 171.

they'd say, 'Waiter!'"⁸⁵ Lazenby grew a beard and broke his contract, leaving the film's producers without a Bond. The film made only half of *You Only Live Twice*'s total gross.⁸⁶ The fact that spy media went out of popularity as audiences grew disenfranchised with their own government, provides more evidence that, on some level, they were supporting their government's use of secrecy and spies when these stories were popular. Following in *Mission: Impossible*'s footsteps the Bond franchise eventually shifted toward plots that revolved around international drug dealers and crazed businessmen, as the series was recast with Roger Moore and took on an even more comedic tone. By 1972, Bond's services would not be employed by the US government as détente became the word of the day.

However, in the 1980s with the Reagan administration's return to Cold War rhetoric, film and media once again returned to stories that revolved around "the bomb." The President also recognized that he could reactivate a figure who had always been there, but was not being used to help fight the Cold War. When Reagan appeared in a documentary celebrating James Bond in which he called him a hero in the vein of the pioneers, soldiers, lawmen, and explorers, and though it may be old fashioned, "a symbol of real value to the free world," he was reaching back into the history of the Cold War to reuse a tool that perhaps he had recognized to be supremely useful to the government in its depiction and promotion of the necessity for secrets and engagement throughout the world. Of course, not everyone would take Reagan's recommendation seriously, and some critics might say that Bond had no real value, and was just an actor in the movies, but then, as Reagan acknowledged and would know better than anyone else, "we've all got to start somewhere."

⁸⁵ Quoted in Field and Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero*, 194.

⁸⁶ Field and Chowdhury, *Some Kind of Hero*, 195.

CHAPTER III

BOND AND THE NEW FRONTIER

In December of 1965, on the eve of the release of the fourth James Bond film, *Thunderball*, Bondmania had engulfed the United States. With *Thunderball* arriving in movie theaters only days before Christmas, Bond merchandise lined the shelves of toy stores and men's sections of department stores across the US, as shoppers flocked to stores in order to purchase presents that could help their friends and family feel like James Bond. Magazine racks and newsstands were littered with cover stories and special issues describing the details of the newest 007 adventure. In honor of the film's release *Playboy*, perhaps Bond's greatest American supporter and ally, featured an extensive interview with Sean Connery, as well as a very revealing feature written by one of the screenwriters of the Bond films, Richard Maibaum.¹

In the article, Maibaum notes that the latest wish fulfillment known as the "James Bond syndrome" is defined as the acute desire to achieve 007 status.² He asks the dutiful, minded *Playboy* reader, "Who wouldn't want to be the best-dressed man, most sophisticated diner, luckiest gambler, top secret agent and greatest lover of his generation all rolled into one? And what woman could resist projecting herself into his arms?"³ Maibaum argues that "Bond and his women have become fantasy figures arousing powerful empathic response in both sexes."⁴ Surrounding Maibaum's text, and perhaps what most "readers" purchased the issue for, were multiple pictures of the actresses who appeared in the Bond films, in various stages of undress. Maibaum writes that it is best not to "overintellectualize [sic] Bond's popularity" as it "might

¹ Richard Maibaum, "James Bond's Girls," *Playboy*, November 1965, 132-41, 144, 205-6.

² Maibaum, "James Bond's Girls," 133.

³ Maibaum, "James Bond's Girls," 133.

⁴ Maibaum, "James Bond's Girls," 133.

spoil the fun.”⁵ By Maibaum’s definition, the aim then of this chapter, is to spoil some of that fun.

Domesticity, *Playboy*, and Doris Day

The popularity of James Bond as a cultural figure in the US marked a significant shift in attitudes toward what the ideal form of Cold War masculinity looked like. In order to explore this shift, one must first examine the Cold War context in the US prior to Bond’s arrival on the scene. In the immediate postwar context in United States, public policy and political ideology were brought to fruition in the private lives of American families. As fears of “the bomb,” communism, and internal decay within the US effected many, the family became a place from which these anxieties could be contained. Historian Elaine Tyler May argues that the “legendary white middle-class family of the 1950s,” was not “as common wisdom tells us, the last gasp of ‘traditional’ family life,” rather it was infused with Cold War ideology and was presented as the first wholehearted attempt to create a new family unit that was characterized as one that was liberated from the past and secure for the future.⁶ In the Cold War context, with the possibility of a nuclear annihilation as an ever present threat, the family seemed to be the one place where people could control their destinies and perhaps even shape the future. The idea of the “nuclear family,” came to represent heterosexual virility, scientific expertise, and wholesome abundance, which in turn promised to ward off the fears of the day. May claims that although all groups within the US contributed to the “baby boom,” the values of the white middle class shaped the dominant political and economic culture, as those who did not conform were often marginalized, stigmatized and disadvantaged.

⁵ Maibaum, “James Bond’s Girls,” 133.

⁶ Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 2008), 13.

The image of the suburban “nuclear family” soon was as abundant as the nation’s rising birth rates. When situation comedies moved from radio to television, programs about multigenerational, working class, ethnic families faded as stories increasingly revolved around the white middle class nuclear family.⁷ In these situation comedies, such as *Father Knows Best*, *The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet*, and *Leave it to Beaver*, fatherhood was the center of a man’s identity, homemaking the center of a woman’s, and school and having fun the center of children’s. Fatherhood especially became the new badge of masculinity and meaning for the postwar man.⁸ The ideal man, as depicted in magazines, advertisements, and television, was solid, responsible, and dependable. He worked a job to provide for his family. What he actually did was not important—one never learns exactly what the father of *Father Knows Best* does for a living—because at the end of the day it is not what defines him. His family does.

An example of this shift is readily apparent through comparing two popular comedies starring Cary Grant. In 1940 Grant starred alongside Rosalind Russell in the screwball comedy *His Girl Friday*, in which a divorced couple who are both newspaper journalists—he the editor, she the star-reporter—are reunited over the love of their job despite their constant quarrelling. When they promise to get remarried as the film’s ends, it is clear that they do not really love each other, what they love is the job. In the postwar context, Grant starred in *Mr. Blandings Builds His Dream House* (1948), this time with Myrna Loy. The film centers entirely around Grant trying to refurbish an old house for his family to move into.⁹ It is clear he hates his advertising job, for which he cannot come up with new a slogan for, as he instead pours all his energy into fixing the dilapidated house for his family so they can move out of the city. His job is no longer

⁷ May, *Homeward Bound*, 28.

⁸ May, *Homeward Bound*, 139.

⁹ The film was loosely remade as *The Money Pit* (1986) starring Tom Hanks and Shelley Long, and again as *Are We Done Yet?* (2005) starring Ice Cube and Nia Long.

important—let alone his wife’s, who does not have a job as Russell did in *His Girl Friday*—his house and family are. As a promotion for the film, the studio built over seventy “dream houses” equipped by General Electric throughout the US, selling them off by raffle.

The “new American male,” that Cary Grant personified in *Mr. Blandings*, was described in detail in a feature in *Life* magazine in 1954, titled “the new American domesticated male” with the subheading “a boon to the household and a boom for industry.”¹⁰ The article claimed that the “average US man,” used to wait to get married and rent an apartment. Now he was getting married younger, buying a house earlier, and now also doing most of the interior decorating. According to the American Institute of Decorators, the husband “is the chief household gadget buyer, helps choose most furnishings for the home and is more modern in his tastes than his wife.”¹¹ The article featured a number of spot illustrations that depicted the skill men had in the home, and how much better they were at it than their wives. One depicted a man jumping on a couch, which read “testing when buying furniture might not occur to a wife, but a husband insists on quality.”¹² Another showed a man presenting a piece of modern art for interior decorating to his wife with the caption that explained that “going modern involves educating his wife to a new point of view,” and that he is “more receptive to mobiles and functional furnishings than she is likely to be.”¹³ Finally, one portrayed a father holding a child as the mother heads out the door, with a caption that read, “baby tending does not terrify husbands today,” and with “father available as sitter, wives can have their hair done, shop, [and] go to club meetings.”¹⁴ The article

¹⁰ “The New American Domesticated Male,” *Life*, January 4, 1954, 42-43.

¹¹ “The New American Domesticated Male,” 42.

¹² “The New American Domesticated Male,” 43.

¹³ “The New American Domesticated Male,” 42.

¹⁴ “The New American Domesticated Male,” 42.

concluded that “not since pioneer days, when men built their own log cabins, have they been so personally involved in their homes.”¹⁵

For women in the “nuclear family,” the expectation was that they would be dedicated to the home to an even greater degree than their husbands; however, their role came with a number of caveats. They were expected to be college educated and well-read, but not to work as that would reflect poorly on their husband’s ability to be the family’s “breadwinner.” They were to be dedicated and devoted toward raising their children, but not too much as there was a fear that excessive mothering posed a danger that could lead their children, especially their sons, to become “sissies” who were likely to become “homosexuals, ‘perverts,’ and dupes of the communists,” if they had too much attention from their mothers.¹⁶ Wives and mothers then were expected to spend their time that they were not working and not with their children, towards taking care of the home, but as *Life* magazine argued, their husbands were apparently better equipped to do that anyway, so best to leave most of it to them. However, despite sacrificing a professional career and a different life, many women claimed that the benefits of marriage, family, and security were well worth it. When they felt unsatisfied with their lives, some turned to tranquilizers, other to psychoanalysis, but for most, one would just have to try to block those thoughts from their head and find satisfaction in whatever areas of their life they could.¹⁷

However, the preeminence of the nuclear family was soon to be challenged by a growing group who felt that it promoted oppressive, degrading, and unrealistic expectations. At least that is how the men writing for *Playboy* magazine put it. Hitting newsstands in December 1953,

¹⁵ “The New American Domesticated Male,” 42.

¹⁶ May, *Homeward Bound*, 139.

¹⁷ May, *Homeward Bound*, 16.

