

UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

Faculty of Philosophy

Niina Sorvari

“A Sexist, Misogynist Dinosaur”?

The Changing Representations of James Bond’s Masculinity

Master’s Thesis

VAASA 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
1 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Material	6
1.2 The Bond Genre	8
1.3 The Cinematic Bond	14
2 PERFORMING MASCULINITY	19
2.1 Filmic Representation	19
2.2 Doing Gender	22
2.3 Defining Masculinity	23
2.4 The Four Sites of Filmic Masculinity	27
3 REPRESENTATIONS OF JAMES BOND'S MASCULINITY	29
3.1 The Body	29
3.1.1 The Gaze	29
3.1.2 The Actors	40
3.2 Action	42
3.3 The External World	47
3.3.1 Interaction with Friends	47
3.3.2 Interaction with Villains	51
3.3.3 Interaction with Women	55
3.3.4 Relation to Institutions	65
3.4 The Internal World	68
4 CONCLUSIONS	74
WORKS CITED	76

UNIVERSITY OF VAASA**Faculty of Philosophy**

Discipline: English Studies
Author: Niina Sorvari
Master's Thesis: "A Sexist, Misogynist Dinosaur"?
The Changing Representations of James Bond's
Masculinity
Degree: Master of Arts
Date: 2010
Supervisor: Tiina Mäntymäki

ABSTRACT

Tutkielmani aiheena ovat James Bondin maskuliinisuuden representaatiot, jotka muodostavat hyvin tunnetun kuvan hänestä kovana, hegemonisena sankarihahmona. Aineistona käytän viittä James Bond -elokuvaa eri vuosikymmeniltä: *Goldfinger* (1964), *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974), *The Living Daylights* (1987), *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997) ja *Casino Royale* (2006). Tutkielman tarkoituksena on tarkastella miten Bondin maskuliinisuuden representaatiot ovat muuttuneet vuosien saatossa. Hypoteesini on että James Bondin maskuliinisuus on muuttunut sosiaalisten muutosten vaikutuksesta: Bond kulttuurisena ilmiönä on tiiviisti yhteydessä maailmaamme ja yhteiskunnassa tapahtuviin muutoksiin, jotka puolestaan heijastuvat Bondin hahmoon.

Tutkimuksen pohjana käytän Pat Kirkhamin ja Janet Thuminin elokuvallisen maskuliinisuuden esittämisen kategorioita. Teoreettisina lähtökohtina ovat myös Laura Mulvey'n teoria elokuvan miehisestä katseesta sekä Judith Butlerin idea sukupuolen rakentumisesta tekojen kautta. Analyysin kohteina ovat James Bond erotoisivan katseen haltijana sekä kohteena, näyttelijöiden fyysinen ulkonäkö, Bondin väkivaltainen käyttäytyminen ja kestävyys, kanssakäyminen miesten ja naisten kanssa sekä suhtautuminen instituutioihin ja tunteiden näyttäminen.

Tutkimustulokset osoittavat että Bondin maskuliinisuus on muuttunut yhteiskunnallisten muutosten vaikutuksesta, esimerkiksi naisten oikeuksien paraneminen ja kylmän sodan päättyminen ovat vaikuttaneet ratkaisevasti Bondin hahmoon. Jos Bond on jollain alueella menettänyt hegemonisen asemansa, on toisia miehisiä piirteitä korostettu enemmän. Myös itse hegemonisen maskuliinisuuden käsitys on muuttunut vuosien saatossa.

KEYWORDS: James Bond, representation, hegemonic masculinity, filmic masculinity, gaze

1 INTRODUCTION

It has been estimated that between a quarter and a half of the world's population has seen a James Bond film, either in the cinema or on television (Chapman 2000: 14). I myself grew up watching James Bond films on television and still find them irresistibly captivating and entertaining. Everyone knows Ian Fleming's James Bond and the kind of life this agent 007 of the British Secret Service leads: driving fast cars, gambling for huge sums of money, sleeping with beautiful girls, saving the world from megalomaniac villains, travelling all around the world and always overcoming the most threatening dangers. The films and novels themselves naturally fascinate people because of their adventures, action and exotic locations, but a great deal of the attraction lies within the character of James Bond; a name which has become to signify stylish masculinity and urban self-confidence (Cork & Stutz 2008: 23). It is precisely his manliness that exists at the very core of his charm and appeals to both men and women.

During the last 25 years representations of men in general have attracted more and more academic attention. James Bond, in particular, functions as a representative of the normative human being, the middle-aged, white Anglo-Saxon. The aim of this thesis is to study how Bond is represented in five Bond films that cover a period of 42 years: *Goldfinger* (1964), *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974), *The Living Daylights* (1987), *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997) and *Casino Royale* (2006). I will concentrate on studying how his masculinity is constructed i.e. how Bond is constructed as the hard and heroic man that the audiences recognise and admire. I will use Pat Kirkham and Janet Thumin's (1993: 11) categorisation of the four sites of filmic masculinity as a basis for the study, so the areas analysed include the body, action, the external world and the internal world.

It can be expected that the character of James Bond has not remained the same for the past 42 years because reality has an effect on fiction, characters and narratives. When values and practices in society change, popular representations are bound to reflect those changes. Moreover, since representations are an inherent part of society, they, too, have an impact on social values and ways of thinking. Social change must have caused

James Bond to change as well, but in what ways? Have some aspects changed more noticeably than others and what could explain this? Is he still “a sexist, misogynist dinosaur, a relic of the Cold War” as M (Judi Dench) calls him in *GoldenEye*, or has he adapted to the changing values and practices of contemporary society?

1.1 Material

Since this study focuses on how representations of Bond’s masculinity have changed over time, I have selected one representative film from each decade. The material extends over a period of 42 years. The material consists of *Goldfinger* (1964), *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974), *The Living Daylights* (1987), *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997) and *Casino Royale* (2006). These feature five of the six actors who have played Bond: Sean Connery, Roger Moore, Timothy Dalton, Pierce Brosnan and Daniel Craig. It is important that the films have different actors because an individual actor’s presence and interpretation of Bond provide something new to the character, and thus, his masculinity gains different nuances in different films.

The five James Bond films that are analysed in this study have been made between the years 1964 and 2006. In *Goldfinger* (1964), which is the third film of the whole series, Bond (Sean Connery) is sent to investigate a gold bullion dealer called Auric Goldfinger (Gert Frobe), who is suspected of stockpiling great quantities of gold. Bond befriends the villain and uncovers his plan to obliterate the world economy by contaminating the bullions held at Fort Knox with nuclear radiation. Bond has to face, among other things, a giant laser threatening to cut him in two and the metal-rimmed hat-throwing Oddjob (Harold Sakata) before he manages to ruin Goldfinger’s plan with the help of his own private pilot Pussy Galore (Honor Blackman).

In *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974), 007, played by Roger Moore, receives a message that he is the next target of the assassin Francisco Scaramanga (Christopher Lee), who charges one million dollars for a kill and uses a golden gun with golden bullets. In addition, Bond must find a solar cell called Solex, which is a device that can

convert the sun's radiation into electricity. By working together with the lovesick fellow agent Mary Goodnight (Britt Ekland) and Scaramanga's mistress Andrea Anders (Maud Adams), Bond eventually wins the game of cat-and-mouse.

In *The Living Daylights* (1987), Bond (Timothy Dalton) helps General Koskov (Jeroen Krabbé) to defect from the Soviet Union to the West, where he is abducted from his hideout only a few hours later. Soon Bond discovers that Koskov staged the attempted assassination on his life by convincing his beautiful cellist girlfriend Kara (Maryam d'Abo) to shoot blanks at him. Bond travels with Kara from country to country tracking him down with the police and Koskov's henchman on their trail. In the end, the real traitors are revealed and punished. This was the last Bond film made during the Cold War.

In *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997), Bond (Pierce Brosnan) works together with a Chinese secret agent Wai Lin (Michelle Yeoh) in an attempt to prevent the media mogul Elliot Carver (Jonathan Pryce) from instigating a war between China and Britain. The mission becomes personal when Carver discovers that his wife Paris (Teri Hatcher) is Bond's former lover and assassinates her. Bond, however, gets his revenge eventually when Carver's invisible stealth boat is sunk by the British, taking him down with it.

Casino Royale (2006) is based on Fleming's first novel in which Bond (Daniel Craig) has to prevent a villain called Le Chiffre (Mads Mikkelsen) from winning millions in a poker game, so that when penniless and chased by his creditors, he would be forced to turn to the Service for protection. Along on the assignment with 007 is the British Government's smart and beautiful accountant Vesper Lynd (Eva Green), with whom Bond falls in love so deeply that he resigns from his job. However, in the end he learns his lesson never to trust anyone after being betrayed by Vesper.

1.2 The Bond Genre

Ian Fleming's creation, James Bond of the British Secret Service, appeared for the first time in 1953 in the novel titled *Casino Royale*. The agent was named after an American ornithologist with the same name, because it sounded plain and dull enough to Fleming. The reason for this was that the hero had to remain a neutral figure also by name because the things that happened to him were so extraordinary. (Chancellor 2005: 112) The question regarding who was the model for Bond's character has existed ever since the first novel appeared, and throughout the years, several actual spies have claimed to have been Fleming's inspiration. Some have also pointed out that his brother Peter, who was a famous travel writer, had many similarities with Bond. However, Fleming himself served in the Naval Intelligence Department during the Second World War, an experience which is strongly echoed in his novels. He became accustomed to the world of spies through his work, but shared also the same interests with the character he created, namely girls, good food, golf and gambling. Though he was not a secret agent himself but a personal assistant to the Director of Naval Intelligence, 007 still resembles him to a great extent. To further reinforce the connection between Fleming and Bond, photos of the author posing with a gun in his hand in film-noir style lighting were used to promote his novels. (Chancellor 2005: 21, 26, 37, 51, 54) After *Casino Royale*, Fleming wrote eleven Bond novels and two short story collections.

Fleming's creation was proved unique, and already by 1964, the year when Fleming died, over 40 million copies of Bond novels had been sold worldwide (Chancellor 2005: 6). Bond's adventures on paper did not, however, come to an end with Fleming's death. Other writers, such as John Gardner and Christopher Wood, have contributed to keeping Bond alive by either writing their own stories or by adapting films that are not based on Fleming's original works into novels. Also Kingsley Amis, who is well-known for his literary study of the Bond novels called *The James Bond Dossier* (1965), has written a Bond story under the pseudonym Robert Markham. (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 49) In addition to Bond films, which have become one of the most successful movie franchises making over billion dollars a film (Chancellor 2005: 6), there are video games and other merchandise related to the films, magazines and fan clubs dedicated to 007, as well as

interviews with the film-makers and advertisements. All these various texts contribute to the popularity of James Bond and construct his character outside the novels and films.

Bond has become a part of culture in many ways. Bond films are aired on television in Finland every two or three years and in Britain on Christmas Day (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 38), which has led to James Bond becoming a house-hold name by having a role in our everyday lives and traditions. There are numerous parody films, and as early as in 1967, a parodical version of *Casino Royale* was made with renowned actors such as David Niven, Peter Sellers and Orson Welles. Other successful parodies include *Spy Hard* (1996) with Leslie Nielsen, *Johnny English* (2003) with Rowan Atkinson and Mike Myers' *Austin Powers: International Man of Mystery* (1997) which was followed by two sequels, *Austin Powers: The Spy Who Shagged Me* (1999) and *Austin Powers in Goldmember* (2002). These films exaggerate and mock the style established in Bond films in humorous ways and at the same time support the formulaic nature of the original franchise. The films and Bond himself can function as an intertextual source for other texts of popular culture, which further reinforces his status as a prominent cultural figure.

As Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott (1987: 13) point out, Bond is a cultural phenomenon of a certain kind. His existence is not confined to merely being a character in the novels and films. People know the values Bond stands for without being familiar with the original works because of the information they get through other texts. (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 14) Bond is a character of great resonance not only culturally but also socially and politically. The films and novels often refer to topical issues, and Bond's character has always been strongly tied to cultural and ideological concerns by functioning as a representative of masculinity as well as for the West and capitalism during the Cold War (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 1, 18). The technology and various gadgets used in the films have often been ahead of their time as well.

The Cold War had a significant effect on the creation of Bond and the whole spy genre, which differs from other genres through its political content (Chapman 2000: 25). When

Fleming began to write *Casino Royale* in 1952, the tension between the capitalist West and the communist East was at its peak. Attitudes were cold, and the world was divided in two: the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, China and North Vietnam clashed ideologically with the United States and most of Western Europe. The US and the Soviet Union, in particular, participated in a nuclear arms race, attempting to create more and more powerful weapons. The need to find out the enemy's plans and progress prompted the use of espionage. The war was cold also because it was fought by spies in secrecy and not by thousands of soldiers on the battlefield. Fleming was strongly influenced by the atmosphere of the time and by the spies he met because of his profession. (Chancellor 2005: 206–208) Fleming was, however, not the only one affected by the circumstances, and the Cold War induced the birth of the spy genre in the 1950s which boomed on film later in the 1960s. Spy novels and films were extremely popular and portrayed spies as heroic, mysterious and even romantic characters. James Bond, who fills all these descriptions, was a part of the emergence of the spy genre.

According to John G. Cawelti (1997, original 1969: 71), all cultural products consist of a mixture of conventions and inventions. Formulaic works of art are conventional, since they follow certain codes known to both the audience and the creator(s). Because we are familiar with these conventional rules, we know that, for instance, in a detective novel, the detective will solve the crime and reveal the culprit, and that in a spy story, the agent will complete his mission successfully (Cawelti 1997: 74). People in general want stability and security in their lives, which is why we value the repetitive nature of formulaic structures in popular narratives. However, we also have an innate desire for variation, hence the popularity of serial works, which provide different plots within the same structure (Berger 1992: 46), as Bond films and novels do.

The texts of a genre are separated from those of another genre by certain aspects such as time, location, heroes, heroines, villains, secondary characters, plots, themes, costume, locomotion and weaponry. For instance spy stories take place in the present and have the whole world as location. The characters are an agent, a female spy, fellow agents, a villain and henchmen. The agent wears suits, travels by cars and planes among other

things, uses a pistol, often with a silencer, and has a mission, usually to save the world. (Berger 1992: 31–33) Though these aspects are different, for example, in a Western and a science fiction story, they are still alike in that they both follow a somewhat similar structure.

In his study on Russian folktales from 1928, Vladimir Propp discovered similarities between the structures of different folktales and the roles of the characters in them. Classic folktales have heroes and heroines, villains and villainesses. The heroes have helpers, which can be people, animals or magic powers, as does the villain. There is a conflict between the hero and the villain, which is indirectly also a conflict between good and evil. They are the opposites of each other in many ways. The courageous hero is young and social, whereas the villain is older and usually unloved and alienated. The villain seeks power and wants to dominate others, but the hero often collaborates with other characters and needs their help to defeat the villain. In addition, the hero's love for the heroine is romantic, whereas the villain feels lust and women want him only for his wealth. (Berger 1992: 20–22)

Propp's study revealed also the structural nature of narratives. At the beginning of a traditional fairy tale, the hero is given a task, traditionally to save the heroine from the villain. On this quest, the hero faces various ordeals and obstacles but overcomes them with the help of other characters and sometimes magic powers. In the end, he reaches his destination, confronts the evil villain and destroys his whole empire. The heroine is rescued by the hero, who then marries her. This structure of a classic fairy tale is the model for all narratives of modern popular genres, from science fiction to adventure and spy stories etc. Some parts can also easily be modernised to correspond the narratives today, for example, instead of the hero marrying the heroine, the hero sleeps with her at the end. (Berger 1992: 14, 20–22) Bond stories, in particular, follow this traditional formula of a fairy tale quite closely, and according to Umberto Eco, there are nine moves in a Bond plot:

1. M gives Bond a task.
2. The villain appears to Bond.

3. Bond gives a “check” to the villain or the villain to Bond.
 4. “The girl” appears.
 5. Bond possesses the girl or starts the process of seduction.
 6. The villain captures Bond and, either simultaneously or before or after, the girl.
 7. The villain tortures Bond and, in some cases, the girl.
 8. Bond vanquishes the villain, killing him and his representatives.
 9. Bond makes love to the girl but he loses her: she leaves him or is killed.
- (Berger 1992: 120–121)

Most of these actions clearly correspond to the structure of a classic fairy tale. Bond’s helpers include other agents and gadgets, and he must defeat several henchmen before facing the main villain. The order of these actions may vary, as can the characters, locations and plots, but Bond novels are always structurally similar. The formula applies also to the films because spy films are usually adapted from novels (Chapman 2000: 24).