Playboy presented bachelorhood as men's liberation from domestic ideology.¹⁸ Hugh Hefner, the magazine's publisher, was convinced that the American male was oppressed by his conventional role, and along with the publication of the bestselling Kinsey report, he believed there was a lucrative market for sex in America. Hefner claimed that Americans had become "increasingly concerned with security, the safe, and the sure, the certain and the known," which was leading towards "conformity, togetherness, anonymity, and slow death."¹⁹ The first issue promised readers that the goal of the magazine was to provide a "diversion from the anxieties of the Atomic Age."²⁰ What the magazine truly offered, as Barbara Ehrenreich argues, was a coherent program for "male rebellion," towards domesticity and marriage.²¹ The centerfolds, for which the magazine was best known, confirmed its male readers' heterosexuality and guarded against any suspicion as to why they wanted to remain single.

The magazine asserted that in the conventional nuclear family, it was women who oppressed men. Writer Burt Zollo claimed in an article that "[a]ll woman wants is security. And she is perfectly willing to crush man's adventurous, freedom-loving spirit to get it."²² Zollo argued that if women went to college or got a job, their real intention in going to these places was to find a potential husband so that they would no longer have to work. Another article claimed that "when the little doll says she'll live on your income, she means it all right. But just be sure to get another one for yourself."²³ Zollo went so far as to say, "take a good look at the

¹⁸ Steve Cohan, *Masked Men, Masculinity and the Movies in the Fifties* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 268.

¹⁹ Quoted in K.A. Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2005), 196.

²⁰ "Volume I, Number I," *Playboy*, December 1953, 3.

²¹ Barbara Ehrenreich, *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment* (Garden City: Anchor Press, 1983), 50.

²² Burt Zollo, "Open Season on Bachelors," *Playboy*, June 1954, 37.

²³ Phil Silvers, "Resolution: Never Get Married," *Playboy*, January 1957, 77.

sorry regimented husbands trudging down every woman-dominated street in this woman-dominated land.” All men deep down, he asserted, considered marriage to be “the biggest mistake of their lives.”²⁴ The bachelor lifestyle *Playboy* promoted instead offered all the promises of the “good life,” without its burdensome responsibilities. A man could be “domesticated,” in the sense that he had a taste for “the finer things in life,” such as stylish bachelor pad, equipped with all the modern gadgets and conveniences, but without the trappings and responsibilities of married family life.²⁵ The magazine offered tips and advice on how to achieve this lifestyle that championed the rewards of consumerism, while also presenting airbrushed photographs of nearly nude female models who appeared to promise sex without commitment.²⁶

The playboy, as a figure and archetype, soon made its way into the popular culture and became a dominant figure in American film, particularly in romantic comedies. Frank Sinatra, Dean Martin, Tony Curtis, and Rock Hudson all played the playboy character in a number of films, complete with bachelor-pads equipped with the latest gadgets. However, the place where the playboy archetype appeared with the highest frequency and with the most popularity was in the films of Doris Day.

Doris Day, in the late fifties and early sixties, was America’s greatest box office star.²⁷ In the early fifties, she had risen to stardom through a number of light-hearted family friendly musicals. However, she wanted a change in her career, and it was with these new films that she became American movie’s biggest star, as she appeared in a number of what were dubbed as

²⁴ Zollo, “Open Season” 37.

²⁵ “Volume I, Number I,” 3.

²⁶ Elaine Tyler May, *America and the Pill: A History of Promise, Peril, and Liberation* (New York: Basic Books, 2010), 60.

²⁷ Jeanine Basinger, *A Woman’s View: How Hollywood Spoke to Women 1939 -1960* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1993), 510.

“sex-comedies.” She starred in many of these films including *Teacher’s Pet* (1958), *Pillow Talk* (1959), *Lover Come Back* (1961), and *That Touch of Mink* (1962), that all follow essentially the same plot, which is as follows: Doris Day plays a career woman who has no time for a relationship or intimacy and is often described in dialogue as “sexless.” Her romantic counterpart in the film, often played by Rock Hudson, is a womanizing playboy who does nothing but bed various women in the early parts of the film. The playboy then for some reason, be it to prove a point to a friend or to trick Day out of a business deal, disguises himself as an innocent country boy or nerdish bookworm in order to woo Day. She falls for him, and unexpectedly, he falls for her too. Day inevitably finds out the playboy has been lying to her about who he is, humiliates him in some humorous way, and then says that she never wants to see him again. At this point the playboy has seen the error in his ways and wants to give up his old lifestyle. Through some colossal act he wins Day back again and the film ends with them at the altar or a few years later with their newborn child as they live happily ever after.

The film *Pillow Talk* provides the best and clearest example of the plot outlined above. Rock Hudson plays the ultimate playboy with a bachelor pad *Playboy* magazine could only dream of, equipped with a control panel that turns a couch into a bed, dims the lights, cues a record with romantic music, and locks the deadbolt doors, all with the flick of a switch. Hudson’s character is questioned by his best friend, played by Tony Randall, who asks him why he doesn’t want a wife, a family, and a house, as “A mature man wants those responsibilities.” Hudson then launches into a soliloquy that encapsulates his thoughts on the matter, which sounds like something taken directly out of the latest issue of *Playboy* as he says:

Before a man gets married, he’s ... uh ... like a tree in the forest. He—he stands there, independent, an entity unto himself, and then—he’s chopped down, his branches are cut off, he’s stripped of his bark, and he’s thrown into the river with rest of the logs. Then this tree is taken to the mill. And when it comes out, it’s no longer a tree. It’s a vanity

table, the breakfast nook, the baby crib, and the newspaper that lines the family garbage can.²⁸ However, near the film's end, once Hudson realizes he has fallen in love with Day, after she has found out that he was lying to her, his friend says to him, "Well what do you know. You're in love. The mighty tree has been toppled. For years I've been waiting for them to yell timber over you." Hudson's character smiles and says, "You could be right." He then spends the rest of the film doing whatever he can to win back Day's affection, which he does.

The playboy character in all of these films are presented as fun loving, urbane men, who are also fundamentally immature, irresponsible, and on some level, deeply lonely.²⁹ He is a man trapped in arrested development, who needs to be freed, often through the love of Doris Day. The playboy lifestyle is depicted as fun, but temporary. If one stays in it, they are sure to wind up depressed and alone. These films also show that no matter how dedicated these men are towards maintaining their playboy lifestyle, once they have met "the one," they cannot wait to get out from their previous life, such as how Hudson near the end of *Pillow Talk* frantically calls every phone number of every girl he has ever known to tell them that he is off the market for good and could not be happier. When he returns on his hands and knees back to Doris Day begging for forgiveness, it is not on his terms, but hers, as the films end with her setting the tenor for their new relationship. It is worth noting that the focus of these films is often placed much more on reining in the unruly man as the more urgent matter than marrying off the career driven Doris Day character.³⁰

These romantic comedies were extremely popular in the late fifties and early sixties, with all of Day's pictures being among the years' highest earners. *Pillow Talk* opened to enormous

²⁸ *Pillow Talk*, directed by Michael Gordon (Universal Studios, 1959) DVD (2009).

²⁹ Cohan, *Masked Men*, 267.

³⁰ Dennis Bingham, "Before She Was a Virgin: Doris Day and the Decline of Female Film Comedy in the 1950s and 1960s," *Cinema Journal* 45, no. 3 (2006): 19.

success, and inspired numerous imitators.³¹ In *That Touch of Mink*, starring Day and Cary Grant, Grant moved away from his suburban family-man roles he had been playing since *Mr. Baldings*, and moved into playing an aging playboy character whose arc follows that of the previously mentioned archetypical Day film, as he gives up his old bachelor life for a life of happy marriage and family. Despite these films huge box office success and genuine popularity, *Playboy* magazine could not, in good consciousness endorse these films. Even though these films starred a character that bore their namesake, in the end the man turns away from his playboy lifestyle, resulting in the magazine generally giving these films bad reviews. As it currently stood, *Playboy* lacked a figure, a hero, for which they could point to in popular culture that represented their ideals, aspirations, and philosophy. That was soon to change with arrival of one James Bond.

In 1960, *Playboy* became the first American magazine to publish a Bond adventure, with the short story *The Hildebrand Rarity*.³² In Bond, *Playboy* recognized the hero they had been looking for. The character of Bond was the ideal *Playboy* figure: he has a taste for the “finer things,” he is equipped with a variety of modern gadgets, and he sleeps with every beautiful woman with which he comes in contact without ever committing to a relationship. His only responsibility is to his himself and his nation which he has sworn to protect.

The New Frontier, James Bond, and Bond Girls

As outlined in the previous chapter, Bond’s popularity in America was due in large part to the public endorsement of President John F. Kennedy. Similar to how Kennedy emphasized distancing himself from the previous administration in his strategies for foreign policy, he also attacked what he referred to as a “softness” that was alleged to have taken over the country.

³¹ Cohan, *Masked Men*, 266.

³² Claire Hines, “Entertainment for Men: Uncovering the Playboy Bond,” in *The James Bond Phenomenon: A Critical Reader*, edited by Christoph Linder (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), 89.

Kennedy's "New Frontier," promised a virile and distinctly masculine brand of Cold War politics, most visibly apparent in the fact that no women were considered for top positions in Kennedy's administration, a first since Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term in 1933.³³ In Kennedy's campaign speeches he stressed that Americans had "gone soft—physically, mentally spiritually soft," which had led to the "erosion of our courage."³⁴ Kennedy and his campaign team went to great lengths to depict Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon's tenure as withering, timid, passive, and soft, which in turn critiqued the domestic conformity that had come to define the ideals of the American middle class. Popular novelist, political journalist, and Kennedy supporter, Norman Mailer argued that "the incredible dullness wreaked upon the American landscape in Eisenhower's eight years has been the triumph of the corporation. A tasteless, sexless, odorless sanctity in architecture, manners, modes, styles has been the result."³⁵ Going one step further, Mailer claimed that those who voted for "the psychic security of Nixon," in the election of 1960, would be a vote for "the way a middle-aged man past adventure holds to the stale bread of his marriage."³⁶

If the era of Eisenhower was defined as soft, passive, and sexless, then Kennedy's vision of a New Frontier for America was to be the opposite. While Kennedy's reputation as a womanizer—now so widely documented and discussed—was not reported in the mainstream press, his sexuality was nevertheless a focus of how he was written about and described at the time. Many news stories and profiles went to great lengths to demonstrate how attractive Kennedy was to young women along the campaign trail. A column in the *New York Post* in

³³ Robert Dallek, *John F. Kennedy: An Unfinished Life, 1917-1963* (Boston: Back Bay Books, 2004), 307.