According to James Chapman (2000: 20–22), Bond films can be seen to belong to different genres, which are the spy thriller, the adventure serial and the Hollywood action movie. Being a combination of various genre traditions alone makes the series one of a kind, but Bond films can also be regarded as a genre of their own. They are unique when it comes to their production ideology, and there is no other similar series that has been as long-lasting or has the character James Bond. (Chapman 2000: 22) The films balance between conventions and inventions as all works of popular narrative, but the formulaic nature of Bond films has been further emphasised for practical and financial reasons. At the early stages of the franchise, the production company deliberately focused on investing more on other areas in the films, such as locations, gadgets and female stars, in order to avoid making the films dependent on one specific actor (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 198). Because of this, certain recurring features, so called trademarks, became a part of every film. These “Bondian effects”, include:

the gadgets, the foreign locations, the threatening character of the villain, who must incorporate both a physical threat and an intellectual threat to the hero, Bond’s relationship with ‘the girl’, the jokes and the form of the crucial pre-credits sequence (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 180).

These are the general guidelines to be followed, and the audience knows what to expect when they go see the latest film. These trademarks differentiate the films from other works within the spy genre, thus supporting the idea of the Bond genre. In addition, there are other, more specific details that make a Bond film a Bond film.

At the beginning of a Bond film, there is usually a scene where Bond, seen through the barrel of a gun, walks into the frame, turns and shoots at the camera thus causing blood to run down the screen while the James Bond theme plays at the background. The title sequence during which the Bond song is performed and the credits are shown, traditionally, has images of scarcely dressed women. In the film itself, there are certain characters who appear regularly, such as Bond's superior M, his flirtatious secretary Miss Money Penny and Q, who provides all the gadgets. Bond has some well-known recurring lines, and without doubt the most famous one is the way he introduces himself, "Bond, James Bond". Another unforgettable line is heard when he orders a vodka martini, "shaken, not stirred", which was not actually used in the early films but was established later. Furthermore, Bond is naturally known for his humorous one-liners which he often delivers right after someone has died at the end of a fight. In these cases the purpose of the one-line joke is to allow the members of the audience to distance themselves from the violence (Spicer 2001: 76). These characteristics make the Bond genre unique and instantly recognisable.

Although the latest films with Daniel Craig as Bond contain some drastic changes, as to having left out some trademarks typical for a Bond film, they still remain loyal to the formula of a Bond adventure. As James Chapman states: "the generic formula of the Bond films is not permanently fixed, but adapts and modifies itself according to various industrial, political and cultural determinants" (2000: 200). In addition to being a symbol for the West and capitalism, Bond also strongly stood for masculinity during the late 1960s and early 1970s and became greatly criticised by the feminist movement that was growing at that time. However, during the last five decades the world has changed; the Cold War was ended, so now, instead of communists, Bond fights against terrorists. Similarly, as a result of the criticism by the feminist movement, the "Bond girls" have become more independent and resourceful than before. For a Bond film to attract new

audiences year after year, it has to be changed in order to be topical and interesting to viewers. This principle of adaptability also applies to Bond's masculinity which cannot have remained the same, considering that the franchise extends over almost 50 years.

1.3 The Cinematic Bond

Ian Fleming himself always wanted to see the Bond novels made into films. In fact, the stories of two of his novels, *Moonraker* (1955) and *Thunderball* (1961), were originally film ideas which he eventually developed into novels. After the publication of *Casino Royale* in 1953, many producers approached him, and a year later, the first Bond novel was adapted into a one-hour teleplay but with various alterations. For instance Bond was Americanised and called "Jimmy" instead of James. In the following years, other adaptations surfaced, and in 1958 Fleming was commissioned by CBS (Columbia Broadcasting System) to write a thirteen-part television series starring Bond. Unexpectedly, Fleming pulled out of the project, and the series was never made. (Chancellor 2005: 224–226) Despite the various television adaptations, 007 did not succeed in making a breakthrough, and Fleming's novels did not attract more readers.

It was not until 1961 that a Canadian producer Harry Saltzman along with his friend Albert R. Broccoli bought the filming rights to all Bond novels except *Casino Royale*. Fleming himself did not take part in writing the scripts for the films. For the role of 007 he suggested a good friend of his, David Niven, and as a second choice the young Roger Moore. However, Saltzman had already found his own favourite, the relatively unknown Shakespearean actor Sean Connery. Fleming was not particularly satisfied with his choice at first but changed his mind after meeting Connery in person. It was decided that the first film was to be based on Fleming's sixth novel *Dr. No* because it was the most visual of his work so far. (Chancellor 2005: 227) However, some aspects of the novel had to be altered for an adaptation more suitable for the cinema.

Fleming himself had stated years earlier, how Bond and his world should be portrayed on film: "[i]n real life, the secret service is a tough, modern organization very far

removed from the cheery, tea-drinking myth usually attached to Scotland Yard” (qtd in Chancellor 2005: 226) and that the audience should dislike Bond “until they get to know him and then they will appreciate that he is their idea of an efficient agent” (qtd in Chancellor 2005: 226). He wanted the James Bond of the novels to be transferred into film just as he was: tough, fatalistic and rather humourless. Nevertheless, the scriptwriters of *Dr. No* took another approach and modified Bond by creating the tradition of humorous one-liners which have been present in every Bond film ever since. They lightened the mood and convinced censors to pass the films despite their abundant use of sex and violence, but at the same time this decision was a step further from Fleming’s Bond. There is no irony in the novels, and compared with the Bond on film, the Bond on paper in general kills fewer people, sleeps with fewer women and is more vulnerable and serious. (Chancellor 2005: 48, 63, 75, 80, 228) Even though the film-makers did not follow the original text faithfully, they knew exactly what they were doing, and the film found its audience.

Dr. No was a success, and soon Bond was known all over the world. An icon was born, much thanks to Sean Connery. To begin with, he fitted the description of Bond’s appearance perfectly, but the character and the actor fused together on other levels as well. According to Bennett and Woollacott (1987: 45), an actor’s real life can “become fictionalised and blended with screen images to result in the construction of a mythic figure poised midway between the two”. This is the case with Connery and Bond. Since he played Bond in the first film of the franchise (and in the next four as well), his acting and looks strongly defined the character, even more than all the other actors who have played Bond. Connery’s own demeanour, confidence and sexual magnetism became the characteristics of Bond (Cork & Stutz 2008: 24), and even today many regard him as the “real” James Bond, because he gave the agent a recognisable face and set the overall tone on how to portray 007. Despite this strong link between Bond and Connery, every actor has brought something new and different to the character compared with previous actors. Their physical looks, talent and ways of portraying masculinity are naturally merged with the characteristics of Bond, who always changes a little with the changing actors.

Connery presented Bond to the audiences as debonair, brooding and ironical. He kept his cool in every situation and was a hero who never failed. He defeated the villains, saved the world and got the girl at the end – and often at the middle – of the film. After *Dr. No*, Connery did four other Bond films: *From Russia with Love* (1963), *Goldfinger* (1964), *Thunderball* (1965) and *You Only Live Twice* (1967). He returned to the role in 1971 for *Diamonds Are Forever* and again in 1983 for the unofficial Bond film *Never Say Never Again*¹. The films Connery made were rather light, and the deadpan humour used in them was full of self-irony. This was needed to bring some reason to the world of the film with its exotic settings and unbelievable situations by indicating that Bond himself realised some things that happened to him were rather absurd, not just to the people watching the film (Ambjörnsson 2001: 16). His remarks connect Bond's world to reality and prevent it from becoming too fantasy-like.

Before Connery returned to the role in the 1970s, an Australian model George Lazenby starred in one film called *On Her Majesty's Secret Service* (1969). By choosing a man with good looks but no prior experience in acting, Saltzman and Broccoli took a great risk. In addition to the new lead actor, the film deviated from previous films by focusing more on the story and characterisation and by diminishing the number of various gadgets (Chapman 2000: 137). Peculiar and unnecessary references were made to Connery in order to indicate that the actor had changed, but Bond also examined old gadgets from previous films to create a link between the new actor and the past films. In addition, the fact that in this film Bond did something extremely unorthodox and got married might have estranged some critics and members of the audience. Nevertheless, Lazenby managed to make Bond look like himself and avoid imitating his predecessor too much, but the film still made less profit than the previous films, and he did not return to the role.

The eighth film, *Live and Let Die* (1973), introduced Roger Moore, the former *Saint Simon Templar*, as the new Bond. After a good response from the audience, it is no surprise that in the next decade or so Moore did six more films: *The Man with the*

¹ *Never Say Never Again* was not produced by the company of Saltzman and Broccoli, thus it is often excluded from the franchise.

Golden Gun (1974), *The Spy Who Loved Me* (1977), *Moonraker* (1979), *For Your Eyes Only* (1981), *Octopussy* (1983) and *A View to a Kill* (1985). Moore's version of Bond was posh and less cruel than Connery's. He was more humorous and rather self-parodying. In the 1970s, especially, the scriptwriters played with intertextual references to other films, such as having a character called Jaws bite a shark in *The Spy Who Loved Me* (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 16, 38). The films in general had a much lighter tone which suited the audiences of the 1970s and 1980s and their desire for escapist entertainment (Cork & Stutz 2008: 28). The Cold War was coming to its end, and the world was changing rapidly. People wanted to escape reality and turned to fantasy for comfort, of which another good example is the *Star Wars*-trilogy, released between 1977 and 1983.

When Moore became older, Timothy Dalton took over the role of Bond in the next two films: *The Living Daylights* (1987) and *Licence to Kill* (1989). While Moore's films did not focus much on the agent's characterisation, Dalton's darker version offered something else. His own intention was to portray Bond as Fleming had intended and to accentuate his bitter and ruthless characteristics but also to reveal his human side. The scripts as well were created paying more attention to the dramatic dimensions of Bond. (Cork & Stutz 2008: 30, 298) Particularly *Licence to Kill* (1989) focused on Bond's character through his personal vendetta to revenge the mutilation of his friend, Felix Leiter, and the murder of his newlywed wife. Though Dalton's first film was a great success, this new approach to Bond in the second one was too different from what the audiences were used to. After two films and a break of six years in the making of Bond films, Dalton refused to return to the role anymore.

Pierce Brosnan was well-known for his performance in *Remington Steele* as a former thief turned private investigator, and he was a perfect choice for Bond according to many polls held in the media (Cork & Stutz 2008: 34). According to Andrew Spicer (2001: 186), Brosnan's Bond was not modern but retro, and his sophistication fitted perfectly "the world of postmodern consumerism". In other words, after the somewhat "darker" period of Dalton, Bond was again hedonistic in his own traditional way and was consuming cars, alcohol, women and clothes among others. After Brosnan's first

film *GoldenEye* (1995) three more successful films followed: *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997), *The World Is Not Enough* (1999) and *Die Another Day* (2002). Although in *GoldenEye* his friend, a fellow agent, deceives him thus making Bond's mission quite personal, the four films concentrate in general on the action and on being as entertaining as possible. The technique of going back to the basics seemed to work, and despite the critics' negative opinions, every film still received millions of viewers.

After four films Brosnan quit, and the search for a new Bond began with much interest from the media. Several suggestions were made and polls held, but in the end, naming Daniel Craig as the next 007 was a surprise to Bond fans. The new Bond had lighter hair and blue eyes and was quite a contrast to Sean Connery, who was still, for many, the cinematic personification of Bond. Despite all the doubt surrounding Craig, his first film *Casino Royale* (2006) became a hit and was praised by both fans and critics. His interpretation re-defined Bond and brought realism to the films by showing how behind his cruel and professional mask, there was a damaged human being (Cork & Stutz 2008: 34–35). This was Dalton's approach too, but the audiences of the 1980s were not yet ready to see weakness and faults in their hero. Showing the real person behind the superhero is, as a matter of fact, a current trend, and Bond *is* without doubt a superhero with his almost superhuman abilities, such as physical stamina. For instance, Christopher Nolan's *Batman Begins* (2005) draws a very different picture of Bruce Wayne as compared to Joel Schumacher's preceding films, *Batman Forever* (1995) and *Batman & Robin* (1997). Now Wayne struggles with combining his hidden identity with his public image while being forced to hide the secret from his friends and loved ones. This is quite different compared with the earlier version of him as a rich and famous playboy who occasionally saves Gotham City without an identity crisis. In October 2007, Craig signed to make four more films (IMDb), and the second one, *Quantum of Solace*, was released in 2008 making it the 22nd official Bond film.

2 PERFORMING MASCULINITY

Teresa de Lauretis (1987: 3, 18) states that gender is constructed through its representation in various social technologies, such as cinema, and in institutional discourses, such as theory. Film, as one technology of gender, produces, promotes and establishes different representations of gender. Because these representations are grounded in cultural conceptions of gender and are in an incessant dialogue with culture, they are varied, constantly changing and regulated by generic conventions. James Bond's hegemonic masculinity, which culturally dominates other types of masculinities, is created through various representations in the films. These representations of Bond's masculinity and how they have changed are studied in this thesis by using Pat Kirkham and Janet Thumin's categorisation of the four sites of filmic masculinity as a basis.

2.1 Filmic Representation

According to film critic Richard Dyer (1993: 3), reality is seen only through various representations of reality. This means that representations, such as images and texts, can only *refer* to reality since it is so vast and has its own logical limitations when it comes to creating meanings to things (Dyer 1993: 2–3). A representation is not real as such, but can be seen as some kind of “distorted reflection of a certain aspect of reality” (Costera Meijer & van Zoonen 2002: 327). It is someone's, an individual's or a group's, interpretation of a member of a certain group that might be partly true, but also misleading and occasionally even offending. A representation is not an exact depiction of one single real person but rather a combination of attributes connected to people similar to this person. In films the characters and events are not real but fiction, representations. For example, the characteristics of Bond's masculinity do not coincide with those of the men in the audience watching the film. Bond is a collection of masculinity traits that are seen as ideal for an action hero by the author and/or the scriptwriter. In general, the mediated world is full of representations that are presented as the truth but in reality can, in fact, prove to be very different from it.

We all play significant roles in the process of creating representations. To begin with, objects, events and people do not usually have a fixed meaning (Hall 1997: 3). It is us, people, who give them a meaning, as Stuart Hall points out:

we give things meaning by how we *represent* them – the words we use about them, the stories we tell about them, the images of them we produce, the emotions we associate with them, the ways we classify and conceptualize them, the values we place on them (1997: 3).

It is the interaction, the dialogue, between representations and audiences that makes them meaningful. Audience members have various ways of reading and interpreting the representations they see, so their meanings vary. (Costera Meijer & van Zoonen 2002: 329–330) Because individuals have diverse backgrounds and knowledge levels, the one and same thing can hold different meanings to different observers.

Time is another important factor when it comes to creating representations. Because of historical specificity some representations are strongly tied to the era in question, which leads to different readings of the same things in different times. This means that representations change; some can be read in another way now as they were, for example, a hundred years ago. We as members of different cultures react to representations in varied ways also because of the different cultural codes available to us (Dyer 1993: 2). Our ways of reading representations are defined by the cultural practices and values we have learned to follow. However, we are able to read representations across cultures if we are aware of the codes of the other culture and are therefore capable of applying them instead of our own codes.

In addition to audiences being involved in creating representations, the media and films have great power over what *kinds* of representations are actually provided. Once a specific representation is created, the media can further reinforce the beliefs attached to it, whether true or not, by presenting it repeatedly and thus making it a common fact in the eyes of audiences without them even noticing it. (Helsby 2005: 6–7) Though it is much easier to reinforce representations, the opposite can happen as well: new

representations that challenge the existing ones can eventually with time change old expectations and representations.

Among magazines, billboards and television shows, the cinema is one powerful medium to produce representations. Richard Dyer (1993: 2) points out that representations function by following the codes and conventions of that particular cultural form in question, and these include various restrictions that define the ways in which reality can be represented, i.e. the medium affects representations. As Teresa De Lauretis mentions:

the impression of reality imputed to cinema by general consensus is not the physical imprint of objects and shapes onto the film, the capturing of actual reality in the image, but rather the result of cinema's ability to reproduce in film our own perception, to reconfirm our expectations, hypotheses, and knowledge of reality (1984: 63).

Reality cannot actually be represented in film but it can seem real to us. For example, the world in which Bond lives might seem genuine because it corresponds partly to what we observe in our world every day. However, Bond as a character and the ways in which he is represented are not completely compatible with what has been established in our world, but still they function perfectly within the world of the film. This fictional world is constructed so that Bond's character does not stand out as odd, which it most likely would do if he were living amongst us. He exists and acts on the terms of the "reality" established within the narrative. The feeling of reality can be further intensified when some characters in films appear to be rather ordinary. This makes identifying with them easier, since viewers recognise something similar between themselves and the fictional character. Films can, of course, offer also positive role models, but some representations are not worth idealising or cannot be imitated as such.