³⁴ Quoted in Cuordileone, *Manhood*, 173.

³⁵ Norman Mailer, "Superman Comes to the Supermart," *Esquire*, November 1960, 43.

³⁶ Mailer, "Superman Comes to the Supermart," 59-60.

October of 1960 mentioned that on the campaign trail Kennedy, “treated southern Ohio yesterday, as Don Giovanni used to treat Seville. His progress, as ever, was an epic of the history of the sexual instinct of the American female,”³⁷ as women were alleged to fawn over him as he waved to them. In depicting female campaign workers at the Democratic National Convention, Norman Mailer described Adlai Stevenson’s “girls” as “horsy-faced,” Stuart Symington’s as “mulish, [and] stubborn,” and Lyndon Johnson’s as “plump, pie-faced, [and] dumb,” whereas “Kennedy ladies were the handsomest; healthy, attractive, tough, a little spoiled...the kinds of girls who had gotten all the dances in high school.”³⁸ A vote for Kennedy then, was framed as the “virile” choice whose masculinity and sexuality brought with it the promise of these “Kennedy girls” as the new American woman. “Hardness” rather than “softness,” “courage” rather than “timidity,” and “sex” rather than “sexless,” defined Kennedy’s persona and in turn the new ideal for American masculinity.

When Kennedy publicly recommended Ian Fleming’s superspy James Bond in *Life* magazine in 1961, he endorsed the use of espionage and flexible response as examined in the previous chapter, but he also, whether intentional or not, sanctioned and approved of the character’s overpowering masculinity and sexuality. James Bond embodied the New Frontier’s idea of the ideal man. He was courageous, patriotic (even if for a different nation), a man of action, suave and urbane, an intellectual with a knowledge of everything from the Latin names of plants to the best way to make a martini. So, while Bond is the New Frontier man, he is also the embodiment of the ideal *Playboy* reader. He has a taste for “the finer things,” he has a flurry of gadgets that define his identity, he is a sharp dresser, and he is immune to marriage and

³⁷ Quoted in Cuordileone, *Manhood*, 199.

³⁸ Mailer, “Superman Comes to the Supermart,” 51.

domesticity, preferring instead to sleep with numerous women for business and for pleasure throughout his adventures. Unlike the playboy characters in Doris Day's movies, Bond is the tree that will never be cut down. He is permanently a bachelor. For the first time in a major motion picture it was clear that the playboy was going to continue to be a playboy after the credits rolled, and that was treated not as a bad thing, but as something to celebrate.

If Bond then is the personification of the federal government's New Frontier and also the idealization of *Playboy* magazine, then that implies that on some level the New Frontier was in a way, *Playboy*. Both criticized the conformity and domesticity that they both claimed were hallmarks of the Eisenhower administration. Both championed a "virile" masculinity that would lead the individual and the nation towards greatness. And both used James Bond as a sort of icon and mascot for their goals, which appeared increasingly to be much the same. As both used James Bond for their goals, the image soon blended into one, with the image of the playboy becoming explicitly linked with the idea of the spy who fights for the safety of the "free world."

The first James Bond film, *Dr. No*, arrived in theaters in 1963, which also happened to be the last year Doris Day was the number one box office star in America. Bond is similar to the playboy characters that Rock Hudson played in Day's films, minus the domestic ending. Like the playboy character of Day's films, Bond disguises himself as other people in order to seduce women for information or his own pleasure, much like Hudson does in *Pillow Talk* or *Lover Come Back*. The difference is that now the male character is not the one who is punished and humiliated for his acts, as Hudson was; instead, he comes out the hero for doing so. In screenwriter Richard Maibaum's article in the 1965 issue of *Playboy*, the main focus was to rate the "Bond girls" against each other, as well as describe Bond's tactics of getting women into bed—presumably for the purpose of helping the readers do the same. In writing about the

character of Miss Taro in *Dr. No*, an Asian enemy agent played by white actress Zena Marshall in very unconvincing make-up, Maibaum claims that as she was an agent of Dr. No, she “deserved no mercy,” yet “she received some recompense in creature comfort. Bond was at the top of his form in the situation he most relishes. And he forgot her the moment he turned her over to the police.”³⁹ Maibaum relished Bond’s ability to use women for his pleasure, by pretending he did not know she was an enemy agent, and then discarding her afterwards. The scene reads as the reverse of the climactic scene in a Doris Day film, where she learns of the playboy’s secret identity, which the audiences knows though the playboy does not, and exposes or humiliates him in some funny way. Here Bond is the one in the know, and he uses Miss Taro for the “situation he most relishes” and then turns her away in a humiliating fashion, never to see her again.

Aside from James Bond’s signature introduction, perhaps the most recognizable and certainly most reproduced images from *Dr. No* is the scene of the character Honey Ryder, portrayed by Ursula Andress, emerging from the ocean in a white bikini as Bond leers at her from the beach. Andress’s image was one of the key elements used in the marketing of the film. The review of film in the *New York Times* was dwarfed in comparison to a large image of Andress lying helplessly on a beach covered in plastic crabs.⁴⁰ A radio advertisement for the film highlighted the Honey character, choosing a particularly unsettling scene to feature on the airwaves. The advertisement began with a narrator exclaiming that Bond “thrives on trouble, both violent and voluptuous. On an exotic tropical island in the Caribbean he meets the beautiful nature girl, Honeychile.”⁴¹ The ad then cuts to an audio clip from the film in which Honey

³⁹ Maibaum, “James Bond’s Girls,” 140.

⁴⁰ Bosley Crowther, “‘Dr. No,’ Mystery Spoof,” *New York Times*, May 30, 1963.

⁴¹ “Beautiful Nature Girl,” *Dr. No*, Blu Ray, directed by Terence Young (United Artists, 1962), Blu Ray (20th Century-Fox, 2015).

recounts how she was raped, and then how she proceeded to kill the man who raped her by placing a black widow spider underneath his mosquito net. She then asks Bond if she was wrong to do so and he jokingly says “Well, it wouldn’t do to make a habit of it.” The radio spot then ends by saying, “See *Dr. No* in theaters!” This certainly was an odd scene to choose to feature in an advertisement for the tropical spy thriller, yet its promise of lurid and violent content brought many to the theater.

Following the release of the next Bond film, *From Russia with Love*, articles began popping up with increasing regularity that strove to explain the popularity of the two Bond films. *Variety* noted after a screening of *From Russia with Love* that “every man in the theatre will identify himself as the cool James Bond and every woman will spend a blissful couple of hours imagining herself the blonde seductress leading him to his doom.”⁴² Scholar Alexis Albion argues that at this point in the US that if women did not explicitly aspire to “be Bond” themselves, many women expressed desires to be with the fantasy character of Bond, and in a sense “relate themselves to the same fantasy as men.”⁴³ Albion claims that at this historical moment in the Bond timeline, the Bond phenomenon was “a condition in which both genders were involved.”⁴⁴ Even though the depictions of women in the Bond films were often exploitative, many women enjoyed the films, and some of the Bond’s greatest supporters in popular film criticism were women.⁴⁵ Also, along with Richard Maibaum, a woman, Johanna

⁴² Quoted in Alexis Albion, “Wanting to Be James Bond,” in *Ian Fleming and James Bond: The Cultural Politics of 007*, edited by Edward Comentale, Stephen Watt, and Skip Willman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 204.

⁴³ Albion, “Wanting to Be James Bond,” 204.

⁴⁴ Albion, “Wanting to Be James Bond,” 204.

⁴⁵ However, it is important to remember that at this time many of these women were working and writing for magazines and newspapers that were dominated by a distinctly masculine culture. Perhaps some of these positive reviews, which would have to be approved by primarily male editors, were a way to affirm one’s entry into the “boys club” of the publishing world, and did not reflect their actual views of these films. Historians and scholars of this period note that many women who wrote for popular magazines at this time addressed “women’s issues,” but that “none of these outlets were digging deep enough, preferring instead to chalk up the problem to an excess of

Harwood, co-wrote the screenplays to the first two Bond films.⁴⁶ Women were often just as culpable in creating the idealized, masculine Bond image as men were. However, though both men and women were involved in this phenomenon, it does not mean that their participation was equal.⁴⁷

After the success of *From Russia with Love*, the third Bond film, *Goldfinger*, was eagerly anticipated around the world, and especially in the US. The two previous Bond films set the stage for *Goldfinger*'s formula, and the film would take the white, male, heterosexual, New Frontier, *Playboy* identity to new heights in the popular culture. Part of Bond's popularity and appeal at this time was that Bond's mission in all his films is to return things to their "proper" order. If an item related to national security is stolen, he returns it; if a madman is on the verge of destroying America's gold supply, he stops them; and if a beautiful woman is not attracted to men, he forces them to be.

The character of Pussy Galore, played by Honor Blackman in *Goldfinger*, provides an interesting case study in Cold War sexual anxieties and identity. In the novel, Pussy Galore, as well as another female character who assists Bond in his mission, were both lesbians. In the novel Bond's accomplice remains resistant to Bond and is later killed, whereas Pussy succumbs to him and she survives.⁴⁸ Elisabeth Ladenson argues that "Pussy Galore offers one of the most arresting images of lesbianism in popular culture in the twentieth century, and this is of course

education or too much freedom of mind," as rocking the boat too much could have resulted in the loss of a job. Andi Zeisler, *Feminism and Pop Culture* (New York: Seale Press, 2008), 48.