Representations have a significant role in how we perceive ourselves and others. We all belong to some social grouping, and how that particular grouping is represented, for instance in the media, affects the way we see ourselves. Moreover, how we see the members of other groups is largely determined by representations offered in different cultural forms which usually present only a limited view of that group. These kinds of

representations have repercussions in the real world because they might affect how some groups are treated and the possibilities and restrictions they have in life (Dyer 1993: 1, 3). Representations not only influence people's opinions of others but also the way they form their own identities because one's identity is constructed by combining elements of various representations.

When growing up, we learn about the differences between masculinity and femininity through representations that offer models for gender identification (Adams & Savran 2002: 153). According to Teresa de Lauretis (1987: 3), gender is, in fact, representation, and the representation and expression of gender is to construct it. When a woman crosses her legs while sitting, she unconsciously expresses her gender by doing something women typically do and at the same time establishes this act as being feminine. Thus, as it is nowadays assumed, one's gender is constructed through "doing" acts which are regarded either feminine or masculine.

2.2 Doing Gender

In her well-known book, *Gender Trouble* (1990), Judith Butler challenged the generally established idea of biological sex and cultural gender as separate, although mutually interdependent. According to her, gender is not the causal result of biological sex, which is determined by anatomy (1999: 9–10). Having a binary system of two sexes does not mean that there are only two genders. Sex as a category cannot be seen as natural, because biology is culturally gendered as "male" and "female" to begin with. This means that a person whose body has the characteristics of female anatomy is not automatically defined as being feminine and of the female gender or of male anatomy as being masculine and of the male gender. (Storey 1998: 141) By separating gender from sex, it "becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one" (Butler 1999: 10). Without any restrictions set by biological sex, gender can be expressed in many versatile ways.

Butler (1999: 43–44) also introduced the concept of gender performance; that gender is constructed through “doing” rather than “being”. Doing is the reiteration of single acts of gender, called gender performatives, over time again and again. The repetition of these instances of doing *is* gender, which seems like a state of being. But as she points out: “[t]here is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very ‘expressions’ that are said to be its results” (Butler 1999: 33). So, it is not the *subject* who “does” but *what* the subject actually “does” that creates gender identity. Things we do are gendered according to the binary division of sex into opposite male and female, so gender performatives guide us towards either masculinity or femininity. General cultural norms also control our behaviour because they define what is acceptable and expected from us. Bond’s masculinity as well is constructed through gender performance. What the character does, for example how he dresses, fights, drinks martinis, flirts with women or drives a car are performatives reiterated in the film. It is through the reiteration of these instances of already gendered performatives that his masculinity is constructed.

2.3 Defining Masculinity

There are certain sets of norms in society that define what is regarded as masculine and what feminine. These norms are “necessary constructions” that we need “to operate in the world, to locate ourselves in relation to others and to organize a sense of who we are” (Nixon 1997: 301). They guide our lives in that they function as examples for us to follow and goals to strive for, but they also affect us through normalisation, i.e., by providing traditional and coercive models on how a “normal” man or woman behaves (Butler 2004: 206). Men are expected and encouraged to follow certain norms so that they would fill the requirements set for masculinity, and women those set for femininity. Norms and rules are not concrete but certain expectations in people’s minds that are reinforced by our actions in everyday life and also by representations. Even the slightest deviance from the norms might cause surprise, or in some cases anger, because we do not want anything to disturb the safe, familiar, routine-like world of ours. (Gauntlett 2002: 94–95)

Masculinity is usually defined as being constructed in relation to the opposite characteristics of the “other”, which is femininity (Skeggs 1993: 17). Since women are expected to be emotional and nurturing, men are then rational, unemotional and practical (Beynon 2002: 56) because anything that is feminine does not belong to being a man. However, there is actually no unified definition of masculinity (Dyer 1993: 42). It has been widely understood that masculinity is constructed socially and culturally, not biologically. When it comes to biology, it is actually “maleness” that is a quality found in all men instead of masculinity. (Beynon 2002: 2, 7) Masculinity is not a concrete product which can be grasped, and “any sense of masculinity’s embeddedness in men’s ‘inner selves’ comes only from fictional and superficial accounts of what a ‘man’ is” (Whitehead 2002: 34). The outer world has a great influence on what we perceive as being masculine.

Various mass media, such as television, films, internet, advertising, literature and pop music create accounts of being a man and construct masculinity through representations. The representations function as accessible role models, and cinematic masculinity in particular provides carefully created visual and idealised images of men. According to Beynon (2002: 64), the men on the silver screen can likely have a much greater influence on young boys than the men in real life, because they might seem much more exciting. This might be true in that boys turn to romantic films and pornographic films for examples on how to be romantic or a good lover, but it is usually the father at home who provides the role model for how to be a father and a husband. People generally tend to adopt qualities they find worth-while in various role models and combine them. However, the idealised images do not actually tell us what men are really like. They give ideas of what men *should be* like, present *ideals* of men or then at least *try* to present what men are in reality. (Dyer 1989: 43) The people behind these ideas are the film-makers and their interpretations of masculinity are presented in the film. The action-adventure genre in particular characterises men in relation to authority, having power over others, aggressive behaviour and technology (Hanke 1992: 191) which all are characteristics fitting for Bond’s masculinity.

Masculinity is strongly connected with social and cultural matters, and there are many factors, such as sexuality, class, age and ethnicity, which separate men from each other (Whitehead 2002: 34). Therefore, masculinity is seen to comprise of “masculinities”, since one can express gender, i.e. be masculine in various ways (Beynon 2002: 1). There can be several different types of masculinities: white and black, middle class and working class, homosexual and heterosexual, heroic and hard, and hegemonic (Connell 1995: 76, 78). Masculinities are created through comparison with others, for example, white masculinity is often constructed not only in relation to white women but also black men (Connell 1995: 75). In the west, heroic and mythic masculinities, on the other hand, are “deeply ingrained in the national psyche” (Beynon 2002: 6) and have been idealised for centuries. But when dealing with various masculinities, one might be inclined to oversimplify things. For instance, there cannot actually be *a* single black masculinity because there are black men who are also middle class or gay or both (Connell 1995: 76). One characteristic is, however, common to all masculinities, namely having power over femininity which has to be clearly separated from masculinity (Dyer 1993: 42). The ability to overpower and control others, whether it is a question of women, other men, their own bodies and feelings or machines, is generally linked to masculinity (Segal 1990: 123), and hegemonic masculinity in particular.

According to R.W. Connell (1995: 37), there are certain “relations of alliance, dominance and subordination” that exist between masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity, which defines the ideal ways of being a man, is always in a domineering and praised position in relation to other masculinities. The concept of “hegemony”, which originally derives from Antonio Gramsci’s analysis of classes, refers to a situation where one social group attains and retains a leading position within society. (Connell 1995: 77) Hegemonic masculinity, then, is a certain type of masculinity to which women and other masculinities – young, effeminate and homosexual men – are subordinate (Carrigan *et al.* 2002: 110). In order to maintain and secure its domineering position in society, representations of hegemonic masculinity are continuously presented and praised in various cultural forms, so that they become generally accepted by the public. At the same time, representations of alternative masculinities are ignored, disparaged and in some cases incorporated into hegemonic masculinity. (Beynon 2002:

16–17) James Bond’s hegemonic masculinity is presented as being above others, such as villains, homosexuals and black men. Also being physically deformed or merely older makes the villain inferior to Bond who, as the alpha male, is strong and perfect.

As Connell (1995: 76) points out, hegemonic masculinity is not “a fixed character type”. Successful ways of being a man at a certain place and time construct hegemonic masculinity. The hegemonic position is not then always connected to the same patterns of behaviour; societies and the opinions of people change, and new groupings challenge the ideals of the hegemonic masculinity in power and create new alternatives. (Connell 1995: 76–77) Masculinities have to be reconstructed constantly in order to fit the definition of masculinity of that particular era in history (Dyer 1989: 42). Men differ from each other in different parts of the world and different times in history, as do their ideas and experiences about being a man (Beynon 2002: 2). The model for being a good father, husband, son or man in general changes from generation to generation which naturally influences fictional characters as well. Characteristics that are considered ideal for a man now in the 21st century are not the same as in, for example, the 1950s.

Even though ideal masculinity or hegemonic forms of masculinity are seen as something that men must conform to, it is not always possible (Beynon 2002: 65). The ideals provided on how to be a man are often quite unattainable and failing to meet them might cause anxiety in men (Skeggs 1993: 27). When it comes to hegemonic masculinity, the number of men who actually practise it is very small (Connell 1995: 79). The models for this type of masculinity are also rather scarce in real life. Although some film actors and athletes can function as representatives for hegemonic masculinity, often the most visible ones are fictional characters (Connell 1995: 77). An imaginary male character like James Bond can easily be strongly hegemonic without seeming ridiculously macho because he lives in a fictional world in which his behaviour is acceptable.

2.4 The Four Sites of Filmic Masculinity

In their article “You Tarzan” Pat Kirkham and Janet Thumin (1993: 11) state that there are four sites where representations of different masculinities are constructed within the cinema. Masculinity can be created through the characteristics of the male character or explicit themes questioning and challenging the idea of what being a man really is. Kirkham and Thumin (1993: 11) name these four sites *the body*, *action*, *the external world* and *the internal world*. In addition to the visual representation of the male body and the clothes which the character wears, the site of the body includes the actor’s presence and the man being displayed as a spectacle. Action focuses on how male strength is expressed through physical violence, competition, aggression, skill and endurance. The external world refers to how the male characters interact with each other and with the institutions that govern their behaviour. The last site, the internal world, concentrates on portraying the inside of the male characters’ minds and their anxieties about being a man. (Kirkham & Thumin 1993: 11–12)

By using this categorisation as a basis, various representations of Bond’s masculinity are analysed. The site of the body is studied through Laura Mulvey’s (1993, original 1973: 116) theory on the gaze in narrative cinema. If Bond’s body is displayed openly in an eroticised way, who is looking at him, a female character or the audience or both? The gaze is applied also to typical masculine behaviour in that the holder of the gaze is usually a man, in this case Bond. The actors’ physical appearance is studied as well because it gives an idea of what is regarded as masculine. The site called action deals with how male strength is represented. Bond’s use of physical violence against men and women is discussed, as is his endurance.

In patriarchal society power has become almost synonymous with masculinity, and films contribute to this notion strongly by connecting masculinity with matters of hierarchy, knowledge, status and success. The male desire to control people, emotions and events becomes blatantly evident within the cinema. Filmic representations of male interaction and attitudes further reinforce our already existing awareness of male power and control. (Kirkham & Thumin 1993: 12, 18–19) The question of power in James

Bond films is studied in this thesis through Bond's interaction with not only men but also women. The internal world refers to "the experience and articulation of being" and how fictional male characters manifest their anxieties about their masculinity (Kirkham & Thumin 1993: 12, 23). The thoughts and feelings of a character can only be revealed by interpreting what is seen and heard. In this study Bond's inner world is dealt with through showing emotions which can be regarded as being weak, i.e. not masculine. Does Bond ever cry, and if so, why? Does he express joy, pain or anger and in what kind of situations?

3 REPRESENTATIONS OF JAMES BOND'S MASCULINITY

By using Pat Kirkham and Janet Thumin's categorisation of the four sites of filmic masculinity as the analytical framework, different representations of Bond's masculinity are discussed in this section. How the *body* is looked at is studied with the help of Laura Mulvey's theory of the gaze and by concentrating on the actors' physical appearance. The second site, *action*, deals with Bond's violent behaviour and endurance. Within the site of the *external world*, Bond's interaction with men and women and his relation to institutions, like M are analysed because how other people react to Bond reveals a great deal about his manliness. Finally, the issue whether Bond ever shows his feelings is discussed within the site of the *internal world*. By concentrating on these areas in the five Bond films, *Goldfinger*, *The Man with the Golden Gun*, *The Living Daylights*, *Tomorrow Never Dies* and *Casino Royale*, the aim is to find out how representations of Bond's masculinity have changed.

3.1 The Body

One way to portray filmic masculinity is the visual representation of the male body, in this case Bond's body. Focus is placed on Bond as both the holder and the object of the eroticising gaze and how these aspects contribute to constructing his masculinity. Chapter 3.1.2, on the other hand, concentrates on the actor behind the character and how his physical appearance has an influence on Bond's masculinity.

3.1.1 The Gaze

In her much debated article "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema", published in 1973, Laura Mulvey (1993: 123) states that "cinematic codes create a gaze, a world and an object, thereby producing an illusion cut to the measure of desire". According to her, this gaze is male, because the pleasure of looking at another person as an erotic object is divided between active and passive, in other words male and female. The woman in the narrative is usually looked at and placed in the position of a spectacle, whereas the man

is always the spectator and bearer of the gaze. In films, the woman is displayed as an erotic object not only to the characters within the story but also to the spectator in the auditorium. The power of looking which the male protagonist has over the events and other characters is transferred onto the spectators when they identify with the hero. Therefore, the audience also objectifies and overpowers the woman along with the male character. (Mulvey 1993: 116)

Because the male protagonist, in this case Bond, drives the narration forward with his active role, the camera concentrates on him and captures his point of view. There are many examples of this in *Goldfinger* (1964). When Bond (Sean Connery) opens the door onto the veranda in Goldfinger's hotel suite, Jill Masterson (Shirley Eaton) is seen for the first time, and the point of view is Bond's. Wearing a black bikini, she is lying face down on a deck chair looking downward through mounted binoculars at Goldfinger's card game by the pool and giving him advice through a microphone. There are three gazes within the cinema; that of the camera, the character in the narrative and the spectator in the audience (Mulvey 1993: 123), and here the camera's gaze is merged with Bond's eroticising gaze making him in control of what the audience sees. Bond's eroticising gaze is crucial when it comes to constructing his hegemonic masculinity, because the gaze of a man has power, something what the female gaze does not have (Kaplan 1983: 31). Being capable of objectifying female characters in the film is to have power and control which is strongly connected to being masculine.

In another scene, after being shot with a tranquilizer gun, Bond passes out, and soon there is a close-up of him waking up. From his point of view, Pussy Galore (Honor Blackman), a name that already reduces the female character into a body part, is seen in the next close-up, first out-of-focus but then coming into focus with Bond's clearing eyesight. Bond's masculinity is represented in relation to the power linked to his eroticising gaze with Jill and Pussy as the objects. In addition, when the camera becomes one with Bond's gaze, he briefly gains absolute control of the narrative, thus reinforcing his masculinity.

Another example where the camera merges with Bond's gaze occurs later in the film, when Bond goes to get some chilled champagne from the fridge but is knocked out. When he wakes up and turns the lights on in the bedroom, viewers see Jill from his point of view, lying face down on the bed naked and coated in gold paint with a pillow of a chair closer to Bond covering her behind. There is a reaction shot² of Bond followed by another shot of Jill again, and his gaze is established through consecutive shots of Bond and what he is looking at. He sits next to her and takes a better look at her, which is indicated with a close-up of her legs. Some camera angles, close-ups in particular, enforce women's lack of power. Eroticising the woman by fragmenting her body into shots of certain parts, e.g. legs or lips, makes her the object of desire and at the same time weakens the chances for her character to be equal with the man in the narrative (Mulvey 1993: 117). Not only is Bond's gaze openly established by merging it with the camera's gaze but the close-up further emphasises the woman being objectified and Bond holding the male position of power. This scene also has quite shocking nuances, because the object of the eroticised gaze is actually dead, and for a while, desire is combined with necrophilia. This demonstrates how a woman can be objectified even after her death, as if there were no boundaries to sexualising the female body.

Since there are women who look, there is also naturally a female gaze (MacKinnon 1997: 19), but the gaze of the female characters in the narrative might not be acknowledged at all. The first shot of Bond before he wakes up in the scene with Pussy Galore is, in fact, seen through Pussy's eyes. However, her point of view is not made as explicit as Bond's gaze, which the camera literally imitates. In another scene when Bond is on the phone, Jill teases him with a strand of her hair until he pushes her back on the bed with his free hand. After finishing the call, he looks at Jill, whom we see in a close-up merging with Bond's gaze lying on her back on the bed looking very seductive with open hair and parted lips. Bond, on the other hand, is not shown from Jill's point of view but he is sideways to the camera looking at her on the bed. These examples show how a part of constructing Bond's hegemonic masculinity is to ignore the female gaze

² A reaction shot is a quick shot recording someone's reaction to an event or action seen on-screen (Film Terms Glossary Dictionary: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms15.html>).

completely or to diminish its existence by accentuating the male gaze, thus making the woman less powerful.