⁴⁶ Maibaum later said that Harwood had some good suggestions, but he felt she did not contribute enough to the screenplays to warrant credit. Unfortunately, it is not known exactly what Harwood or Maibaum contributed the screenplays, however most film scholars tend to support the assumption that Harwood contributed much more than Maibaum has suggested. Harwood also contributed to the first draft of *Goldfinger*, but did not receive screen credit on the film. Chapman, *Licence to Thrill*, 73.

⁴⁷ Also, though women participated and contributed to the Bond films' production it does not inherently imply that it was a women's product either.

⁴⁸ Chapman, *Licence to Thrill*, 85.

also because of her name.”⁴⁹ The film certainly downplays these aspects of Galore’s character, leaving only hints such as when she tells Bond “You can skip the charm. I’m immune.”

However, these subtleties were not lost on the audience, who were either able to pick them up from the film itself, or who had read the novel prior to seeing the film and knew what to expect.

In a short but glowing review in *Playboy*, Galore is described as “Goldfinger’s Lesbian lieutenant who decides she’d rather switch than fight when she comes to grips with Bond.”⁵⁰ In Maibaum’s profile, released the following year, he describes Galore as “Bond’s only leading lady with lesbian leanings,” who “decides she would rather switch than fight”⁵¹ The scene in which Bond causes Galore to “switch rather than fight,” is again revealing of Bond’s overpowering and domineering heterosexuality that defined this new Cold War masculinity.

The scene of Galore’s “switch” is disturbing and also informative as to what kind of images people were watching and enjoying during the time. Galore, who is working for Goldfinger, tries to stop Bond from escaping from a barn that is covered in hay. They fight back and forth, until Bond forces himself on top of her. She desperately tries to push him off, and he resists her, and then forcibly, and somewhat unexpectedly, kisses her. She still resists and tries to push him off, until she stops, and instead wraps her arms around him which in turn cues the film’s brassy theme song, suggesting a moment in which the audience was supposed to cheer. In the next scene, she has switched to Bond’s side in more ways than one. The implications of rape in this scene was not lost on the film’s screenwriter. Maibaum wrote in his article for *Playboy* that Bond provided Galore “with a kind of psychiatric therapy. It takes some doing, approaching

⁴⁹ Elisabeth Ladenson, “Pussy Galore,” in *The James Bond Phenomenon: A Critical Reader*, edited by Christoph Linder (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009) 225.

⁵⁰ “Movies,” *Playboy*, December 1964, 28.

⁵¹ Maibaum, “James Bond’s Girls,” 137.

rape, but Pussy is undoubtedly the better for it.”⁵² Maibaum’s explanation and justification is appalling, but it is revealing of the attitudes of the filmmakers and certainly some of the film’s fans. The filmmakers and the film’s fans wanted to see the reestablishment and reinforcement of the heterosexual order, and Bond’s mission in everything is to restore things to their “proper” order by whatever means necessary.

The desire for a hero that provided security in a chaotic time, led the character down an alarming road. It is illuminating that Bond, the hero, as part of his hyper-heterosexual drive forces himself onto a woman, and his act is perceived as a heroic, perhaps even a patriotic, as it is done in the name of preventing an evil villain from carrying out their plot. In *Dr. No*, Honey tells Bond she killed a man after he raped her. In *Goldfinger*, Bond is the offender and many audience members gladly went along with him, as they believed his intentions to be worthwhile. Reviews of the time hardly if ever brought up the scene in question, and the few that did often described it as a playful “seduction” scene. Instead, reviews tended to focus on what they claimed was the overall “sexiness” of the film. Wanda Hale’s review for the *New York Daily News* claimed that “‘*Goldfinger*’ exudes fun and sex galore,” pointing out that there are “girls galore in *Goldfinger* to fall for [Bond’s] irresistible charm.”⁵³ Also, the early marketing campaign for the film focused on Sean Connery’s appeal to female fans, publishing several images of Connery surrounded by female autograph seekers, much in the same way that Kennedy was written about on the campaign trail in 1960.

The central image of the *Goldfinger* marketing campaign was the gold painted body of actress Shirley Eaton. The image adorned posters, billboards, and the cover of *Life* magazine.

⁵² Maibaum, “James Bond’s Girls,” 205.

⁵³ Wanda Hale, “‘Goldfinger’ Exudes Fun and Sex Galore,” *New York Daily News*, December 22, 1964.

One radio advertisement for the film featured a couple who were inspired by these ads. The radio spot begins with the man asking his female partner why she has painted herself gold, and she says she did it to match the girl on the cover of *Life* magazine who is in the new Bond film.⁵⁴ Another radio spot for the film featured a dramatic narrator who asked the listening audience “How would you like to make love to a woman, a fantastically formed creature, bathed a glistening gold? Agent James Bond did and he never forgot it.”⁵⁵ Four large door panels that were designed to hang outside of movie theaters featured images of Sean Connery and three actresses from the film, Honor Blackman, Shirley Eaton, and Nadja Regin, all dressed in bikinis, despite the fact that Blackman is fully clothed throughout the film and Regin only appears in the film for a few minutes. Across the four door panels the tagline read “Mixing business and girls! Mixing thrills and girls! Mixing danger and girls!”⁵⁶ It is clear the main selling point for *Goldfinger* was the film’s sexual elements, which were also explicitly linked to the business, thrills, and danger of espionage and working for the government.

Wanting to Be James Bond

Evidence of Bond’s importance to the US public on an individual level can be found in the merchandising industry and its dedication to help consumers live out the Bond lifestyle. More than just a fantasy, Bond was a role model for a particular *Playboy* inspired lifestyle, with all the gadgets a spy/bachelor could need. Bond’s life is stable and secure, as he is never frightened or unsure of himself when dealing with nuclear war or women, two things several

⁵⁴ “What are you doing with that paint?,” *Goldfinger*, Blu Ray, directed by Guy Hamilton (United Artists, 1964), Blu Ray (20th Century-Fox, 2015).

⁵⁵ “How would you like to make love to a woman?,” *Goldfinger*, Blu Ray, directed by Guy Hamilton (United Artists, 1964), Blu Ray (20th Century-Fox, 2015).

⁵⁶ Alastair Dougall, *James Bond: 50 Years of Movie Posters*, (New York: DK Publishing, 2016), 58-9.

American men desperately tried to contain during the Cold War era.⁵⁷ And many hoped some of that Bond stability would rub off on them if they could look and feel like him.

The Bond merchandising industrial complex was running at full speed by 1965 and its popularity was well known to Americans with everything from Bond cufflinks to cologne being heavily advertised in the United States in print and on television. The licensed Bond toiletries from Colgate were particularly popular which included a set of aftershave and cologne titled “007,” and the marketing campaign for it is very revealing as to the potency of the Bond image. One print ad for the cologne showed a woman in a casino holding the product while looking directly at the viewer. The caption read “If you don’t give him 007...I will.”⁵⁸ Even though it was a male cologne, the ad campaign was directed more towards women, suggesting that the man in their life was so desirable and so much like James Bond, that he may be just as susceptible to Bond’s predilection for multiple bedroom partners. The smaller caption in the ad tells the reader “give him as much as you dare. But hurry. If you don’t, someone else will.” This advertisement provides another window into how women may have participated in the promotion of the Bond image and lifestyle. By buying these Bond related products, which would serve as “the perfect gift,” the ad promised that stability and security could be maintained in the relationship, but only if they acted fast and before someone else did the same.

The “007” toiletry set was also advertised to men, through using a slightly different message. In a television spot for “007,” the commercial begins with a Bond look alike, jumping into a convertible with a woman who is waiting in the car for him. They pull off into a field, and crash through a fence as a man fires a shotgun at them. The woman in the car then presses a

⁵⁷ May, *Homeward Bound*, 16.

⁵⁸ 007, “If you don’t give him 007...I will,” advertisement in *Life*, December 17, 1965, 13.

button revealing that the “007” toiletry set was hidden in the vehicle the whole time. The narrator of the commercial then says in a dramatic reading that men need to buy “007” in order to get “The license to kill...women.”⁵⁹ The woman in the car then turns to the camera and in a very overwrought and breathy voice says, “When you use 007, be kind...” Print ads that accompanied this commercial used the two slogans, “007 gives any man the license to kill...women” and “When you use 007, be kind,” both displayed in Figure 3. The ads that used these two slogans, tended to appear in men’s magazines such as *Playboy*, while the ad where a woman in the casino threatened to give “007” to viewers’ male partners if they did not, tended to appear in magazines women were more likely to read.



Figure 3. 007 After Shave advertisement. Source: 007, “007 gives any man the license to kill...women,” advertisement in *Playboy*, December 1965, 57.

Though all of these ads are misogynistic, they suggest a different type of Bond lifestyle for men and women. For women, as long as they supply the man in their life with Bond products

⁵⁹ nepley, “60’s Aftershave Commercial – 007, The License to kill...women,” YouTube Video, 0:39, February 8, 2009, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-0sbCauLP9Q>.

in a timely manner, then their own personal Bond will remain faithful to them. For men, the message was the opposite. If they purchased or were given these products, it gave them a “license to kill...women,” with the plural “women” being the key to the sentence. Also, the “be kind” marketing campaign suggests that the “007” cologne gave men a power over women that they could choose how to use at their own discretion. By the mere act of saying it, the ad suggests that their license to kill women was so powerful with these products that if they had to be rough, as Bond was with Pussy Galore, then that was in their power and discretion to do so. These ads state that men have a choice as to how they will execute and use their “license to kill,” whereas women do not.

What these advertisements also reveal is how national politics and foreign policy were linked with the *Playboy* identity and persona. Similar to how Cold War politics had invaded the home and the family in the early days of the Cold War resulting in the “baby boom,” here Cold War politics and flexible response became infused with the swinging bachelorhood that Bond personified. In the 1950s, advertisements often appealed toward family life with images of outdoor barbeques or family meals, and depicted the stereotypical nuclear family and the security that came with it. The ads for Bond, such as the one depicted in Figure 3, place the product next to a gun, offering a different vision for security. If one wanted to be like Bond, and experience the pleasures he encounters on the job, then they would also have to take up the cause of defending their nation. But no matter, as to do so was depicted as exciting, dangerous, and exhilarating, a place to test one’s masculine courage both in and out of the bedroom.