A similar example occurs at the veranda, when Bond sits on the chair next to Jill and leans over to see through the binoculars. During the beginning of their conversation there are a few close-ups³ of both of them. Jill is resting her head on the back of the chair with a sensual shot of her face filling nearly the whole frame. She looks almost straight at the camera which strongly invites the eroticising gaze, whereas the close-ups of Bond's face are shown more from the side. Bond looks at her or at Goldfinger through the binoculars, which makes Jill's gaze non-existent and his viewpoint more obvious. A close-up of her is used even though Bond is not looking at her in the next shot, in which case she is objectified by the camera's gaze and not Bond's. The gaze of the camera might be considered rather neutral on technical terms but it can, nevertheless, be "male" if the director is a man (Kaplan 1983: 30), because his eroticising gaze can be transferred onto the camera. Bond's masculinity might seem to be weakened, since he is not the one who holds the gaze here, but in relation to women, he is still more powerful because she is the one who is objectified by the camera and through the audience.

The male body is not treated in a similar way as the female body when it comes to the objectifying gaze. Masculinity is strongly defined as tough and active, whereas femininity, while regarded as its opposite, is seen as weak and passive. If the male body is the object of the gaze and desire, it becomes feminine and loses its masculine power. (van Zoonen 1994: 98) Showing weakness in any way makes a man less powerful and hence less of a man. Though there are a few close-ups of Bond, the situations where they occur are different in that they involve distress or trouble often on Bond's part, and they are not sensual as the close-ups of women. Scenes where close-ups of him are used also often ignore the other character's gaze completely. Bond is shown without his shirt on in a few scenes in *Goldfinger*, such as in bed with Jill or at the pool talking to Felix Leiter. Naturally, audience members have different ways of enjoying the film and

³ In a close-up a person's head is seen in the frame from the shoulders or neck up (Film Terms Glossary Dictionary: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms6.html>).

relating to the characters. They pay attention to different things, and thus scenes with Bond without his shirt or a close-up of his face can be sexual to some viewers. However, in this case the camera does not display Bond as a spectacle in the ways it does with the women in the narrative. Furthermore, Bond is not placed in the position of the object of any character's eroticising gaze. By not being subjected to the gaze Bond retains his hegemonic masculinity which equals power through holding the gaze.

Bond's gaze works in another way in *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974), in which Bond (Roger Moore) sneaks into the hotel room, and eventually the bathroom, of a woman, Andrea (Maud Adams), who is delivering the specially manufactured golden bullets to Scaramanga, the main villain of the film. After discovering that she is not alone in the bathroom, Andrea slides the shower door open revealing a gun pointed at Bond and asking him to hand her the robe. He brings it to her and takes a good look at her body before she covers herself. The audience does not see what Bond sees, because in the shot Andrea is still standing inside the shower stall almost completely covered by the rippled door. She tells Bond to turn around and steps outside the stall with Bond walking in front of her. The camera moves from a close-up from the chest up of both of them into Bond, whose expression shows that he is seeing something pleasurable. The following shot is of a small round mirror in which Andrea is seen finishing putting on her robe implying that Bond has seen her the whole time through that mirror. Here, Bond's gaze is not constructed by combining it with the camera's gaze but by clearly distinguishing these two from each other. Bond's masculinity is linked in general with the power of seeing, and he has more power than the viewers and the camera because he can see the woman and others do not.

Earlier in the same scene, when Bond goes into the bathroom, there is a medium shot⁴ of Andrea from the knees up in the shower seen through the rippled glass shower door. In the following shot, Bond walks into the room and notices her, after which there is another medium shot of Andrea, indicating the merging of Bond's gaze with the camera's view point. Bond is enjoying the situation tremendously, which becomes

⁴ In a medium shot a person is shot from the waist or knees up (Film Terms Glossary Dictionary: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms12.html>).

apparent in the next shot where he is smirking. The camera goes back to Andrea but this time we see a close-up of her from the back – another example of the fragmented female body – inside the shower stall where Bond cannot see at this point. Here, Bond's gaze is separated from that of the camera again, but interestingly, in contrast to the previous example the audience is shown something he does not see. Now Bond has less power than the audience and the camera, but even though he is not in control of the narration or of the gaze, the woman is still eroticised through the camera's gaze.

A scene where Bond's gaze is clearly established and the female gaze ignored in *The Man with the Golden Gun* occurs when Bond breaks into the estate of a villain called Hai Fat (Richard Loo) by climbing over a wall. He walks in the garden but suddenly stops when his attention is caught by something interesting. After a close-up from the chest up of Bond, we see a naked girl swimming in a pool, raising her head in the middle of a stroke when Bond talks to her. The camera cuts back to Bond and then back to the girl showing her figure underneath the water surface. The next three shots of her are close-ups but a little farther away, because they still reveal her naked upper body which is blurred by the water. During their conversation, Bond is seen in medium shots from the knees and waist up as well as in close-ups. The shots of Bond can be seen as the camera taking the girl's point of view thus making him the object, but her gaze is still weakened by the fact that she is naked and openly eroticised and therefore weaker in relation to Bond.

In the same scene, Bond takes off his shirt in order to reveal Hai Fat his fake third nipple for which Scaramanga is known. The camera zooms in from a close-up of his face to his chest taking Hai Fat's point of view, but there is nothing sexual in this gaze. According to Steve Neale (1993: 17), men in films can be subjected to the voyeuristic gaze of the spectator and other male characters, and this position is most evident in scenes of fighting where "male struggle becomes pure spectacle". A good example of this kind of male spectacle is the shoot-outs in Westerns with their repetitive close-ups that freeze the narration for a moment just like close-ups of the faces of beautiful actresses. Though the purpose of these spectacles appears to be the same, the gaze is still different. Spectators do not look at the male bodies displayed directly but through

the other characters' eyes. Because of this, the gaze is marked by what the character is feeling, such as fear or hatred, and not by desire on the spectator's part. Thus, the man is not being eroticised and feminised. (Neale 1993: 18) Here, Hai Fat's gaze is marked by surprise and shock, so Bond is not directly subjected to the eroticising gaze and his masculinity is not threatened. Bond being naked from the chest up is also crucial to the storyline and does not freeze the narration as the fragmented body of a woman would do and as it, in fact, does earlier in the scene with the girl in the pool.

A clear change in Bond's eroticising gaze has occurred in *The Living Daylights* (1987). The approach is less biased as compared with the previous two films, and the gaze is mostly held by the camera which remains rather neutral. There are considerably fewer instances where the camera merges with Bond's gaze. The clearest example of the camera taking Bond's point of view and showing a female character as the object of his eroticising gaze occurs when he sees Kara (Maryam d'Abo) playing the cello at a concert through his binoculars. The camera mimics Bond's (Timothy Dalton) eyes as it first moves past the stage with Kara seen among the other players and then goes back to her as Bond notices her. As typically happens with the female body, the scene freezes the narration for a moment, since Bond pays attention to the girl and comments on her beauty. However, the scene is not meant to merely objectify the woman but is actually relevant for the plot because it introduces this significant character to the audience, though quite briefly. In general, over-the-shoulder shots⁵ or medium shots with both Bond and Kara in the frame are mainly used in this film, and no character's gaze is adopted in general. There are no sensual close-ups or otherwise abundant objectification of the female characters. Bond's masculinity is not constructed as strongly through the eroticising gaze as before. This might make him less powerful as a man but he still is not objectified himself.

There is only one clear example where the woman is objectified in this same film. This occurs when Bond rips off the nightgown of Pushkin's mistress (Virginia Hey) in order to distract one of Pushkin's henchmen about to enter the room. The henchman opens the

⁵ In an over-the-shoulder shot the camera films behind the other character's shoulder and/or head (Film Terms Glossary Dictionary: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms14.html>).

door and is surprised to see the woman topless in her underpants. After a medium shot of him, there is a close-up of the woman shot above her breasts from the henchman's point of view as the camera briefly merges with his gaze. Though Bond is involved in the scene, it is not actually he who holds the gaze but another minor character. This shows another noticeable change regarding power in that Bond does not always hold the gaze but another character can take this position. Instead of Bond, the male protagonist, the camera is also more often the holder of the gaze. Bond can be seen to be less masculine, because he is not solely in control of the narrative or the eroticising gaze.

The unbiased approach to the eroticising gaze is continued in *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997), and most of the time, the camera captures the events without taking any character's point of view and usually with a two-shot⁶. In one scene, however, Bond's gaze is established in a way reminiscent to *The Man with the Golden Gun*. Paris Carver (Teri Hatcher) comes to meet Bond (Pierce Brosnan) in his hotel room, and eventually they kiss. This is followed by an over-the-shoulder shot where Paris is seen from the chest up facing the camera sideways with Bond's left shoulder and cheek visible. The camera zooms slightly in on Paris so that the audience does not see her breasts when Bond removes the top of her dress. His gaze is separated from that of the camera, so that the audience does not see what Bond sees, thus making him have more power. But it must be noted that this happens only in one scene.

Allowing the audience to see something Bond does not occurs more often in this film. Bond and Paris are standing next to the bed embracing each other in a full-shot⁷ with Paris's back to the camera and Bond behind her. He removes the rest of her dress, which falls on the ground revealing her underpants and stockings. A similar situation takes place when Bond is seen in a full-shot lying in bed with a Danish professor (Cecilie Thomsen). She is closer to the camera with her back to it, and Bond is positioned behind her. The woman starts kissing him and eventually almost lies on top of Bond with the sheet covering her behind leaving her legs, thighs and back visible, whereas his

⁶ A two-shot is a shot with two people in it (Film Terms Glossary Dictionary: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms20.html>).

⁷ A full-shot includes the person's entire body from head to feet (Film Terms Glossary Dictionary: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms12.html>).

upper body is seen. In both these scenes, the eroticising gaze is not held by Bond but by the camera, which also shows the woman to the audience from an angle Bond himself cannot see, thus weakening his position of masculine power. But yet again the woman's body is more explicitly fragmented, and therefore makes her weaker in relation to the camera, audience and even Bond.

In contrast to the previous films analysed, Bond is quite openly the object of the gaze in this film. After he and Wai Lin (Michelle Yeoh) manage to escape from Carver's men, they clean up under a water shower on a street in Saigon. Wai Lin is wearing a white t-shirt, and Bond has no shirt at all. In a full-shot they are seen standing facing each other with the water running down on them. The camera lingers on them by slowly zooming in and eventually changes into a few close-ups of their faces. As Wai Lin handcuffs Bond on to a water pipe, he is directly under the showering water seen in a medium shot from the waist up. In addition to Wai Lin, also Bond is being subjected to the eroticising gaze of the camera and through it the audience. Here, the situation is similar to the scene with the professor; there is no other character present whose feelings would mark the camera's gaze and thus prevent the man from being objectified directly (Neale 1993: 18). Bond becomes feminised and less powerful by becoming the object of the eroticised gaze. However, the fact that the gaze is held by the camera and not by a female or male character makes Bond still have power over other characters in the narrative. Also, since there is a woman who is being eroticised in the shot instead of Bond alone, his masculinity is somewhat redeemed because they both are looked at by the audience.

In *Casino Royale* (2006) Bond's gaze is established in ways similar to the other films analysed. There are many instances where the camera merges with Bond's point of view. Vesper (Eva Green), wearing a revealing dress, is seen walking into the game room through Bond's (Daniel Craig) eyes and the next shot reveals his reaction. A little later, she walks away from him and the card table in a full-shot, and the following shot shows Bond looking at her direction. In another scene, shot from the waist up Bond is in bed with Vesper who gets up holding the sheet to cover her breasts until she walks out of the frame. The camera stays on Bond looking at Vesper who is out of the frame and

beyond the gaze of the camera. The following shot is positioned on the other side of the bed with Bond lying on it and Vesper standing next to it. She has her back to the camera and is finishing buttoning her long red dress in the front indicating that Bond has watched her put it on. The same technique is applied in *The Man with the Golden Gun* and *Tomorrow Never Dies*: Bond's gaze is not merged directly with the camera by showing what he sees but is constructed by showing him looking at a woman hidden from both the audience and the camera. This also strongly demonstrates his masculine power.

Bond is subjected to the eroticising gaze in shots where there is a woman present in *Casino Royale* as well. When kissing Solange (Caterina Murino), a villain's girlfriend, on the floor of his hotel room, Bond's shirt is open and in bed with Vesper, he is bare-chested. However, a drastic change occurs when Bond himself actually takes the position of the spectacle. At one point, in *Casino Royale* Bond is swimming in the sea in the Bahamas and emerges from the water near the beach in swimming trunks. First, there is a close-up of his face when he surfaces, and when he fully stands up the camera stays close to the surface of the water briefly capturing his bare muscular chest and abs. This is followed by a medium shot from the waist up of him walking towards the beach and stopping when noticing something. The camera and through it the audience hold the eroticising gaze because no other characters are involved in the scene at that moment. There is no female character in the shot to be looked at, and there is really no reason to focus on his body for that long plot-wise. These shots of Bond freeze the narration briefly exactly like the body of a woman often does, so the typical techniques usually applied to women are now used with Bond. He then becomes less masculine and his power is lost when he is subjected to the desiring gaze of the audience.

Bond is also looked at by a female character which has not occurred this openly before. Bond has put on the tuxedo Vesper had tailored for him and is admiring it in the bathroom mirror visibly impressed with how well it suits him. He is seen adjusting his bow-tie through Vesper's eyes when she is secretly standing in the doorway looking at him. Vesper is the holder of the gaze in another scene at the beach as well. In a medium shot from the knees up Bond walks towards the camera wearing swimming trunks.

When the camera moves down, we see Vesper sitting on the ground with her back to the audience and Bond walking to her and sitting down next to her. Here, the eroticised gaze of the camera is merged with Vesper's gaze. It seems that Bond can be objectified openly through the eyes of a female character and through her the audience thus making him less powerful. However, in this case the camera does not stay on Bond's body particularly long, and it seems that Vesper is, in fact, the only female character who can hold the eroticising gaze. So even though a clear change has occurred with Bond being the object of the gaze, certain restrictions exist.

Bond's character has gone through a gradual change over the years regarding the gaze. Eroticising women through the male gaze is strongly hegemonic, as is the power linked to controlling the narrative by merging the protagonist's gaze with that of the camera. In the 1960s, Bond's hegemony was strongly established through these techniques; in *Goldfinger*, women are objectified and the female gaze is ignored completely which reinforces Bond's masculine dominance. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, made in 1974, his hegemonic position is somewhat weakened when the viewers are occasionally able to see more than him, but still it is only the women who are eroticised.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Bond moved further away from the type of hegemonic masculinity established in *Goldfinger*. In *The Living Daylights* (1987), the gaze is noticeably less biased as the audience is the holder of the gaze more frequently than Bond and female characters are not eroticised so blatantly. Women became more and more equal in society in the 1980s which is reflected in the camera's neutral treatment of both women and men, since Bond is not the object of the gaze either. Because Bond is not in control of the camera's gaze, the audience has more power than him which causes a fracture in Bond's hegemonic masculinity. In *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997), Bond is the object of the desiring gaze of the audience but only if there is a woman present in the same shot. Bond being in the position of a spectacle, although within certain limitations, is quite the opposite of what is regarded characteristic for hegemonic masculinity.

It was not until 2006 that Bond himself was eroticised in ways typically used to objectify women, i.e. not only by the camera and the audience but also by a character in the film, in this case a woman. Even though Bond's gaze is established in traditional ways in *Casino Royale*, by being the object of the eroticising gaze he becomes the passive party and thus less powerful, which does not correspond to the values of hegemonic masculinity. One reason for this drastic change is that Bond films are not targeted primarily at men anymore, and in order to reach the women who have become a significant part of the audience, the female gaze has to be acknowledged.

3.1.2 The Actors

The actor playing Bond has great importance on how the representation of Bond is constructed because he illustrates the masculinity trends and thus the ideal male body of the time. The choice of the actors in Bond films ranges from a "normal" to a muscular action hero. The actors have in general always been slim, quite tall and relatively good looking because of credibility and pleasure of looking. A clear change in the body ideal from slender towards muscular in the new films has occurred. The ideal male body has become more muscular which emphasises hardness, strength and male prowess.

Sean Connery was the actor who set the model for Bond since he was the first actor to portray the character in the series. Connery has black hair, brown eyes and suntanned skin causing him to look strikingly dark and thus quite dangerous. He is quite tall with 189 cm (IMDb) and particularly well-known for his hairy chest and legs which strongly signify masculinity. Physically, Connery is lean rather than muscular, and he actually took part in Mr. Universe competition in 1953 (Cork & Stutz 2008: 24). Obviously, bodybuilding back then was not taken quite to the same proportions as today but this background can be seen on Connery's trim physique. Since Bond's body reflects the masculinity trends of the time, it can be concluded from Connery's appearance that in the 1960s the favoured male body was hairy, tanned and noticeably trim.

Roger Moore has brown hair and blue eyes, thus he is not as dark as Connery. However, he is also tanned and quite tall with 185 cm (IMDb). His body type is not as lean as

Connery's, and instead of being muscular or slender, he rather resembles the man in the street. Moore, in general, is not very agile but portrays Bond as more of a gentleman spy. He has no chest hair or any other similar noticeable physical feature which would function as visible proof of his manliness. Judging by Moore's looks, Bond's body has changed: the favoured male body in the 1970s was still tanned as in the 1960s but physically more "normal" rather than trim and not hairy.

Timothy Dalton is 188 cm tall (IMDb) and has dark brown hair and green eyes. He is not that muscular or trim and has much paler skin compared to both Moore and Connery. Bond's body build remains the same as in the 1970s, even though the 1980s introduced a different kind of ideal male body type. New action film heroes, such as Sylvester Stallone and Arnold Schwarzenegger, represented masculinity through barbaric violence and bulging muscles. Although Bond is an action hero as well, his role is completely different and changing his appearance would have not coincided with the image of a sophisticated spy. In the 1980s, Bond films favoured a more "ordinary" male body type which was also fair skinned and not hairy. Pierce Brosnan resembles Dalton in many ways; he is tall and physically not different from everyman. He is not tanned either but Brosnan has, however, a hairy chest, although not as obvious as Connery's. There is no great change in the body ideal since Bond's body in the 1990s does not differ dramatically from that of the 1980s.

Compared to previous Bonds, Daniel Craig is a little shorter than all the other actors with 178 cm (IMDb). He is not tanned or hairy either but the most noticeable difference to the others is his body type. Craig has a very muscular build with big upper arms and neck muscles and looks, in fact, like a bodybuilder and more like the typical action hero of the 1980s. The hyper-muscular male body already as such symbolises power (Brown 1999: 103), but Bond becoming smooth and more muscular is connected to him becoming the object of the desiring female gaze. The muscular male body that has little fat appears hard, and the skin surface functions as armour preventing any leakages between the inner and outer worlds (Easthope 1992: 52). The fear of the real body, that shows weakness by being the object of the gaze, has led to Bond becoming physically harder, almost like a machine, a concept often associated with the disciplined male body

(Easthope 1992: 52). In addition to looking hard, Bond's skin is visibly a smooth surface without any fractures, which would signify vulnerability and weakness. Bond's muscular body seems to compensate for being less masculine on other areas, for instance the gaze, but it also enables him to hold the eroticising gaze without fractures. The favoured male body in the 2000s is relatively tall, not tanned, hairless and very muscular.

Since the 1980s, being tanned has not been a favourable characteristic of Bond. He has become a little shorter quite recently, and his hairiness can be seen to derive from the actor rather than from the era in question. For many decades, Bond's physique remained relatively similar even though some trends were more popular in the media and society. In the 1960s, a little more slender body type was appreciated, but for the next three decades, Bond was physically like any "normal" man in the audience. Only in the 2000s, he became more of a bodybuilder with a hard and smooth surface, which allowed him to become the object of the desiring female gaze.

3.2 Action

Aggressive behaviour and the violence that usually ensues are considered to be more innate to men than women. Men use violence against women in order to maintain their dominant position within the patriarchal society and against men to establish certain boundaries. (Connell 1995: 45, 83) Violence is an essential part of the Bond genre, as it is of all action adventure films. Furthermore, the binary relationship between the good hero and the evil antagonist(s) legitimises violence which becomes a sign of decency when one fights for the right cause. Violent behaviour is then justified and seen as an acceptable, and even desirable, way to be a man.

Bond, in all the films of the series, fights with numerous henchmen, so his hegemony is strongly constructed through violence and the power linked to it. The villain's helpers are usually defeated with one punch or kick, but Bond also kills his antagonists. Homicides in real life occur more often between men (Connell 1995: 83), hence killing

someone can be regarded as a masculine act. Although Bond kills men, a certain distance remains between him and the actual act of killing. Often, humorous one-liners are used to lighten the aftermath of the violent scene, but sometimes Bond kills the antagonist so that he does not directly become physically involved in the death of the person. In *Goldfinger*, at one point during a fight, a thug falls into a bathtub full of water in Bond's suite. As he tries to reach for Bond's gun in its holster on a chair nearby, Bond tosses a fan into the bathtub electrocuting him. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, a man, after a fight, falls into a printing press and is crushed to death making the machine spit out blood-stained newspapers. The death of the antagonist occurs often at the end of a struggle in which Bond has to fight for his life. The ability to survive and improvise during a fight is a hegemonic quality.

When shooting someone, Bond still maintains a distance to the killing because he does it through an object. The final battle between Bond and Scaramanga in *The Man with the Golden Gun* becomes a game of cat-and-mouse when the villain all of a sudden disappears in the middle of a duel. The servant Nick Nack (Herve Villechaize) leads Bond into the villain's training area where there are mannequins and mirrors set to confuse the opponent. In the end, Bond surprises Scaramanga by taking the position of a mannequin modelled after him and kills the villain with one shot, demonstrating resourcefulness. After murdering Paris Carver in *Tomorrow Never Dies*, the assassin, Dr. Kaufman (Vincent Schiavelli) holds Bond at gun point. Bond tricks Kaufman to stun and paralyse himself with his mobile phone and then forcefully turns the assassin's gun towards him. Kaufman tries to reason with Bond saying "I'm just a professional doing a job" to which Bond replies "Me too", and shoots him. Being a pro who does what he has to do is another aspect of his hegemony. Kaufman's profession and the fact that Bond is avenging the death of Paris make this killing somewhat more justified. A certain sense of righteousness and readiness to exercise vigilante law are characteristics of a hegemonic masculine man.

Bond rarely kills antagonists with his bare hands but this does happen in *Casino Royale*. Two thugs passing by notice a transmitter in Bond's ear and begin shooting at him and Vesper. After a brutal fight, one of the thugs falls into his death in a staircase and the

other is strangled by hand by Bond. His masculinity is constructed through his capability to defend not only himself but the woman, Vesper, as well, which is consistent with the notion of hegemony. The violence in this film, in general, is much more realistic compared with the previous films; it is bloody and messy, and Bond is physically more involved in the fights. Violent acts and deaths do not merely happen, but they are always committed by someone. Bond also shoots two men although they are unarmed and one man in the back. The line between the good guy and the bad guy is somewhat blurred when Bond acts in a way we expect a villain to do. This makes Bond a more complex and realistic character, but, yet again, also demonstrates his professionalism when in order to complete his mission, he is prepared to do anything. His motive to defeat the evil villain remains the same, but his methods are more drastic than before.

There is a certain degree of inequality in patriarchal society; women are at a disadvantage when it comes to income for instance. In order to maintain their dominance, men use violence and intimidation, both physical and verbal, against women. (Connell 1995: 82–83) Bond uses violence on a woman in *The Man with the Golden Gun*, when Scaramanga's mistress Andrea holds a gun at him. Bond unarms her and then twists her arm behind her back until she reveals to whom she is delivering the golden bullets. When he asks her where Scaramanga is, she says she does not know, at which point Bond slaps her face with an open hand and grabs her by the front of her robe. This is the most brutal example of Bond using violence against women in the five films analysed. Men who are violent to women do not necessarily see anything wrong with their behaviour but consider it as their right as the superior male sex (Connell 1995: 83). Slapping a woman, which proves the man is more powerful because he is physically stronger, was considered a more acceptable way of being a hegemonic man in the 1970s than it is today. The violence Bond uses against Andrea is still quite moderate because even though she is on the villain's side, she does not present a real threat to Bond. Action heroines in 1974 were not yet common in film, and unlike men, women were regarded as unworthy antagonists.

The violence Bond uses against women is not similar to how he fights with men, thus women are not antagonists in the same way as men. In *Goldfinger*, Bond uses some Judo moves on Pussy Galore who then retaliates with similar tosses but the scene functions as a prelude to Bond seducing her so it is not really an actual fight. Some violent acts are also moderate and committed without the intention of actually hurting the woman. In *The Living Daylights*, Bond holds Kara's arm and rips her sleeve to reveal the shot wound she has, not to hurt her. In *Casino Royale*, he vents his anger on Vesper after losing all of his money in the poker game and grabs her arm when she is about to leave. Dominating women through violence is not seen as a positive quality for a hegemonic man nowadays, although it might have been more tolerated in the 1970s. Bond is decent and a gentleman because he does not hit women at all or at least not in the same way as he hits men. He does not kill any women in these five films either, but it is usually the villain who does it or gives the order. This accentuates the villain's evilness and separates him from Bond's character when he has no scruples about hurting the less powerful, i.e. killing women.

In addition to violence, Bond's physical strength is expressed through endurance. A hero in Western culture is a relentless warrior who does not break down or give up but keeps on pushing no matter how tired he is or how difficult things get (Robinson qtd in Kleiber & Hutchinson 1999: 138). This notion applies also to Bond who is a hard action hero. At the beginning of *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Bond steals a fighter plane with nuclear missiles. Once up in the air, he is attacked by a henchman sitting in the backseat. As he is being strangled with a steel wire, Bond manoeuvres the plane by moving the stick with his legs and swerves away from missiles shot at him. In *Casino Royale*, Le Chiffre wants Bond to be eliminated from the poker game by any means, so his girlfriend slips poison into Bond's drink. When Bond realises that something is wrong, he leaves the table taking a salt shaker with him from a nearby table. In the bathroom, he tries to vomit the poison out by drinking salted water, but eventually, he has to scramble to his car and contact the Secret Service. He follows the doctor's instructions, although he is on the verge of collapsing and manages to attach the leads of the defibrillator onto his chest and inject himself in the neck with a shot of lidocaine.

Bond is a man who does not give up in situations which other men would find difficult or even impossible to overcome.

In *Casino Royale*, in particular, Bond's physical stamina is accentuated more compared with the other films. There are long on-foot chases, and during one of them, Bond climbs up a crane and runs through a wall among other things. When jumping off the crane, he lands heavily onto a hard roof and careens off to the roof of a lift shaft. This is clearly painful, but Bond, lying on the ground, barely shakes his head, gets up and continues the chase by kicking in a door next to him. When he finally has the chance to stop for a minute at the back of a van going the same way as the bomber he is chasing, he does not seem out of breath at all. However, instead of presenting Bond as a man with superhuman stamina, the film gives the impression that he is capable of doing these things because he is in good shape and trained for the job. He gets cuts and bruises just like any other person and is, in fact, hospitalised at one point. There is still something more to Bond that distinguishes him from other men and establishes his hegemonic position which he deserves because of his toughness.

Within the site of action, Bond's masculinity is constructed through various characteristics that correspond to the notion of hegemony. In addition to being able to defend oneself, protect others and improvise in fights, a sense of morality, being a professional and having physical endurance are ideal qualities of a man who represents hegemonic masculinity. The nature of Bond's violent behaviour is different depending on the sex and motive of the antagonist. Whereas in the 1970s slapping a woman might have been considered acceptable male behaviour that supports his hegemony, this is no longer the case, and has not been for the last three decades. Bond can still be hegemonic, even though he does not dominate women through violence because the definition of hegemony in this case has changed.

The violence in Bond films is more realistic in the 2000s because films, in general, have become much more violent and the computer technology available sets no boundaries to "colouring" fight scenes. The character of Bond has become more real as well and thus more fascinating. During the Cold War (1945–1989), when the three first films studied

were made, it was important to choose one's side and differentiate the villains from the heroes. Now the situation has changed: Bond is on "our side" but behaves occasionally like a bad guy making him a more complex character. Today's audience is capable of accepting the changed Bond because the world is not divided in two so radically anymore, and it is, in fact, a contemporary trend to construct a more complicated representations of heroes in popular culture.

3.3 The External World

A character's interaction with the fictional world and other characters reveals a great deal about the character himself/herself. Therefore, within the external world, I analyse Bond's interaction with both men and women and his relation to institutions, e.g. M. (Bond's interaction with the female M is studied in chapter 3.3.3.) It is also essential to take into consideration how other characters react and relate to Bond and his behaviour

3.3.1 Interaction with Friends

Overpowering the villains by angering or outwitting them is essential to Bond's character but he must maintain certain superiority even in relation to his male fellow agents and team members in order to retain his hegemonic position. One of them is Major Boothroyd, also known as Q, who appears in altogether 18 Bond films⁸. He and the scientists working at the Q division invent and build the gadgets which the agents use on their missions. The scenes with Bond and Q consist of sarcastic chit-chat with Bond intentionally trying to vex the inventor – often successfully. In these situations, Bond's character is created in contrast to an older man who has a special role within the Secret Service, a role that is completely different from that of Bond. Other colleagues that Bond works with contribute to constructing Bond's masculinity for example through showing incompetence and lack of knowledge.

⁸ The character of Q does not appear in *Live and Let Die* (1973), *Casino Royale* (2006) and *Quantum of Solace* (2008).

The way in which Bond teases Q and Q's reaction to it establish the difference in their personalities. In *Goldfinger*, when Q (Desmond Llewelyn) shows Bond the tracker on the dashboard of his Aston Martin, Bond comments on how it allows him to have a quick drink while following someone. To this Q responds rather upset: "It has not been perfected after years of patient research and time for that purpose, 007." In *The Living Daylights*, Q shows him a key-ring finder that has an explosive in it and that also omits stun gas when whistling a certain tune. After a demonstration of the gas, Bond attaches the finder onto Q's gas mask hanging on his neck. When he is about to whistle the tune as if to test the explosive, Q shouts him to stop, worried that Bond might actually carry on. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Q, posing as a car rental service worker, meets Bond at an airport. As he lists out various choices for insurance such as collision and fire coverage, Bond says yes to all of them. Hearing this, Q's facial expressions indicate that he is not pleased with Bond's answers. Bond's boyishness and playful attitude are accentuated because Q is more serious and does not care for Bond's remarks and teasing behaviour. Bond is somewhat hedonistic and care-free but still takes things seriously when the situation calls for it.

Bond's behaviour when interacting with Q brings forth the different roles these characters have within the Service; Bond is the active agent whereas Q stays mainly in London and does not participate in actual missions. In *Goldfinger*, Q tells that it should take about an hour for him to introduce all the new gadgets to Bond. When hearing this, Bond looks very bored signifying that he is not interested in the tedious details but wants to start his mission as soon as possible. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, Q and another scientist examine the bullet that killed a double-0 agent. They discuss the workmanship commenting on the material to each other and mention the name Lazar. After listening to their conversation for a while and not hearing anything useful that he could investigate, Bond impatiently asks "Well, what the hell is Lazar?" to which Q answers sighing that he obviously is the man who made the bullet. Bond behaves in a quite childish manner by being so impatient, and sometimes Q in response treats him as one. As well as accentuating Bond's role as the active hegemonic man, Bond's younger age becomes quite obvious in their relationship.

Although Q is the intelligent inventor and scientist, Bond can still dominate him in his area of expertise. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Q takes Bond to his new car, a BMW that one can steer remotely with a cell phone. He tries to demonstrate this and drives the car with the phone, but it moves in a jerky manner. When it is Bond's turn, the car moves smoothly around the hangar as if someone were inside the car driving it. Bond overpowers Q because he is skilled by nature and does not require any practice in order to control new gadgets. Technology is an important area of identity construction for men. It is encoded as male, as Judy Wajcman (1991: 137) points out: "the very definition of technology has a male bias". Being handy with machines and technical devices is also a crucial aspect of Bond's hegemony. Overall, Bond's relationship with Q follows the same pattern throughout the series, and Bond visiting the Q branch is actually a crucial element of the formula of the Bond film.

The agents Bond works with and their actions emphasise some of Bond's hegemonic qualities and especially his individuality. Bond's character is strongly constructed in relation to his male helpers who often complicate things and leave Bond to deal with the situation alone. Some helpers are incompetent like in *Goldfinger*, where Bond is held captive at the villain's ranch but manages to escape. However, he is soon caught and escorted back to Goldfinger. At the same time, Felix Leiter (Cec Linder) and another agent are spying on the ranch from further away. Goldfinger sees them and realises they might be there because of Bond. Therefore, when Bond is brought back, he treats him as a guest so that Leiter and the other agent would be convinced Bond has everything in control. His plan succeeds because Leiter, after seeing Bond walk into a barn with Pussy, decides that he does not need any help and they leave. He and the other agent fail to understand what is really going on, thus showing their incompetence and leaving Bond to take care of everything by himself. He is naturally capable of doing that which demonstrates his skills and individuality.

A similar example of a helper's lack of skill occurs at the beginning of *Casino Royale*, when Bond and another agent, Carter (Joseph Millson), are keeping an eye on a bomber who is watching an organised fight between a cobra and a mongoose amidst a huge crowd of people. When the bomber receives a text message, he leaves pushing himself

through the crowd in Carter's direction. He informs Bond through a transmitter that the target is moving and touches his earpiece to hear Bond's response better. Bond tells him not to touch his ear so visibly but, at the same time, the bomber notices Carter and starts to run. Carter follows him drawing his gun which Bond angrily tells to put away. When Carter jumps into the pool where the fight takes place, he trips and accidentally fires his gun into the air causing panic among the people. Bond then goes after the bomber himself and eventually catches him obtaining crucial information from him. Bond is more competent and experienced compared with some of his co-workers, and his capability to cope by himself becomes accentuated. He fits the image of a hard, heroic man as the "lone ranger" or "lonely wolf" who does not need anyone's help.