With the avalanche of Bond imitators in film and television that soon followed the success of *Goldfinger* and *Thunderball*, the image of the *Playboy* man became even more linked

to fighting the Cold War through espionage. In the Derek Flint films, starring James Coburn, advertisements promised “the total man” who was depicted as even more Bond than Bond. The poster for the first film, *Our Man Flint* (1966), showed Coburn as Flint, stylishly dressed in tuxedo, holding a gun in one hand and a martini in the other, while a number of scantily dressed women pose behind him. The text on the film’s poster read, “‘Our Man Flint’ makes love in 47 languages! He’s a karate champion, brain surgeon, swordsman and nuclear physicist...He’s the top master spy of all time, with his cigarette lighter containing 82 death dealing devices, his 2 man eating dogs, his 4 luscious playmates, and his love nest—built for 5...” This advertisement mentions Flint’s various accomplishments, his skills as a spy, his gadgets, but focuses most of all on his “love nest,” that is built for five. In the film Flint’s bachelor pad was promoted as a modern day “harem” where his four female companions/servants live with him and do all the chores around the house, give him massages, cut his hair, provide secretarial work, and are always available for him when he wants them for other purposes. They are entirely loyal to him, though he has no responsibility or devotion to anyone one of them. Flint has achieved the ideal *Playboy* lifestyle, in which he gets all the benefits of domesticity, minus the responsibilities. His only responsibilities are to the CIA who call on him to solve cases and protect the world from threats only he is skilled enough to defeat through his toughness, confidence, and masculine charm.

Not to be outdone, Dean Martin portrayed Matt Helm as another Bond inspired secret agent, and took the “harem” idea even farther than Flint. Helm lives on a compound with seemingly hundreds of supermodels as he doubles as a fashion photographer in his spare time when he is not saving the world from nuclear destruction. One advertisement for the first Helm film *The Silencers* (1966), promised, “girls, gags, and gadgets! The best spy thriller of nineteen

sexy-sex!” and showed Helm with his back to the viewer with two women in their underwear on each arm, while he holds two guns in each hand—further linking sex with his profession of espionage for the CIA. The phallic gun imagery of the film’s main US poster was less than subtle, as displayed in Figure 4.



Figure 4. *The Silencers* (1966) poster. Source: “Dean Martin in the *Silencers* (1966),” IMDb, <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0060980/mediaviewer/rm2533503232>.

Helm’s massive gun, positioned between his legs, is licensed to kill for the government, while also, like the “007” cologne, “licensed to kill... women,” which seemed to promise that fighting this fun Cold War brought with it, its own sexual rewards. Both the Derek Flint and Matt Helm series of films were among the years’ highest box office earners.

Evidence of how entirely the image of the playboy became linked with espionage is revealed by once again returning to the films of Doris Day. With the arrival of the James Bond films and this new wave of spy media, Day’s popularity had begun to fade in American film. In

order to capitalize on Bond's newfound fame, and because the playboy character, which Day's films originally helped create, had become so intertwined with espionage, Day made two spy films: *The Glass Bottom Boat* (1966) and *Caprice* (1967). If Day was to reform and end up with a playboy than it would have to be in a spy context, because in this new paradigm of spy media it seemed impossible to be a playboy without being a spy and visa-versa. The films followed Day's previous formula, as the romantic comedy elements derive from misunderstandings, lies, false identities, betrayals, and reunions, only now the films were set within the context of a spy thriller. *The Glass Bottom Boat* tied into the space race and the potential for infiltration from Soviet spies, while *Caprice* was set in the world of cosmetics in which spies were employed to steal secrets. Reviews for both these films were particularly harsh, especially for *Caprice*, and Doris Day's role in it. Bosley Crowther, writing for the *New York Times*, said of the film's premise, "I think it is to have Miss Day enacting a sort of hard-boiled female James Bond, engaged in spying," and to have the film's male lead "Richard Harris enacting a sort of male Ursula Andress or Honor Blackman, engaged in attempting to foil her and seduce her with coy and sexy wiles. Otherwise, there is no explanation of why Miss Day appears and acts with such masculine muscularity, and Mr. Harris affects the arts and airs of a very sissy gentleman."⁶⁰ In speculating what was next for Day's career, Crowther's ended his review by saying "Well, let's just say of her that she appears to have reached that stage where massive wigs and nutty clothes and acrobatics cannot conceal the fact that she is no longer a boy."⁶¹

With the failure of *Caprice* both critically and especially financially, Doris Day's box office stardom withered away, and with her so too did female led films. By the late 1960s, 1970s

⁶⁰ Bosley Crowther, "Screen: 'Caprice' Opens: Doris Day Plays a Spy at Several Houses," *The New York Times*, June 8, 1967, 52.

⁶¹ Crowther, "Screen: 'Caprice' Opens," 52.

and 1980s, film historian Jeanine Basinger argues, “films began to be more and more about men, with fewer great female stars and fewer roles for the ones that existed.”⁶² The death of female led films was tied directly to the rise in Bond inspired spy films that championed the *Playboy* lifestyle, masculinity, and reduced women to objects for male pleasure. With the rise of these spy films’ popularity, female stars like Day tried to compete with their own spy films, but were often rejected by audiences, with the films dying at the box office, which in turn led studio bosses and independent producers to believe more and more that there was not a market for female led films as there had been in the 1950s and early 1960s.⁶³ “007” in fact truly did give audiences “the license to kill...women.”

This reduction of female led films and female stars also coincided with the rise of second-wave feminism in the US. In 1963, the same year *Dr. No* premiered in America, Betty Friedan published her exposé of domesticity for women, *The Feminine Mystique*. As a well-educated white woman, she spoke for thousands like herself whose dreams and desires had disappeared through the pressures of domestic life and the expectations placed on women.⁶⁴ Her book became an immediate bestseller and created a national sensation, and eventually a movement. Elaine Tyler May argues that the “book enabled discontented white middle-class homemakers across the country to find their voices. It was if someone was finally willing to say that the emperor had no clothes; soon a chorus joined in support.”⁶⁵ Now the concept of “women’s liberation,” became a hot button issue as women called for equal rights in the home and in the workforce.

⁶² Jeanine Basinger, *I Do and I Don't: A History of Marriage in the Movies* (New York: Vintage Books, 2012), 307.

⁶³ Basinger, *I Do and I Don't*, 307.

⁶⁴ She did not speak for working-class wives and many women of color in the US, who either continued to work throughout the “prosperity” of the 1950s, or who felt liberated rather than trapped if they were able give up their menial jobs in the paid workforce for a life as a homemaker. May, *Homeward Bound*, 199.

⁶⁵ May, *Homeward Bound*, 199.

As the movement ran concurrent with the very popular, and very masculine driven spy film, the films' fans readily shared their thoughts on this new movement. Even mild critiques of the Bond films, such as one written by Shana Alexander in *Life* magazine in 1965, were greeted with a harsh backlash from the films' fans.⁶⁶ Alexander wrote that in her estimation the Bond image had completely overtaken the market to a ridiculous degree. She took particular note of what she described as the "avalanche of 007 merchandise," and the "complete line of what is known, revoltingly, as 'men's toiletries.'"⁶⁷ Alexander sharply disagreed with most of Bond's critics, and instead argued that there was nothing wrong with the Bond character, but that she had just become tired of him. Alexander went on to explain that she fell in love with Ian Fleming's early novels, but she hated the films. She argued that the Bond of the films had become the "bachelor-fantasy of every married man's dream"—a term that was very common at the time in describing the appeal of Bond—that left little room for women to enjoy Bond's adventures.

In the letters to the editor in a subsequent issue, *Life* readers wrote in to explain their thoughts on Alexander's column. One man wrote in that he had "secretly hoped that at last [he] had found a man's woman writer."⁶⁸ However, he stated with great regret that in Alexander's "evaluation of the James Bond syndrome she reveals that she too, is only wallowing in the paranoia of *The Feminine Mystique*." Another reader, who described herself as a "sophisticated" woman who loved the James Bond movies, criticized Alexander's appraisal of the films by arguing that the films "are almost the only movies made nowadays where women are portrayed as intelligent, independent, yet sexually attractive creatures who can spy and counterspy with the

⁶⁶ Shana Alexander, "Agent 008—Where Are You?" *Life*, July 16, 1965, 27.

⁶⁷ Alexander, "Agent 008—Where Are You?" 27.

⁶⁸ "Letters to the Editors," *Life*, August 6, 1965, 13.

best of them.”⁶⁹ In her estimation the Bond films were not misogynistic, but instead quite the opposite, as the only true feminist films on the market.⁷⁰

Soon the films themselves addressed the rise of the feminist movement in the US. In the second Derek Flint film, *In Like Flint* (1967), the villains of the film are revealed to be upper-class, well-educated feminists, who plot to brainwash women using blow-dryers in hair salons across the world so that they will rise up and overthrow the male dominated world. Flint of course is successful in thwarting their “diabolical” plot. Another common motif that appears in spy films from this era are attractive, killer, female assassins or even human looking robots, who are programmed to seduce and/or kill men and then take over the world.⁷¹ These films argued that women who aligned themselves with feminism were evil, brainwashed, or programmed in order to carry out this new and seemingly dangerous philosophy which threatened the masculine paradigm these films represented. There were female-led spy films, besides Doris Day’s films, such as *Modesty Blaise* (1966) and *Fathom* (1967), as well as television shows such as *Honey West* (1965-66) and *The Girl from U.N.C.L.E.* (1966-67); however, similar to Day’s spy films, these films did not do well at the box office, and *Honey West* and *The Girl from U.N.C.L.E.* were both cancelled after only one season, all while male-centric spy media dominated the landscape.

The one outlier in spy media at this time was the character of Emma Peele, played by Diana Rigg in the popular British television export *The Avengers*. Emma Peele, and her partner

⁶⁹ “Letters to the Editors,” 13.