When other agents follow rules faithfully, Bond often trusts his own instincts which further emphasises his individuality. In *The Living Daylights*, a colleague called Saunders (Thomas Wheatley) tells Bond to shoot when they see a sniper trying to kill General Koskov who is going to defect to the West. The sniper is, in fact, the cellist they saw playing earlier. Bond shoots at the gun deliberately missing the girl though M's orders are to kill the sniper. Saunders is angry about this and brings it up later threatening to inform M. Bond is not worried about M because, as he tells Saunders, he only kills professionals and the girl obviously was not a real sniper. Moreover, since Bond is the good hero and a decent man, he does not kill women. If it had not been for Bond, an innocent girl would have been killed. Emphasising his capability of making independent decisions constructs him further as a hegemonic character.

Some characters' behaviour draws attention to Bond's self-confidence and courageousness. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, Bond wants to meet a millionaire called Hai Fat because he is suspected of hiring Scaramanga to kill an important solar-energy expert. Bond is in liaison with Lieutenant Hip who tells that Hai Fat's house is heavily guarded and meeting him is impossible. Hip is still convinced of this when they arrive there and tells Bond to take a look himself. He climbs on Hip's shoulders to see over the wall surrounding Hai Fat's house and continues climbing over it much to Hip's surprise. Whereas Hip is hesitant to take action, Bond boldly leaps in. Bond is represented as confident and capable of doing things that other agents would not do or

even dare to try. Bond's strength and his manliness compared with other agents emphasise his extraordinariness and his hegemonic position.

The ignorance of his colleague can illustrate Bond's competence on areas such as technology and cultural issues. In *The Living Daylights*, when Saunders and Bond are waiting on the balcony of the opposite building for the Russian sniper to appear, Saunders puts on night vision binoculars but does not see anything through them. Bond, sitting next to him, reaches out and turns them on. On another occasion, Bond mentions that Koskov has bought a cello called the Lady Rose for Kara. Saunders is surprised that a cello would have a name to which Bond replies that all Stradivarius cellos have names. By being technologically more skilled and having more cultural knowledge than the other agent construct Bond's hegemonic masculinity.

Bond's masculinity is strongly created in comparison with other men. Certain qualities found in Bond, such as being boyish, technologically skilled, self-confident, courageous and individualistic become emphasised through his interaction with other male characters and are all in line with the idea of hegemony. The way in which Bond dominates and outperforms other men in the narrative – usually in more than one way – has not changed over the years.

3.3.2 Interaction with Villains

Bond's masculinity is constructed in his relationship with the villain in three different areas: physical combat, smartness and sex. Bond defeats the villain in physical confrontation by usually killing him in the end. He often outwits the villain by intentionally provoking him until he loses his temper or by being smarter and fooling him somehow. Sleeping with the villain's wife, mistress or employee is another typical way for Bond to disempower the antagonist. Furthermore, the villains in Bond films are often physically deformed or have otherwise peculiar appearance and/or behaviour. This is a familiar concept from old traditional fairy tales; visible physical deformation is a sign of an evil character whereas the hero is usually perfect.

The ultimate way for Bond to disempower the villain and establish his own superiority is to kill him at the end of the film. In *The Living Daylights*, Bond is faced with an American arms dealer Brad Whitaker (Joe Don Baker) who has a machine gun with a bullet proof glass to protect the shooter. Bond shoots at him and runs out of ammo, but eventually kills Whitaker by causing a column to fall on him with an explosive key-ring finder. In *Goldfinger*, Bond encounters Goldfinger in the plane which is supposed to take him to Washington. After a struggle for the gun, Goldfinger accidentally shoots at the window and is sucked through it. Bond is a hero who by killing his main antagonist makes sure that the villain does not hurt anyone anymore in the future. Warriors are selfless (Beynon 2002: 67), and Bond, if anyone, works relentlessly to protect Britain and the whole world without much worrying about his own fate.

Bond is not always the one who kills the villain. In *The Living Daylights*, the death of General Koskov is not shown at all but is strongly hinted at when his superior Pushkin promises to fly him back to Moscow in a diplomatic bag, in other words, a body bag. Bond does, however, kill the other villain, the arms dealer Whitaker who had been working with Koskov, so defeating the villain by killing him is a part of his hegemony. In *Casino Royale*, after being tortured by Le Chiffre, Bond struggles to stay conscious lying on the floor, and just before he passes out, he sees Le Chiffre being shot by someone. Although Bond can be seen to indirectly cause his death by winning the game and making him penniless, this, nevertheless, differs greatly from the familiar formula of a Bond story and creates a fracture in Bond's hegemonic masculinity.

Not showing emotions is an important part of masculinity. Women are emotional, men act rationally. An emotional man loses his credibility as an antagonist because emotions are a wound in the hard surface of masculinity. When Bond provokes the villain somehow so that he loses control over his emotions, he succeeds in making him less manly. In *Goldfinger*, after finding the girl who tells Goldfinger his opponent's cards through an earpiece, Bond turns the microphone off. When he turns it back on, he taps it a few times making Goldfinger quake from the noise. Bond tells him to lose 15 000 dollars or he will go to the police. Goldfinger obeys and after losing the hand, he snaps a pencil in two in anger. Similarly, in *Tomorrow Never Dies*, the villain Elliot Carver is

suspected of being involved with the sinking of a British warship and framing the Chinese for it. At a party celebrating Carver's satellite network, Bond cuts off the broadcast in the middle of Carver's speech making him yell angrily at his employees. Another example of irritating the villain occurs in *Casino Royale*, when after losing a hand to Le Chiffre in the poker game, Bond orders a dry martini and gives the barman exact instructions on how to make it. This wakes the curiosity of three other players who order the same drink. Annoyed by the delay in the game, Le Chiffre impatiently asks if anyone is interested in playing poker. Bond sets out to annoy him, in which he succeeds. Bond is stronger in relation to the villain who is incapable of controlling his emotions.

Outsmarting the villain by fooling or surprising him is another way to establish Bond's hegemony. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, Bond goes to a boxing match to meet Scaramanga's mistress who has stolen a solar cell called Solex from her lover. After finding her dead with a bullet hole in her chest, he takes her bag looking for the item, when suddenly Scaramanga sits next to him. Bond is clearly taken by surprise but still participates in light conversation while Scaramanga's servant Nick Nack holds a gun at him. As the villain tells about his background and why he actually became an assassin, Bond sees the Solex lying on the floor nearby. He smoothly picks it up and without Scaramanga noticing slips it to Lieutenant Hip who walks by disguised as a peanut seller. The same happens in *Tomorrow Never Dies*, where Bond has seized Carver's computer expert and tries to exchange him for Wai Lin who has been captured by Carver. When the expert tells everything is ready on his part, Carver himself shoots the man. Bond is not left completely helpless but detonates the bombs he had placed earlier close to some fuel tanks. He surprises Carver and takes control by causing mayhem. Although the villain appears to be one step ahead and in control of the situation, Bond, nevertheless, manages to outsmart him and prove his superiority.

Another way to overpower the villain is to reveal his ignorance of some matter which accentuates Bond's vast knowledge of various things. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, Bond flies to Scaramanga's private island where the host shows him the room with generators that convert solar energy into electricity. Scaramanga tells Bond that he does

not understand the process completely for science was never his strong point. Bond informs him that the large containers are “Superconductivity coils cooled by liquid helium” as if to prove how smart he is. Being smarter than the villain is a part of the way of constructing Bond as a hegemonic character.

Homosocial rivalry between men over a woman’s body is a recurring theme in popular culture (Sedgwick 1985: 1, 23), and it functions as a way to construct heroes as hegemonic characters. The hero humiliates the villain by winning not only the body of the villain’s woman but also her loyalty. This happens in the Bond films as well. Having sex with the villain’s mistress, wife or employee signifies a change in power relations because of the idea of woman being man’s property. The woman often turns against the villain and/or reveals important information about him to Bond as well. In *Goldfinger*, he sleeps with two of Goldfinger’s employees, Jill Masterson and Pussy Galore. Both these women, after surrendering to Bond’s charm, help him work against Goldfinger. The same occurs in *The Man with the Golden Gun*, where Scaramanga’s mistress Andrea willingly steals the Solex from the villain’s safe after a night she spent with Bond. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Paris who, in fact, has had an affair with Bond before, tells him crucial information about Carver’s secret laboratory before leaving Bond’s hotel suite. Bond obviously has something more to offer than the villain because he has such a strong influence on the women. The ability to seduce another man’s woman and make her deceive him is a hegemonic attribute.

In *Casino Royale*, Bond does not have sex with Le Chiffre’s girlfriend Valenka (Ivana Milicevic) and does not, in fact, even speak to her during the whole film. This creates another fracture in Bond’s masculinity in this film when it comes to his relationship with the villain. He seduces the wife of a smaller thug but does not actually have sex with her either because he leaves after she casually tells her husband is flying to Miami. Not having sex with these women does, however, emphasise Bond’s individuality; he does not seem to need their help because he does not use his sexual magnetism to turn them against their lovers.

Bond's hegemony is established through the many ways in which he overpowers the villain; he provokes him so that he loses control over his emotions, outsmarts him, has sex with a woman close to him and eventually kills him. In *Casino Royale*, made in 2006, Bond does not disempower the villain by killing him or by sleeping with his mistress but his hegemonic position is constructed mainly through smartness and muscles. The idea of seeing women as property of men is not approved in society and especially not by the audience of today, thus the film's more equal treatment of female characters.

3.3.3 Interaction with Women

Bond's influence on women is an essential part of his hegemonic masculinity. The type of relationships Bond has with women can be categorised into four groups: unrecruited love, authority, casual sex and genuine love. Miss Money Penny, who belongs to the first category, is smitten with Bond but their relationship never develops beyond flirting. The female M represents authority in Bond's life, and Bond's interaction with her is not similar to how he relates to the male M. The numerous partners of casual sex naturally enhance Bond's manliness through sexual activity, whereas truly being in love shows a more vulnerable side to his character.

The only recurring female character in Bond films is Miss Money Penny, M's secretary⁹. The scenes between Bond and Money Penny are usually rather brief but reveal the nature of their relationship quite clearly. It is a question of unrecruited love from Money Penny's side; a relationship that is based on flirting without ever becoming anything more. In *Goldfinger*, after ending a meeting with M and stepping out of his office, Bond asks Money Penny (Lois Maxwell) what she knows about gold. She says that the only gold she knows is the kind you wear on the third finger of your left hand. Bond answers teasingly "Hmm. One of these days we really must look into that." after which she suggests tonight saying she will bake him an angel cake. Bond refuses making her think that the reason is some woman, but when she finds out he is having

⁹ There are only two Bond films, *Casino Royale* (2006) and *Quantum of Solace* (2008), in which she does not appear.

dinner with M she asks “So there’s hope for me yet?”. After kissing her on the cheek, Bond answers “Money Penny, won’t you ever believe me?” and leaves the room. Their flirting is light and quite harmless, but Money Penny’s hints of marriage strongly support the image of her as a woman with a traditional goal: marriage. While Bond travels around the world encountering beautiful women, Money Penny stays in London waiting like the perfect obedient housewife of the early 1960s. This also emphasises Bond’s independence; Money Penny would most likely marry him if he wanted to but action heroes are “lonely wolves” who do not have wives and families waiting at home.

Bond’s own behaviour reinforces the idea of Money Penny as a wife. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, Bond is talking to Money Penny (Lois Maxwell) about the death of another double-0 agent. M calls her to his office through the intercom, and before she enters the room, Bond has another question for her:

Bond: Oh, just one moment, darling.

Miss Money Penny: Yes, James?

Bond: Why wasn’t Scaramanga confirmed as the killer?

Miss Money Penny: Because they couldn’t find the bullet! ... Darling!

The affectionate word “darling” is typically used between lovers or particularly between a husband and a wife. Furthermore, it is quite sexist to use a word like “darling” when addressing a female co-worker but it also contributes to constructing Bond’s hegemonic masculinity. She, on the other hand, clearly expected a more intimate question because of Bond’s choice of word, since she speaks her last line rather angrily and the added “darling” very icily and sarcastically. Although she is somewhat disappointed, their never-ending game of flirting is continued with her mocking reply.

The idea of Money Penny as the sacrificing wife becomes clear in *The Living Daylights* as well. Bond tells Money Penny (Caroline Bliss) to book him a plane ticket to Tangiers (where Pushkin is) via Bratislava though M’s orders are to assassinate Pushkin as soon as possible. Bond asks her not to tell anyone about the ticket, to which Money Penny agrees without questioning his intentions. Like a good wife, she is willing to do favours for her “man” and is prepared to even endanger her own job by working behind M’s back. In

the same film, Bond asks Money Penny to find information on a woman cellist who played at Bratislava the night Koskov defected. While taking off her eyeglasses in a flirtatious manner, she replies that if he, in fact, is such a music lover, he should come over to her place to listen to her Barry Manilow collection. Bond puts her glasses back on crookedly, and judging by the sound, slaps her on the bum, and after he has left, Money Penny is shown sighing dreamingly like a school-girl. This is shockingly sexist and degrading behaviour for a film made in 1987, and slapping a female colleague's bottom at the workplace would definitely not be tolerated these days. Money Penny is first and foremost loyal to him, which demonstrates Bond's influence over her and women in general.

In the 1990s, Money Penny's character changed noticeably. This change can be linked to the introduction of the new M (Judi Dench) who was a woman. The relationship between Miss Money Penny and M altered, which becomes obvious in *Tomorrow Never Dies* where they seem to join forces in teasing Bond. M gives him an assignment to investigate Elliot Carver and the following conversation takes place:

M: Use your relationship with Mrs Carver if necessary.
 Bond: I doubt if she'll remember me.
 M: Remind her. Then pump her for information.
 Miss Money Penny: You'll just have to decide how much pumping is needed, James.

These two women are familiar with Bond and his usual escapades. Neither of them is afraid to refer to Bond's methods in a rather mocking tone, not even Money Penny (Samantha Bond) in the presence of the female M. It would seem odd if Bond's superior were an efficient and accomplished woman, with Money Penny still behaving like a school-girl with a crush on him. As she has become more independent and modern, Bond's influence on her has weakened creating a fracture in his hegemonic masculinity.

Bond does not possess control over Money Penny in the same way as before. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, M says that Bond should use his past with Carver's wife in order to get information on Carver. He replies that he was not aware that their relationship

was public knowledge and gives Moneypenny, sitting on the front seat of the car, an accusing and slightly hurt look. She, on the other hand, is not much affected by this and says “Queen and country, James” implying that there are no secrets to be kept when working for the government. Moneypenny of the 1990s does not blindly do what Bond asks her to and even dares to break the bond of trust between them. Her feelings for him do not affect her judgement, which suggests that Bond is not able to charm her over anymore. His relationship with Moneypenny does not correspond with what is regarded as hegemonic. Furthermore, Bond seems to become somewhat feminised in this scene when a female superior tells him to use sex to get information – something what women have traditionally thought of doing.

The female M, played by Judi Dench, was first introduced in *GoldenEye* in 1995 and has appeared in every Bond film since. As a result of this, the dynamics between M and Bond changed noticeably; Bond does not relate similarly to her as he does to the male M. Even though Bond has to obey her or would otherwise have to quit his job with the Service, the fact that the authority figure in his life is a woman affects his behaviour to some degree because taking orders from a woman can be seen to weaken his manliness.

Bond does not always take the female M seriously and occasionally seeks to provoke her intentionally as if to belittle her position of power. In *Casino Royale*, the media are reporting about some security camera footage of Bond when killing an unarmed man in an embassy. When M goes home, she finds Bond sitting in her living room. She is angry about the incident becoming public and scolds him for being so careless. When M asks Bond how he found out where she lives, he replies “The same way I found out your name. When you recruited me I thought M was a randomly assigned letter, I had no idea it stood for –“ at which point M interrupts him irritated. Bond has a desire to rebel against authority, i.e. the Service and M, but he does not seem to take her anger seriously also partly because she is a woman. Bond’s rather playful behaviour causes a shift in the power balance between him and M in his favour, and overpowering women is strongly hegemonic.

Bond is quite insubordinate at times, and it is usually M who has to comply with his decisions. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Bond is ordered to leave a Russian terrorist arms bazaar at once but instead he goes after the fighter jet with nuclear missiles. When a naval commander questions his actions, M defends him by saying that he is doing his job. In *Casino Royale*, Bond breaks into M's apartment, hangs up the phone on her, lies to her about not telling his name to Solange (the wife of a henchman) and logs into the website of the Secret Service using her password. He also pursues the clue he found on the bomber's cell phone, although M orders him to lay low for a while because of the embassy incident. In the end, he is proven right when his investigations lead him to preventing a terrorist attack. After this, Bond has a meeting with M who gives him an assignment to continue his investigations on the matter. The way in which the female M yields to Bond's independent decisions constructs his hegemonic masculinity by accentuating his individuality and his more powerful position in relation to his superior.