⁷⁰ Scholars continue to debate the role women play in Bond films and their relation to the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Timothy Hoxha argues that the Bond films teaches masculine supremacy over women, whereas Tom McNeely argues that there are many moments throughout the films where female characters are depicted as having skills equal to, or perhaps even surpassing, those of 007. Robert Weiner, B. Lynn Whitfield, and Jack Becker, eds., *James Bond in World and Popular Culture: The Films Are Not Enough* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2011).

⁷¹ Examples include *Dr. Goldfoot and the Bikini Machine* (1965), *Deadlier Than the Male* (1967), and *Some Girls Do* (1969) to name only a few.

John Steed, played by Patrick Macnee, were slick and stylish spies who engaged in witty banter as they saved the world. While Steed is certainly confident and intelligent, Emma Peele is the brains and also the brawn of the operation, as she often saves Steed using karate kicks and judo chops while he is tied up to a deathtrap. Unique to female characters in media at this time, one of the rules for the show's writers and directors was that Peele would never scream in fear, as so many female characters in film and television did in horror movie fashion at the sight of the slightest threat. Though the show undoubtedly sexualized Diana Rigg's character to sometimes ridiculous levels, particularly in the episode "A Touch of Brimstone," she was nevertheless a stark contrast to most depictions of women in spy media and on television in general for her competence, skill, and overall popularity.⁷² If there were ever a female counterpart to James Bond, it was Rigg's Emma Peele. Which made her perhaps the perfect choice to be the one woman to finally yell timber over Bond's bachelorhood in the film *On Her Majesty's Secret Service* (1969).

On Her Majesty's Secret Service, starring first time Bond George Lazenby, did the unthinkable by concluding the story with Bond getting married to the character Tracy, played by Diana Rigg. It went against everything Bond had stood for, and what *Playboy* magazine had celebrated him for. At Bond's wedding, he also says goodbye to his boss M and his secretary Moneypenny, as he plans to retire from spying all together. The film demonstrates that for Bond, being a secret agent and being married were so diametrically opposed one could not do one while being the other. As the film comes to close it appears as though Bond is set for a life of domesticity, safety, security, and perhaps even, family. However, the film could not allow this to happen. The final scene shows Bond with his new wife driving off to their honeymoon when the

⁷² Rigg was nominated for the Emmy for "Best Actress in a Drama Series," in 1967 and 1968 for playing Emma Peele.

maniacal villain Blofeld and his sidekick Irma Bunt, shoot and kill Bond's new wife. The film ends with Bond coming to the realization that he is forever cursed to a life of bachelorhood and by extension, service to his government, as he cries holding his dead wife in his arms. If Bond is truly defined by anything, it is his job. With the next Bond film, *Diamonds Are Forever* (1971), Sean Connery returned to play the character, and he was back to his fun-loving, bachelor ways, showing no sense of remembrance or remorse for his dead wife.

In 1969 the BBC interviewed Diana Rigg on location while she was filming *On Her Majesty's Secret Service* and asked her what she felt the role of women were in Bond's world. Despite the fact that Rigg was supposed to promote the film, she instead offered a critique of the portrayal of women in Bond stories by arguing that "from the women's point of view," women in Bond stories, "are victims. And in our society at the moment women are being very busy trying to prove that they are not victims. But Ian Fleming definitely puts them in sort of subsidiary position, and Bond uses them. They are vessels for his lust or to get to the big bad boss, or something. They are cyphers, they are not real people."⁷³ When asked if she felt that her character in the film and the fact that she gets married to Bond was a gain in the depiction of women in Bond films, Rigg replied:

In a sense it's a gain, but it's quite a clever trick because the *man*, who here-to-for has been absolutely unattainable, suddenly decides, through love or whatever, to marry this girl, and he subscribes. But Ian Fleming only allows him to subscribe for an hour after his wedding, and then I get a bullet through one ear and out the other. You know it's quite a good trick, because it means that he has all the right motives, deep down underneath, in other words he is prepared to get married if he loves the girl, but then by some terrible trick of fate, she is taken away from him. And he is suddenly available for all those females again. Slightly embittered, you know.

⁷³ Bamford7e, "Diana Rigg, George Lazenby and the controversy behind *On Her Majesty's Secret Service*," YouTube Video, 5:32, September 7, 2017, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SrNWTwsk188>.

Rigg's comments are surprising coming from someone who was supposed to be promoting the film, yet they are insightful and revealing as to how some women felt about these films' trends and the depiction of women in them.

The hyper-heterosexual masculinity that is imbued with toughness and confidence that Bond personified, dominated Cold War culture in the US in the early and late 1960s. It rejected the domesticity of the 1950s and instead championed bachelorhood and "male rebellion," from the home. It embodied the *Playboy* philosophy and linked that lifestyle to espionage. The Bond films arrived on the market following Doris Day's success in comedies starring playboy characters like Bond, however the ending of the Bond films marked a dramatic shift. Where in Day's films the playboy is reformed, in Bond's he continues in permanent bachelorhood. A sign that more and more Americans wanted to see this depiction of masculinity is demonstrated by the fact that at this moment Bond and his imitators took over the box office, while Day's films faded away despite her and her producers attempts to make spy films of their own. The Bond lifestyle was so attractive to Americans that an industry of Bond merchandise exploded on the market, as both men and women purchased items to associate themselves with this tough, sexual identity. Bond's popularity was also linked to the rise in New Frontier masculinity that Kennedy represented. The New Frontier criticized Eisenhower's "soft" approach to policy both foreign and domestic, and instead endorsed a new masculine brand of Cold War politics that valued toughness above all else. As this ideology's icon, Bond and his imitators dominated media from film and television, to merchandise. The popularity of characters who were defined by the tough, masculinity that the spies represented, demonstrates how this ideology consumed the culture, which also had its long-term consequences. Women were increasingly marginalized in media,

despite the rise of second-wave feminism. Another effect of this cult of masculine toughness can be seen in what eventually resulted in the loss of popularity in spy media, in the case of war in Vietnam.

Lyndon Johnson, who inherited the presidency and the commitment to South Vietnam from Kennedy, felt the pressures of the New Frontier and Kennedy's legacy. Johnson explained to his biographer why he felt trapped in his commitment to Vietnam, by saying if he pulled troops out of the region "then I'd be doing exactly what Chamberlain did in World War II," and that if he failed in Vietnam he feared that, "there would be Robert Kennedy out in front leading the fight against me, telling everyone that I had betrayed John Kennedy's commitment to South Vietnam...that I was a coward. An unmanly man. A man without a spine."⁷⁴ Johnson's excuse for his commitment to the war in Vietnam long passed the point where victory seemed viable, was the fear that he would be seen as "unmanly." The pressure to be tough, to be confident, to put things in their "proper" order, to be the "total man," to not be bound to the home, but free and destined to go to the far corners of the globe to preserve security, and also maybe have some fun, was pervasive in American culture and politics. The weight of the cult of masculine toughness, which all this spy media undoubtedly helped support and encourage, led Johnson down a path he felt captive to, even if that was or was not the case in reality. With the eventual unpopularity of the war in Vietnam, spy media which had helped create and foster the culture of New Frontier masculinity, faded away as Doris Day's films had before them. The one figure who made it out alive, who gave critics the slip through another death defying feat was James Bond. Bond films continue to be produced and his popularity has continued to this day, as they carry

⁷⁴ Quoted in Doris Kearns Goodwin, *Lyndon Johnson and the American Dream* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 264.

the torch from the Cold War to today in their support of the *Playboy* philosophy, New Frontier era masculinity, and merchandise that allows consumers to achieve the Bond lifestyle.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

When James Bond returned to theaters for the first time after the end of the Cold War in *Goldeneye* (1995), the film series received yet another high-profile endorsement, this time from President Bill Clinton. Clinton claimed that he loved the Bond films and that he “watched them in the theater in the White House,” all the time.¹ He also stated that the actor Pierce Brosnan was “really good and just perfect for the transition out of the Cold War.”² Clinton’s fandom of the James Bond went so far that in 2012 he appeared in a promotional documentary for James Bond—as Reagan had before him—to share his appreciation for the character. When asked why Bond seems to be so popular with policymakers, Clinton stated that “I get why presidents like it. The good guys win. The idea that one brave person, supplied with adequate back-up and technology, can stop something big and bad from happening, it’s immensely reassuring to people.”³

Clinton’s quote sums up many of the elements that are explored in this thesis. In the midst of the Cold War, in the wake of persistent fears of nuclear destruction, the character of James Bond arrived on the scene. He was brave, calm, cool, and courageous, the perfect New Frontier man. He was equipped with technology that provided him with security and adequate back-up when he needed it to strategically and flexibly respond to threats throughout the entire globe. As Clinton summarized, all this taken together was immensely reassuring to people. The idea that somewhere out there, there are brave and loyal spies who kept the world safe and were maybe even having some fun doing it, perhaps did help Americans sleep softer at night. Now of

¹ *Everything or Nothing: The Untold Story of 007*, directed by Stevan Riley (Epix, 2012) DVD (20th Century Fox, 2013).

² *Everything or Nothing*.

³ *Everything or Nothing*.

course audiences knew, as film critics so often stated, that these films were not be taken “seriously,” yet that did not stop the idea from being any less reassuring.