Compared with the male M, the female M shows more affection for Bond. In *Casino Royale*, after Vesper's death and the revelation of her betrayal, Bond is on the phone with M. She explains how Vesper's boyfriend was kidnapped and that she was blackmailed into stealing the money Bond won from Le Chiffre. During the conversation, M calls Bond by his first name twice, something which the male M does not do. She is compassionate and even suggests he should take some time off. However, at the same time, she is pleased that Bond now knows not to trust anyone and is thus a better agent. Although showing compassion, she still remains professional and knows that it is her job to train Bond to become almost a machine, an effective instrument of the Service. Bond's behaviour is different when interacting with the female M as well. In *Casino Royale*, in the parking lot at a hotel, Bond walks to his Aston Martin. Once inside the car, he opens an envelope containing a document regarding the assignment signed by M. With a smirk on his face, Bond says out loud "I love you too, M", something which he surely would not say if M was a male character. Bond's relationship with the female M is more intimate than with the male M, but there is, nevertheless, a certain degree of distance and formality between them, as there should be.

The third group of the women Bond interacts with includes casual sexual partners and other female characters. Bond encounters numerous women on his missions and often treats them as sex-objects in order to establish his manliness and carry out his mission. At the beginning of *Goldfinger*, he is having his back massaged by a woman called Dink (Margaret Nolan) at a pool. Felix Leiter comes to find Bond, and after introducing him to Dink, Bond asks her to leave because of “man-talk”, takes her by the shoulders, turns her around and slaps her on her bottom before she walks away. The same thing happens in *The Living Daylights* with Money Penny being slapped. In *Goldfinger*, Bond also has a tendency to glance at women’s behinds. He does this once to Money Penny in her office and twice to an air hostess in Pussy Galore’s airplane. Bond’s behaviour is extremely sexist, and there is no attempt to hide it. Portraying women as sex-objects in this manner would not be approved nowadays, and, in fact, there are no examples of similar behaviour in *Tomorrow Never Dies* and *Casino Royale*. Being sexist was a crucial element of Bond’s hegemony in the earlier films but not anymore in the 1990s and 2000s.

Having success with women constructs Bond’s masculinity as hegemonic to a great extent. Some women surrender to his charm immediately without much resistance. In *Goldfinger*, Bond discovers Jill Masterson helping the villain to cheat in his card game. She does not resist when Bond talks to the microphone forcing her employer to start losing money but is rather amused of Goldfinger’s angry reaction. She tells Bond that she is beginning to like him more than anyone she has met in a while. He asks what they should do about that, and they kiss. In the next scene, they are half-dressed kissing on the bed in Bond’s suite. In *Casino Royale*, Bond becomes better acquainted with the wife of one of Le Chiffre’s henchmen, Solange. After beating her husband at a card game and winning his Aston Martin, Bond invites her for a drink to his cabana. In the next scene, they are kissing on the floor with Bond asking questions about her husband and his job. Solange notices this and says she is afraid he would sleep with her just to get to her husband. Bond asks how afraid to which she replies “Not enough to stop” and starts kissing his bare chest. Solange is quite willing to commit adultery with a stranger who is clearly after her husband. Being irresistible to women strengthens Bond’s manliness.

Sometimes Bond does not have to make much of an effort at all when the woman takes the initiative. Even though the woman is more active, Bond's sex appeal still becomes accentuated. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, Bond discovers that the golden bullet used to kill 002 is now in the possession of a belly dancer (Carmen Sautoy). He goes to her room after her performance and complements on her dancing. The girl replies that he is very handsome, and after telling how she found the bullet, which is now her lucky charm, she strokes Bond's cheek and says they should forget the past. At the beginning of *The Living Daylights*, a woman (Kell Tyler) in a bikini is on a yacht telling her friend on the phone that she hopes to meet a real man. Conveniently, after saying this, Bond lands on the yacht with a parachute and borrows the woman's phone. He calls the Service to say he will report in an hour but when the woman, holding a glass of champagne, flirtatiously asks him to join her, he changes the deadline into two hours. Bond's sexual magnetism is so strong that he does not have to persuade the woman for her to become interested.

All women do not submit to Bond's charm at once but behave quite passively and even defiantly towards him. However, they are not able to resist him forever. In *Goldfinger*, Bond meets Pussy Galore when waking up on an airplane after being shot with a tranquilizer gun. He is suave and flirtatious as usual and hopes the flight with her will be memorable. Pussy answers coolly "You can turn off the charm. I'm immune." On the ground Bond is welcomed by Oddjob, and when he remarks to Pussy that this Goldfinger's right hand kills little girls like her, she replies "Little boys too." She reacts indifferently to Bond and does not seem to care what happens to him. On his ranch Goldfinger asks Pussy to be polite to Bond so that the CIA men spying outside would think everything is fine. She does as told, taking Bond for a walk, and eventually they end up in a barn. He begins to flatter her in order to win her to his side but Pussy stays reluctant:

Bond: What would it take for you to see things my way?

Pussy: A lot more than you've got.

Bond: How do you know?

Pussy: I don't want to know.

She is not interested, and when Bond persistently grabs her arm, she hurls him with a Judo move. Bond retaliates, and soon they are lying in the hay Bond lying on top of her holding her down. He lowers his face and whole body gradually and kisses her. Pussy resists at first but then yields and kisses him back flinging her arms around him¹⁰. Winning a reluctant woman is “every man’s dream”, and a “real” man, like Bond, succeeds in it. All women, no matter how uninterested or unwilling they might seem in the beginning, eventually surrender to Bond which supports his hegemony.

Another example of resistance on the woman’s part is found in *Tomorrow Never Dies* where Bond collaborates with a Chinese agent Wai Lin who is very skilled at her job and used to working alone. When they are handcuffed to each other by Carver’s henchmen, she says she hopes they will not stay like that for long. When they ride a motorcycle still cuffed, she climbs onto Bond’s lap to see the cars following them. As she is sitting in front of Bond facing him, she tells him not to get any ideas. After the chase, while Bond is suggesting they should work closely together, Wai Lin secretly picks her hand free with a picklock in her earring and cuffs him on to a water pipe. Judging by her behaviour, she does not immediately find him irresistible. They do kiss eventually but only in the very last scene of the film. Although it takes a little longer for Wai Lin to fall for him, sexual appeal is still an essential element of constructing Bond’s hegemonic masculinity.

Bond shows compassion for some female characters instead of merely using them for sexual pleasure and gaining information. The woman might be an innocent bystander and not a professional agent at all which affects Bond’s attitude towards her. In *The Living Daylights*, Kara Milovy is a naïve cellist in love with General Koskov whom she helps to stage his assassination attempt. At first, Bond wants to use her relationship with Koskov to find him, but during the course of the film, he begins to care for her more. Bond even goes back to her although his assignment is accomplished. After playing at a concert, Kara returns to her room disappointed when hearing that Bond is on a mission elsewhere. She notices two martinis on the table and whistles, to which the key-ring

¹⁰ In Fleming’s original novel *Goldfinger* (1959) Pussy Galore is actually lesbian but she, nevertheless, falls for Bond in the end.

finder answers. Bond's hand appears from behind a screen holding the finder, and when Kara walks to it, Bond grabs her hand and pulls her next to him onto the sofa. They kiss and lie down as the camera moves to the other side of the screen. It is quite unusual for Bond to return to the Bond girl because traditionally he takes advantage of the situation of being alone with her at the end of the film when the villain has been defeated. This differs from the established Bond formula and brings a new element to his masculinity: not all women are treated as mere sex objects by him – some of them are represented as having subjectivity and thus capacity to make visible the internal world of Bond.

Bond is more considerate also if the woman is an old friend of his. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Bond has had an affair with Paris Carver in the past. During their conversation at Elliot Carver's party, it is revealed that she is aware of Bond's real profession and assumes from the very beginning that he is trying to use her to get information on Elliot. Bond, however, denies this immediately and quite adamantly indicating that he does not want to exploit their past relationship and get her involved in his investigations. When she comes to his hotel suite later that night, Bond tells her to go back, and as she is getting ready to leave Bond's suite, he says he can get her out of the country in four hours. He wants to protect Paris from her husband who might find out about their affair. Like in the previous example, Bond's behaviour concerning this woman deviates from the formula and constructs him as less hard a character than before.

A love interest is introduced to the Bond formula in *Casino Royale*. The category of genuine love includes only Vesper Lynd, since Bond's feelings for her are much stronger than for Kara or Paris. The love affair between Vesper Lynd, an accountant for the Treasury, and Bond in this film is more serious than one is used to seeing in Bond films. She makes an impression on Bond already on their first meeting when she concludes many things about his personality and childhood which are true. She gives quite a speech assessing Bond and stating where she herself stands:

Now, just having met you I wouldn't go as far as calling you a cold-hearted bastard – but it wouldn't be a stretch to imagine that you think of women as disposable pleasures rather than meaningful pursuits, so as

charming as you are, Mr. Bond, I will be keeping my eye on our government's money and off your perfectly formed ass.

In addition to actually saying this to Bond, her behaviour indicates that she dislikes him. On their way to the hotel in Montenegro, Bond tells Vesper that they are staying in a shared suite because of their cover story as a couple very much in love. She quickly comes up with an explanation for the suite to be changed into one with two bedrooms. Bond brings a dress for Vesper to wear for the poker game that evening and asks her to walk into the room so that all the other players see her. However, she enters the room from another direction so that Bond is the only one who is distracted by her beauty. As a show for Le Chiffre, at one point during the game, Bond walks to Vesper and kisses her but as he is about to kiss her again, she turns her head away. Vesper, at first, plays hard to get but eventually falls in love with Bond. Even when she betrays him by stealing the money Bond won, she does it because of a deal she had made to spare his life which proves she truly loves him. Yet again, Bond's influence on women is established.

Bond's attitude towards Vesper in the beginning is quite sexist. When she sits opposite to him on the train introducing herself by stating "I'm the money", Bond replies "Every penny of it" taking a look at her from head to toe. He jokingly tells her that the name of her alias is Stephanie Broadchest, but whether this is true is never revealed. Bond kissing Vesper in the middle of the game with everyone watching is meant to distract Le Chiffre but Bond wants to deliberately annoy Vesper as well. His behaviour changes after Vesper helps him to kill a thug. When returning to the suite, he finds her sitting in the shower with her dress on under running water crying and clearly shocked about the incident. Bond sits next to her and comforts her but they do not have sex. He falls in love with Vesper and even leaves his notice of resignation to start a life with her. This kind of behaviour causes a fracture in Bond's hegemonic masculinity. However, she deceives him by transferring the money to another account and is eventually killed by drowning. Bond is a lonely action hero who cannot have a happy ending with the woman he loves. Being sexually active is such a crucial element of Bond's hegemonic

masculinity, thus he cannot remain monogamous. There will always be other women to be charmed in the next film.

Having success with women and overpowering them is an essential part of Bond's hegemony. In the 1960s and 1970s, Bond's masculinity was strongly constructed through casual sex and the degrading treatment of women. In the 1980s and 1990s, Bond's hegemonic position was weakened when, in addition to becoming less sexist and showing more compassion for some female characters, Miss Money Penny's blind devotion for him disappeared. In 2006, he became vulnerable by truly falling in love, something which is not in line with what is considered constitutive of hegemonic masculinity. Even though Bond's masculinity is not so strongly constructed through his influence on women, he still establishes his hegemony often by belittling the authority of the female M who remains professional while simultaneously showing more compassion for him.

3.3.4 Relation to Institutions

The original M is often said to be a father figure to Bond who in the novels is strict and demanding but occasionally caring towards Bond as well (Bennett & Woollacott 1987: 129). Furthermore, M differs from other male characters in Bond films in that he represents the Secret Service. He is the personification of the organisation that gives Bond the orders and is able to take away his double-0 status. At times, Bond rebels against M and through him the whole Service by embarrassing his superior and/or by being insubordinate. Although his rebellion is mostly verbal or otherwise moderate, it still emphasises Bond's individuality and functions as means to shift the power balance between Bond and M. Overpowering one's superior, even if only momentarily, is a hegemonic quality.

In order to gain the power in their relationship, Bond often outsmarts M in the presence of others as if to deliberately humiliate him by exposing his ignorance on some matter. In *Goldfinger*, Bond is having dinner with M (Bernard Lee) and Colonel Smithers (Richard Vernon) who tells them about Goldfinger and his background. When Smithers

offers Bond some brandy saying that it is rather disappointing, M asks what is wrong with it. After sniffing the brandy, Bond replies “I’d say it was a thirty-year-old fiend indifferently blended, sir, with an overdose of Bon Bois” to which Smithers says he is correct. Later, while Smithers is talking with Bond, there is a shot of M smelling the brandy decanter and glancing at Bond with an expression indicating he does not notice anything peculiar with it. A similar situation occurs in *The Man with the Golden Gun* in a meeting with M (Bernard Lee) and other department chiefs. When M asks Bond what he knows about the assassin Francisco Scaramanga, he lists several facts about his background and mentions that he has “a superfluous papilla”. M asks “A what?”, to which Bond replies that it means a third nipple. Outsmarting and thus revealing a weakness in M is one aspect of Bond’s hegemony.

Bond only briefly overpowers M who usually re-establishes the power balance. For instance, at the end of the meeting in *Goldfinger*, Smithers sets a bar of gold on the table intended for Bond to use as bait to awaken Goldfinger’s interest. As he touches the bar to pick it up, M, with a smug grin on his face, stops him by saying that he can retrieve it in the morning with the rest of his equipment. It seems that by not allowing him to take the gold right away M gets even with Bond for embarrassing him by knowing so much about the quality of the brandy. Similarly, in *The Man with the Golden Gun*, a while after Bond tells M what a third nipple is called, M shows Bond a golden bullet with the number 007 engraved on it suggesting that someone has hired Scaramanga to assassinate him. When Bond wonders who would pay a million dollars for his death, M is quick to offer different choices: “Jealous husbands, outraged chefs, humiliated tailors. The list is endless.” Here, as well, this sharp remark is a response to Bond outsmarting him only a moment earlier. This creates a fracture in Bond’s hegemonic masculinity. However, since M represents the Service and Bond is the employee, the power balance has to be restored. Bond cannot be hegemonic in relation to the organisation but can be to M on a personal level, although even then only momentarily.

Bond’s defiant behaviour is usually verbal and quite moderate which establishes M’s superiority. In *Goldfinger*, M (Bernard Lee) scolds Bond for purposely provoking Goldfinger instead of merely observing him, as was assigned. Bond becomes annoyed

for not being told why Goldfinger is under surveillance in the first place and says quite bitterly “I am prepared to continue this assignment in the spirit you suggest if I knew what it was about” and then adds a dry “sir” when M looks at him disapprovingly. Because of M’s authoritative position, Bond quickly notices he is out of line and adjusts his behaviour. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, M wants Bond to disappear for a while because having Scaramanga on his tail would jeopardise his assignments. He is not pleased with this decision, but instead of going after Scaramanga all by himself, before leaving his office, he says to M that the situation would be different if he found Scaramanga first to which M agrees. Bond does not want to work behind M’s back but consults him about his idea showing great loyalty to the Service and respect for M’s position of authority. A part of being a warrior is to obey orders (Beynon 2002: 67), and being an efficient and loyal spy is essential to Bond’s character.

There are instances when Bond’s insubordinate behaviour does not remain merely on a verbal level. In *The Man with the Golden Gun*, while in bed with Mary Goodnight, Bond receives a phone call from M wanting to congratulate them on their successful mission. He asks to speak with Goodnight, but instead of giving her the phone Bond places it on the bed next to them and continues kissing her. M waits on the other end of the line and says Goodnight’s name a few times. After a while, Bond picks up the phone, wishes “Good night, sir” and hangs up. Bond’s power is emphasised when he with his daringly defying behaviour humiliates M who does not this time respond with a witty comment. However, since Bond has accomplished the mission successfully and is most likely to have a few days off, his rebellion is not that serious and does not lead to drastic consequences. He is still the obedient and loyal warrior (cf. Ambjörnsson 2001: 30–33).