This idea, that the individual, suave, and courageous spy who had the nation and the world’s best interests at heart was out there protecting the “free world” was an image that the US government went to great lengths to promote and benefited from, particularly in the decade of the 1960s. As this thesis has demonstrated, Kennedy, Dulles, and others like them, endorsed James Bond stories, and through their recommendations the character exploded in popularity in the US. Soon there were hundreds of spy stories in novels, movies, and television that were highly successful. This moment of pop culture exuberance for spy stories arrived on the heels of the failed Bay of Pigs invasion, when public support for the CIA and spies was at a low-point in the US. However, with the help of these fictional spies, the public perception of the CIA improved. William Colby, the director of the CIA from 1973 to 1976, in his memoir *Honorable Men*, recalled that in those days “the Agency had enjoyed a reputation with the public at large not a whit less than golden,” as they were perceived as brave men “in the fight against totalitarian aggression, matching fire with fire in an endless round of thrilling adventures like those of the scenarios in James Bond films.”⁴

The promotion and popularity of all this Bond inspired media was not without its ramifications on life in the US. For one, just as “New Look” foreign policy—which relied on nuclear weapons as the ultimate deterrent for war—became a part of Cold War life during Eisenhower’s administration with Americans being encouraged to build bomb shelters, flexible response—which relied on strategic strike forces throughout the globe—also invaded the home during Kennedy and Johnson’s tenure. Stories of fictional spies were everywhere, and many of

⁴ William Colby and Peter Forbath, *Honorable Men: My Life in the CIA* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), 180.

these stories' fans wanted to be like their heroes which they could achieve through purchasing "spy" clothing, using gun shaped vodka pourers, or purchasing gun toys for their children. Flexible response became a visible part of everyday life. The other consequence of these Bond stories was their personification of the "male rebellion" found in *Playboy* magazine which became linked with New Frontier Cold War masculinity. The result of the popularity of these stories that glorified bachelorhood and masculine toughness above all else in service to the fight for the Cold War, led to a reduction in female-led stories and promoted a cult of masculinity that had long term consequences both at home and abroad.

The James Bond character's relationship to the government and gender dynamics in the US was circular. Bond stories tried to capitalize on the geopolitics of the day to tell entertaining and fun stories. Policymakers promoted these stories which helped further their own agendas. These stories became immensely popular with the public, as they personified New Frontier toughness and vitality—which was first defined and promoted by Kennedy and his administration—and also the unrestricted bachelorhood that *Playboy* magazine championed. These gender expectations that the films promoted, placed pressure on many Americans, including policymakers, to act in certain ways, as the fear of criticism from failure and "unmanliness" was framed as the ultimate sin. This in turn effected everything from the kind of movies that were made to foreign policy, most notably in the case of Vietnam. With the public's eventual disenfranchisement with the war and frustration over the government's lack of transparency, the relationship unraveled, the government fell out of fashion and so too did popular spy films. The relationship between fictional spies, the US government, and New Frontier/*Playboy* masculinity that allowed all three to succeed in the minds of the public, would ultimately be each of their undoing. At least, for the moment.

Epilogue: Bond from Vietnam to Today

After the events of Vietnam, the Bond series struggled to find its place. With Roger Moore now portraying the character, his first two films *Live and Let Die* (1973) and *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974) stayed away from geopolitics and focused more on plots that revolved around drug dealers and crazed businessmen. Non-Bond spy films and films about the CIA, in a post-Vietnam, post-Watergate world took on a radically different tone. Films such as *The Conversation* (1974), *The Parallax View* (1974), and *Three Days of the Condor* (1975) depicted spies who were driven insane by the job or who were being hunted and killed by their own government when they were no longer of service. These films revealed in a paranoia that the government was evil and did not have its citizens best interests at heart. The next several Bond films starring Roger Moore took on a much more humorous tone, with some of the films intentionally coming across more as comedies than action films, which at times seemed almost to be spoofs of the character of Bond himself.

However, with the re-heating of the Cold War during the Reagan administration spy films took on a new vitality. Muscle-bound action heroes like Sylvester Stallone, Arnold Schwarzenegger, and Chuck Norris starred in a number of films as masculine supermen in service to the government as they suppressed “Third World” dictators and killed communists by the thousands in seemingly endless hails of bullets. The Bond films responded in kind, recasting Bond with actor Timothy Dalton in *The Living Daylights* (1987). *The Living Daylights* and its follow up *License to Kill* (1989), were much darker and more violent than any of the previous entries, as the backdrop of the Cold War was moved to the foreground and Bond got more serious and deadly in his mission to save the “free world.” *License to Kill* also took on the crusade of Reagan’s war on drugs, further linking the era’s national politics with the films. After

License to Kill, the producers ran into some legal trouble over ownership of the character, and the series went into limbo for a number of years, during which time the Cold War came to an end.

Despite producers' fears that the character of James Bond may not survive the end of the Cold War, upon the eve of the release of *Goldeneye* (1995), the character proved to be just as popular as ever, and once again spurred a series of imitators, as there was a renewed nostalgia for the early days of the Cold War media. Mike Meyer's Austin Powers three-film series, parodies of spy films in the vein of the Derek Flint films, were very successful as they goofily sent up the well-known conventions of spy films from the 1960s. Similarly, the Brosnan Bond films after *Goldeneye* often leaned in the direction of the more comedic Moore films. However, after the tragic events of 9/11, serious spy fiction once again came into vogue, as film and television portrayed spy heroes who employed increasingly violent tactics to defeat terrorists. Keifer Sutherland portrayed Jack Bauer in the television series *24*, as an anti-terrorist agent who used brutal tactics to subvert terrorist plots and save the nation from ultimate disaster. Matt Damon starred as Jason Bourne in a series of action-packed films, who through amnesia has lost his identity and must relearn that he is a ruthless killer. Tom Cruise revitalized the *Mission: Impossible* series which came to be defined by his death defying stunts, as he foiled global terrorists from taking over the world. On television *Alias* (2001-2006), *Chuck* (2007–2012), *Burn Notice* (2007-2013), *Homeland* (2011 – Present), to name only a few, once again depicted spies as heroes who protected the nation's secrets and citizens.

The producers of the Bond franchise believed that in the post-9/11 context a more serious Bond was needed. They decided to cancel the next Brosnan film that was already set to go into production, and instead took a hiatus to recalibrate the film series' direction. They recast Bond

with actor Daniel Craig in the film *Casino Royale* (2006), as the Bond films entered a new era. The film was more violent and brutal than the series had ever been before, as they depicted a number of extended and cringe-inducing torture scenes. Bond's missions to prevent global terrorists from taking over the world took on a renewed relevancy and the films proved to be the most popular the series has ever been since Bond's golden era in the 1960s. The songs from the films, such as Adele's "Skyfall," once again topped the charts and countless magazines and websites promoted style guides on how to look, dress, smell, and act like James Bond just as *Playboy* magazine used to do.⁵

With the success of the Daniel Craig Bond films, spy fiction has taken on a renewed prominence in popular culture, and continues to address the anxieties of the day. A recent crop of spy films such as *Kingsman: The Secret Service* (2014), *Captain America: Winter Soldier* (2014), *Jason Bourne* (2016), *Mission: Impossible – Rouge Nation* (2015) and *Mission: Impossible – Fallout* (2018), and even the Bond film *Spectre* (2015) all depict essentially the same plot where in someone in the government wants to shut down a spy program in favor of an over-reaching digital surveillance system and the spy heroes prove that their nation still needs patriotic spies to put their lives on the line to save the world. These films make the same argument the Cold War spy films of the 1960s did: the "free world" needs courageous, thrill-seeking spies and the government and the citizenry of the nation have to trust these individual spies if they are to successfully do their job and keep the world safe. These films argue that large faceless programs and "New Looks" for the military and espionage are not the way towards security. It is instead, individual spies who can flexibly respond to threats throughout the world, who through their unique brand of toughness and charisma, will keep the world safe.

⁵ A few prominent examples include jamesbondlifestyle.com and bondlife.com.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

- Balio, Tino. *United Artists: The Company That Changed the Film Industry*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1987.
- Basinger, Jeanine. *A Woman's View: How Hollywood Spoke to Women 1939 -1960*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1993.
- . *I Do and I Don't: A History of Marriage in the Movies*. New York: Vintage Books, 2012.
- Bennet, Tony and Janet Woollacott. *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero*. London: Routledge, 1987.
- Benson, Raymond. *The James Bond Bedside Companion*. London: Boxtree, 1988.
- Black, Jeremy. *The Politics of James Bond: From Fleming's Novels to the Big Screen*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Boyer, Paul. *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Burlingame, Jon. *The Music of James Bond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Chapman, James. *Licence to Thrill: A Cultural History of the James Bond Films*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.
- Cohan, Steve. *Masked Men, Masculinity and the Movies in the Fifties*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Colby, William and Peter Forbath. *Honorable Men: My Life in the CIA*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007.
- Combs, James and Sara Combs. "The Postwar Agenda," *Film Propaganda and American Politics: An Analysis and Filmography*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1994.
- Comentale, Edward, Stephen Watt, and Skip Willman, eds. *Ian Fleming and James Bond: The Cultural Politics of 007*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Cuordileone, K.A. *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005.
- Dallek, Robert. *John F. Kennedy: An Unfinished Life, 1917-1963*. Boston: Back Bay Books, 2004.

- Doherty, Thomas. *Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture and World War II*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Dougall, Alastair. *James Bond: 50 Years of Movie Posters*. New York: DK Publishing, 2016.
- Dulles, Allen. *The Craft of Intelligence*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Duncan, Paul and Jürgen Müller. *Film Noir*. Cologne: Taschen, 2017.
- Duncan, Paul, ed. *The James Bond Archives*. Cologne: Taschen, 2015.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment*. Garden City: Anchor Press, 1983.
- Field, Matthew and Ajay Chowdhury. *Some Kind of Hero: The Remarkable Story of the James Bond Films*. Stroud: The History Press, 2015.
- Funnell, Lisa, ed. *For His Eyes Only: The Women of James Bond*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gallup, George. *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1935–1971*, vol. 3. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Gebert, Michael. *The Encyclopedia of Movie Awards*. New York: St. Martin's Paperbacks, 1996.
- Goodwin, Doris Kearns. *Lyndon Johnson and the American Dream*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Kael, Pauline. *Kiss Kiss Bang Bang*. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press Book, 1968.
- Linder, Christoph, ed. *The James Bond Phenomenon: A Critical Reader*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *America and the Pill: A History of Promise, Peril, and Liberation*. New York: Basic Books, 2010.
- . *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 2008.
- Patterson, James Patterson. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945–1974*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Sayre, Nora. *Running Time: Films of the Cold War*. New York: Doubleday, 1982.

Schuster, 1978.

Shapiro, Jerome. *Atomic Bomb Cinema: The Apocalyptic Imagination on Film*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2001.

Shaw, Tony. *Hollywood's Cold War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.

Smith, Jean Edward. *Eisenhower in War and Peace*. New York: Random House, 2012.

South, James and Jacob Held eds. *James Bond and Philosophy: Questions Are Forever*. Chicago: Carus, 2006.

Thomas, Evan. *Robert Kennedy*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Weiner, Robert, B. Lynn Whitfield, and Jack Becker, eds. *James Bond in World and Popular Culture: The Films Are Not Enough*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2011.

Zeisler, Andi. *Feminism and Pop Culture*. New York: Seale Press, 2008.

Journal Articles:

Abbott, Tristan. "Bomb Media, 1953-1964." *Postmodern Culture* 18, no. 3 (2008).

Baimbridge, Mark. "Movie Admissions and Rental Income: The Case of James Bond." *Applied Economics Letters* 4, no. 1 (1997): 57-61.

Bingham, Dennis. "Before She Was a Virgin: Doris Day and the Decline of Female Film Comedy in the 1950s and 1960s." *Cinema Journal* 45, no. 3 (2006): 3-33.

Dodds, Klaus. "Screen Geopolitics: James Bond and the Early Cold War Films (1962-1967)." *Geopolitics* 10, no. 2 (2005): 266-89.

Enns, Anthony. "The Fans from U.N.C.L.E.: The Marketing and Reception of the Swinging '60s Spy Phenomenon." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 28, no. 3 (2000): 124-32.

Neuendorf, Kimberly, Thomas Gore, Amy Dalessandro, Patricie Janstova, and Sharon Snyder-Suhy. "Shaken and Stirred: A Content Analysis of Women's Portrayals in James Bond Films." *Sex Roles* 62, no. 11 (2010): 747-61.

Newspaper and Magazine Articles:

007. "007 gives any man the license to kill...women." Advertisement in *Playboy*, December 1965, 57.

007. "If you don't give him 007...I will." Advertisement in *Life*, December 17, 1965, 13.

- Alexander, Shana. "Agent 008—Where Are You?" *Life*, July 16, 1965, 27.
- Bacon, W. Stevenson. "Crazy Gadgets of 'The Man from U.N.C.L.E.'" *Popular Mechanics*, December 1965, 186.
- Boucher, Anthony. "On Assignment with James Bond." *The New York Times*, August 25, 1963, 135.
- Canby, Vincent. "Bond Films Keep Their Deadly Allure." *The New York Times*, December 22, 1965, 23.
- . "United Artists' Fort Knox." *Weekly Variety*, March 31, 1965.
- Carlson, Walter. "Advertising: There's Gold in That 007 Label." *New York Times*, March 11, 1965, 53.
- "CIA Under the Microscope." *The New York Times*, May 9, 1961, 38.
- Crowther, Bosley. "Screen: 'Caprice' Opens: Doris Day Plays a Spy at Several Houses." *The New York Times*, June 8, 1967, 52.
- . "'Dr. No,' Mystery Spoof." *The New York Times*, May 30, 1963, 15.
- Dulles, Allen. "Our Spy-Boss Who Loved Bond." *Life*, August 28, 1964, 19.
- "Four Impressions of the CIA Controversy." *The New York Times*, April 30, 1961, 168
- Genêt. "Letter from Paris." *The New Yorker*, March 20, 1965, 166.
- "Great TV Spy Scramble." *Life*, October 1, 1965, 118-19.
- "Group Pickets CIA." *The New York Times*, May 1, 1961, 3.
- Hale, Wanda. "'Goldfinger' Exudes Fun and Sex Galore." *New York Daily News*, December 22, 1964.
- Harding, H. "The United Nations Gets Inquiries about *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.*" *TV Guide*, January 8, 1966, A-1.
- "Heads Down—But Not the Spirit." *Life*, November 9, 1962, 38.
- "James Bond 007." *Boys' Life*, May 1966, 54.
- Johnson, Paul. "Sex, Snobbery and Sadism." *New Statesman*, April 5, 1958, 430.
- Knickerbocker, Conrad. "The Spies Who Come in from Next Door." *Life*, April 30, 1965, 13.

“Let’s Stop Baiting the CIA.” *Life*, March 6, 1964, 4.

“Letters to the Editors.” *Life*, August 6, 1965, 13.

Maibaum, Richard. “James Bond’s Girls.” *Playboy*, November 1965, 132-41, 144, 205-6.

Mailer, Norman. “Superman Comes to the Supermart.” *Esquire*, November 1960, 43-60.

McCormick, Anne O’Hare. “Abroad: The Promethean Role of the United States.” *The New York Times*, August 8, 1945, 22.

“Movies.” *Playboy*, December 1964, 28.

“Playboy Interview: Ian Fleming.” *Playboy*, December 1965, 106.

Powledge, Fred. “Clues to Oswald Traced in Books.” *The New York Times*, November 28, 1963, 23.

“Reappraising the CIA.” *The New York Times*, April 26, 1961, 38.

Sidey, Hugh. “The President’s Voracious Reading Habits.” *Life*, March 17, 1961, 59.

Silvers, Phil. “Resolution: Never Get Married.” *Playboy*, January 1957, 77.

“The New American Domesticated Male.” *Life*, January 4, 1954, 42-43.

“TV Spot Uses Reagan to Promote 007.” *The New York Times*, June 30, 1983, 61.

“Volume I, Number I.” *Playboy*, December 1953, 3.

Zollo, Burt. “Open Season on Bachelors.” *Playboy*, June 1954, 37.

Online Resources:

Bamford7e. “Diana Rigg, George Lazenby and the controversy behind On Her Majesty’s Secret Service.” YouTube Video. 5:32. September 7, 2017, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SrNWTwsk188>.

brendan007. “Ronald Reagan James Bond.” YouTube Video. 0:54. December 30, 2010, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZL11Sd3DPLQ_

“Dean Martin in the Silencers (1966).” IMDb, <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0060980/mediaviewer/rm2533503232>.

“Food & Drink.” Toys of Bond, last modified 2019,
http://www.toysofbond.co.uk/Consumables/james_bond_007_food_drink_smirnoff.html.

“Guns.” Toys of Bond, last modified 2019,
http://www.toysofbond.co.uk/Toys_and_Games/james_bond_toy_guns_ppk.html.

nepley. “60’s Aftershave Commercial – 007, The License to kill...women.” YouTube Video.
 0:39. February 8, 2009, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-0sbCauLP9Q>.

Reagan, Ronald. “Address to the National Association of Evangelicals (“Evil Empire” Speech).”
 Voices of Democracy: The U.S. Oratory Project,
<http://voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/reagan-evil-empire-speech-text/>.

Sorensen, Theodore. “Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., 1917-2007.” The American Prospect, last
 modified March 18, 2007, <https://prospect.org/article/arthur-m-schlesinger-jr-1917-2007-0>.

The House in the Middle. United States Civil Defense Administration’s National CleanUp, Paint-
 Up, Fix Up Bureau, 1954. http://www.archive.org/details/Houseint1954_.

Additional Resources:

“Beautiful Nature Girl.” *Dr. No*. Blu Ray. Directed by Terence Young. United Artists, 1962, Blu
 Ray. 20th Century-Fox, 2015.

“How would you like to make love to a woman?” *Goldfinger*. Blu Ray. Directed by Guy
 Hamilton. United Artists, 1964. Blu Ray. 20th Century-Fox, 2015.

“What are you doing with that paint?” *Goldfinger*. Blu Ray. Directed by Guy Hamilton. United
 Artists, 1964. Blu Ray. 20th Century-Fox, 2015.

APPENDIX

Films:

The Ambushers (1967)
Arabesque (1966)
Billion Dollar Brain (1967)
Caprice (1967)
Captain America: Winter Soldier (2014)
Casino Royale (1967)
Casino Royale (2006)
The Conversation (1974)
The Day the Earth Stood Still (1951)
Deadlier Than the Male (1967)
The Deadly Affair (1966)
Diamonds Are Forever (1971)
Dr. Goldfoot and the Bikini Machine (1965)
Dr. Goldfoot and the Girl Bombs (1966)
Dr. No (1963)
Dr. Strangelove or: How I learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb (1964)
Easy Rider (1969)
Everything or Nothing: The Untold Story of 007 (2012)
Fail Safe (1964)
Fathom (1967)
From Russia with Love (1963)
Funeral in Berlin (1966)
The Glass Bottom Boat (1966)
Goldeneye (1995)
Goldfinger (1964)
His Girl Friday (1940)
In Like Flint (1967)
Invasion of the Body Snatchers (1956)
The Ipcress File (1965)
Jason Bourne (2016)
Kingsman: The Secret Service (2014)
Kiss Me Deadly (1955)
Ladybug, Ladybug (1963)
The Last of the Secret Agents? (1966)
License to Kill (1989)
Live and Let Die (1973)
The Living Daylights (1987)
Lover Come Back (1961)
The Man with the Golden Gun (1974)
Mission: Impossible – Fallout (2018)
Mission: Impossible – Rouge Nation (2015)
Modesty Blaise (1966)
Mr. Blandings Builds His Dream House (1948)

Murderers' Row (1966)
On Her Majesty's Secret Service (1969)
On the Beach (1959)
Operation Kid Brother (1967)
Our Man Flint (1966)
The Parallax View (1974)
Pickup on South Street (1953)
Pillow Talk (1959)
The Quiller Memorandum (1966)
Seven Days in May (1964)
The Silencers (1966)
Some Girls Do (1969)
The Spy Who Came in from the Cold (1965)
Spectre (2015)
Teacher's Pet (1958)
That Touch of Mink (1962)
Them! (1954)
Three Days of the Condor (1975)
Thunderball (1965)
War of the Worlds (1953)
The Wrecking Crew (1969)
You Only Live Twice (1967)