Defiant behaviour on Bond’s part during the mission does occur as well but within certain limits; he does things behind M’s back which makes his rebellion still relatively moderate. In *The Living Daylights*, the Secret Service has received information on a Russian General Pushkin’s plan to kill double-0 agents which M (Robert Brown) believes is true. Bond is assigned to assassinate him but he tells M he knows Pushkin (John Rhys-Davies) and is not convinced he could be involved with such a plan. Furthermore,

M is not pleased with Bond only wounding and not killing the female sniper earlier, so he threatens to give Bond a fortnight's leave and send 008 to do the job because he follows orders. Bond protests adding that if Pushkin has to be killed, he would rather be the one to do it. However, he trusts his own instincts more and, in spite of M's orders, flies first to meet the sniper, Kara, before going to Tangiers where Pushkin is. Even then, rather than killing him immediately, Bond gives Pushkin a chance to defend himself and decides to stage his assassination in order to mislead the real culprits. Bond is not loyal to M and the Service in the same way as before; he has become less of a warrior and more of a man who behaves in line with hegemonic male values. In the 1980s, individuality is then a more ideal quality in a man than following rules blindly. Nevertheless, Bond works in secret because if he rebelled more openly against the organisation, he could lose his license to kill or be dismissed altogether. Bond has become powerful in relation to M but with certain restrictions.

Bond has a desire to rebel against the Service in order to prove his individuality. In the films made in the 1960s and 1970s, he overpowers M by embarrassing him and/or by being insubordinate but his rebellion is still quite moderate since it is mostly verbal or otherwise subdued. Bond gains the hegemonic position only momentarily, because following orders and being loyal to the Service is considered ideal for a warrior and not for a man who represents hegemonic masculinity. Bond's defiant and individualistic behaviour in the 1980s, on the other hand, corresponds with hegemonic values. One explanation for Bond's behaviour is the atmosphere of the late 1980s when the Cold War was coming to its end, and people were ready for a change. Bond, who ignores his orders and eventually collaborates with Pushkin, mirrors the weakening political and ideological dichotomy in the world. The East and the West were able to work together successfully if there was a common enemy to defeat.

3.4 The Internal World

In cinema, dialogue and the character's facial expressions and actions reveal her or his feelings (unless there is a voiceover telling their thoughts). Showing emotions is

generally considered feminine and therefore something what a masculine man does not do. Hard, heroic men, in particular, must be tough and have control over their emotions (Beynon 2002: 67). In order to hold onto his hegemonic character, Bond has to remain unemotional and be able to control his feelings.

Bond often manages to keep his emotions under control in various situations. Appearing nervous or anxious is a sign of weakness which would give the antagonist the advantage. In *Goldfinger*, during their golf game, Bond shows Goldfinger the gold bar given to him by the Bank of England. When at the next hole it is Bond's turn to hit, Goldfinger suggests they should play for the bar which is worth 5 000 pounds. Bond looks a little nervously down and bites his lower lip before getting ready to swing because he is expected to return the bar to the bank after the mission. However, his ball lands perfectly, whereas Goldfinger's ball ends up in the rough. Visibly most anxious Bond is when he is threatened to be cut in half by Goldfinger's laser. Lying on his back on a table with the beam getting closer and closer to his crotch Bond licks his lips, has a little sweat on his forehead and keeps looking somewhat worriedly from the beam to Goldfinger while trying to convince him that he knows about his grand plan. When the laser is finally shut off, he is clearly relieved. These feelings of fear and concern are extremely subdued, and because Bond exhibits such control over his emotions in the presence of others, his tough masculinity is emphasised. This toughness constructs him as a hegemonic character who has power over other people.

There are other instances where Bond, although being distraught, remains calm. In *Casino Royale*, his first reaction to seeing Solange murdered is silence. While he and M are standing next to her body on the beach, the camera zooms onto him. After answering no to M's question whether she knew anything that could compromise Bond, he gulps and glances to the side, away from Solange. He seems unaffected, but there is some indication of him being slightly upset. In the same film, Bond strangles a man to death at the end of a long and brutal fist fight. Afterwards in the bathroom of his suite, he takes off his shirt and washes away the blood – his and the other man's. He takes a drink of whiskey and after keeping his eyes closed for a while, stares at himself in the mirror breathing deeply and looking rather upset. He seems to use those few seconds to

gather himself and, at the same time, to come into terms with having killed a person brutally only a moment earlier. Exhibiting this kind of self-control clearly constructs him in terms of hegemony.

Bond does not always succeed in controlling his feelings. When an acquaintance or a closer friend of his dies, he does not, however, express grief by crying but through anger. Aggression is considered natural to the male sex (Connell 1995: 45), so it is an acceptable emotion for a man to express. In *Goldfinger*, while Bond lies unconscious on the floor, Jill, the girl he had just slept with, is killed. After waking up, he walks to the bedroom and turns on the light. His reaction to seeing her dead covered in gold paint lying face down on the bed is quite controlled and only in his eyes can one detect a mild shock. Bond goes to the body and sits next to it, and as he calls Felix Leiter, his facial expression and tone of voice is angry because he knows Goldfinger is the culprit and is now more determined to catch the villain. Instead of showing weakness by grieving her death, his masculinity is established through aggression.

Another similar example occurs in *The Living Daylights* where Bond meets Saunders at a café in an amusement park in order to collect new passports for him and Kara. He leaves the café before Bond, and when reaching the doorway, the automatic glass sliding door closes too early and hits Saunders killing him. Bond rushes to him and finds next to the body a balloon with the words “Smiert Spionom” indicating that Saunders was on General Pushkin’s list of Western agents to be assassinated. Bond squeezes the balloon in anger until it pops. His immediate reaction is aggression, through which he vents his other possible emotions. A little later, his anger is turned against Kara whom Bond treats quite icily – after all, she is in love with Koskov who is also involved in killing double-0 agents. When she asks if they could stay longer in Vienna, he sharply replies that they are leaving immediately and takes her by the arm pulling her with him. Grief turned into aggression is a tough man’s way to avoid appearing weak.

In addition to being emotionless and having self-control over one’s feelings, another attribute of the kind of warrior masculinity that Bond represents is to value revenge over

personal grieving (Beynon 2002: 68). In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Bond tricks Dr. Kaufman to paralyse himself with Bond's cell phone, and with anger in his eyes, he revenges Paris' death by shooting the assassin with his own gun. Bond's feelings of sorrow are transformed into anger and then vented through vengeance. This is another example of typical behaviour for a warrior and a hard, heroic man and is consistent with the idea of hegemony.

Anger does not always replace Bond's feelings of grief. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, Elliot Carver calls Bond and tells him that he has two items that belong to him; an encoder he just stole from his laboratory and Paris in his hotel room. Bond enters the suite and goes into the bedroom. He walks to the bed where Paris is dead lying face down, crouches next to her, says her name rather desperately and almost whispering and places his mouth on her hair clearly shocked. His mourning, however, is interrupted by the realisation that the assassin, Dr. Kaufman, is still in the room. At one point during their conversation, Bond, now sitting next to Paris on the bed, looks at her and caresses her hair after which he speaks to the assassin with an ever so slightly broken voice. Although he does not cry, he is visibly upset. Bond still manages to keep his emotions in control but this, nevertheless, shows a fracture in his hard warrior masculinity.

Another example of genuine grief can be found in *Casino Royale*. At the end of the film, Bond fails to save Vesper from drowning when he does not manage to open on time the locked door of the lift where she is trapped. He gets her dead body on dry land and tries to resuscitate her but finally his mouth-to-mouth technique turns into desperate kissing. He steps away from her panting and stares at her looking quite devastated and shocked. In the next shot, which is from further away, he kneels next to her and takes her into his arms. The audience does not actually see if he is really crying because of the distance, but it is strongly hinted at. Vesper's death causes a fracture to appear in Bond's hard masculinity by showing his vulnerability. However, it also makes him human and a more realistic character, which is a general trend with heroes in the cinema these days.

Emotions can make a warrior weak because they might cloud his judgement (Beynon 2002: 68). This happens to Bond when in *The Living Daylights*, after finding the balloon next to Saunders' body, he suddenly sees a small bunch of balloons behind a hedge nearby. Thinking it is the killer with the balloons, he runs towards them, jumps in front of the person holding them with his gun drawn out only to discover that it is a young boy with his mother. Bond seems surprised and a little shocked. The death of a colleague has an effect on his ability to make good decisions and leads to him behaving in a quite unprofessional manner when he almost endangers the lives of innocent people. In addition to being disappointed with himself for not being able to prevent Saunders' death, Bond is also worried he might be the next on the list of agents to be assassinated. Even though he exhibits self-control by not expressing these feelings clearly, they still have an influence on his thinking and behaviour.

As a spy, it is essential for Bond to be able to control his feelings and appear unmoved. This kind of behaviour does not occur merely in the presence of villains and other antagonists but also when Bond is with someone closer to him. For example, in *Casino Royale*, although Bond has admitted his love for Vesper and resigned the Service, he does not smile or laugh any more freely when being alone with her. Bond, in general, has a tendency to smirk rather than smile in all the films which is in line with the image of a composed spy. When he does express true joy openly, often it is not because he enjoys the company of a person but because of an inanimate object. In *Tomorrow Never Dies*, during a chase in a parking house where he steers his car from the backseat with a cell phone, he smiles when he fills a flat tire on his car with just one push of a button. A little later, he jumps out of the car, drives it off the roof of the building and watches it land into a display window on the street with a wide smile on his face. After this he coughs, his expression becomes serious and he leaves the place. Bond seems to get great satisfaction from his car with all the gadgets like a little boy does from a toy. This accentuates the boyish nature of Bond but also the fact that he is a lonely action hero who does not get emotionally too attached to other people on a personal level.

An important part of Bond's masculinity is his ability to control his feelings of concern, fear, shock and sadness which corresponds with hegemonic values. Emotions can have

an effect on Bond's judgement but only on rare occasions. Bond's grief is often vented through anger which is acceptable for a tough man. In the 1990s and 2000s, Bond expressed sorrow more freely which caused fractures in his hegemonic masculinity. Although this revealed a more vulnerable and realistic side to him, James Bond still cannot be shown to cry. Changes in society in this case are reflected only partly in Bond films; even if a man of the 21st century can cry more freely than before, it does not mean that 007 is one of those men.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The way in which Bond's physical strength is portrayed and his masculinity is constructed in relation to other male characters in the films has not changed over the years. In other areas, his hegemonic masculinity has been weakened by the numerous fractures caused by behaviour not corresponding to what is regarded as hegemonic; he defeats the villain only through smartness, his influence on women has weakened and he shows his grief more openly. Some of these changes have occurred in the 1980s and 1990s but the definition of Bond's masculinity has been modified the most only quite recently, in *Casino Royale*, made in 2006. Bond has also become the object of the eroticising female gaze but this is made possible because of his more muscular and harder body that can bear the eroticising gaze.

Social and political changes in society have clearly had an influence on Bond's character. Bond is not "a sexist, misogynist dinosaur" anymore and has not been since the 1990s. His treatment of women is more equal mirroring women's position in society. Although the eroticising female gaze was not clearly established until the 2000s, it is still a reaction to the growing number of female viewers. Bond's violent behaviour is more brutal and questionable now than for example in the 1960s which reflects modern warfare where techniques do not necessarily have to be acceptable as long as the motive and end result are. In addition to violence being more realistic, Bond himself has become more human which corresponds with the trend of depicting heroes. The last restless years of the Cold War affected Bond's attitude towards his superior and willingness to work together with the Russians. This is not surprising because when the whole world changed, it was reflected in societies and eventually the cinema and the representations it offered.

There is a certain pattern to the changes in the way in which Bond's masculinity is represented. When some characteristics or actions seem to weaken Bond's masculinity in some area, other qualities are emphasised more as if to compensate for the "lack". For example, in *Casino Royale*, Bond can be seen as less masculine because he is subjected to the objectifying gaze of a female character, he shows vulnerability by

falling in love and does not defeat the villain by killing him. These flaws are compensated by making him brutally violent and look almost like a bodybuilder with a hard surface. This way, Bond is always clearly hegemonic in some area although the areas may differ from decade to decade. This practise of compensation can be distinguished in all the films analysed in this thesis except for *Goldfinger* where Bond is represented as the hyper-masculine alpha male who does not have any weak points and thus there is no need for compensation. Changing times and opinions have resulted in a different approach to Bond's character over the years but, nevertheless, showing weakness in him still cannot be done without resorting to accentuating his other hegemonic qualities.

By applying the idea of compensation to different Bond films than the five used in this thesis, one would discover whether it applies to them as well. Another intriguing angle for future studies would be why Bond's hypermasculinity came to its end; was it so strongly associated with Sean Connery so that when he quit the role, Bond became automatically less masculine on some areas or did the trends of the following decades have a greater impact on this change? The 22 Bond films and 14 Bond books made provide a comprehensive source of material for different studies, for example on masculinity, femininity, technology and various ideologies, and it seems there is no end to the career of James Bond as a movie legend or an objective of academic study.

WORKS CITED

Primary sources

- Casino Royale*. Dir. Martin Campbell. (2006) [DVD] Sony Pictures (2007).
- Goldfinger*. Dir. Guy Hamilton. (1964). MTV3. Recorded 17th September 2000.
- The Living Daylights*. Dir. John Glen. (1987) [DVD] FS Film (2008).
- The Man with the Golden Gun*. Dir. Guy Hamilton. (1974). MTV3. Recorded 23rd September 2000.
- Tomorrow Never Dies*. Dir. Roger Spottiswoode. (1999). [Video] Warner Home Video (1998).

Secondary sources

- Adams, Rachel & David Savran (2002). "Representations." In *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Eds. Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden: Blackwell. 153–156.
- Ambjörnsson, Ronny (2001). *Mansmyter: James Bond, Don Juan, Tarzan och andra grabbar*. Stockholm: Ordfront.
- Bennett, Tony & Janet Woollacott (1987). *Bond and beyond: the political career of a popular hero*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Berger, Arthur Asa (1992). *Popular culture genres: theories and texts*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Beynon, John (2002). *Masculinities and Culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brown, David (1999). "The Social Meaning of Muscle." In *Talking Bodies. Men's Narratives of the Body and Sport*. Eds. Andrew C. Sparkes and Martti Silvennoinen. Jyväskylä: SoPhi. 99–117.
- Butler, Judith (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell & John Lee (2002). "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." In *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Eds. Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden: Blackwell. 99–118.
- Cawelti, John G. (1997, original 1969). "The concept of formula in the study of popular

literature.” In *Reading Popular Narrative*. Ed. Bob Ashley. London: Leicester University Press. 71–75.

Chancellor, Henry (2005). *James Bond. The Man and His World*. London: John Murray.

Chapman, James (2000). *Licence to thrill: a cultural history of the James Bond films*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R W. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cork, John & Collin Stutz (2008). *James Bond Ensyklopedia*. [*James Bond Encyclopedia*.] Translated by Reija Becks & Henrik Laine. Helsinki: Readme.fi.

Costera Meijer, Irene & Liesbet van Zoonen (2002). “From Britney Spears to Erasmus: Women, Men and Representation.” In *The Media: An Introduction*. Eds. Adam Briggs & Paul Copley. 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. 326–339.

De Lauretis, Teresa (1984). *Alice doesn't: feminism, semiotics, cinema*. London: Macmillan Press.

De Lauretis, Teresa (1987). *Technologies of gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dyer, Richard (1989). “Images of Masculinity or Can Men Be Sex Objects?” In *What's that got to do with my gender?*. Eds. Tiina Holopainen, Jukka Lehtonen, Merja Myöhänen and Kari Salonen. Turku: Turun yliopiston ylioppilaskunta. 42–45.

Dyer, Richard (1993). *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representations*. London: Routledge.

Film Terms Glossary Dictionary. [Cited 21st November 2009] Available at: <http://www.filmsite.org/filmterms.html>

Gauntlett, David (2002). *Media, gender and identity: an introduction*. London: Routledge.

GoldenEye. Dir. Martin Campbell. (1995). [Video] Warner Home Video (1996).

Hanke, Robert (1992). “Redesigning Men: Hegemonic Masculinity in Transition.” In *Men, Masculinity and the Media*. Ed. Steve Craig. Newbury Park: Sage. 185–198.

Helsby, Wendy (2005). “Representation and Theories.” In *Understanding representation*. Ed. Wendy Helsby. London: BFI. 3–25.

IMDb – Internet Movie Database. “Biography for Daniel Craig.” [Cited 25th January

2009] Available at: <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0185819/bio>

IMDb – Internet Movie Database. “Biography for Roger Moore.” [Cited 21st December 2009] Available at: <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000549/bio>

IMDb – Internet Movie Database. “Biography for Sean Connery.” [Cited 21st December 2009] Available at: <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000125/bio>

IMDb – Internet Movie Database. “Biography for Timothy Dalton.” [Cited 22nd December 2009] Available at: <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0001096/bio>

Kaplan, E. Ann (1983). *Women and Film. Both sides of the camera*. London: Methuen, Inc.

Kirkham, Pat & Janet Thumin (1993). “You Tarzan.” In *You Tarzan: Masculinity, Movies and Men*. Eds. Pat Kirkham and Janet Thumin. London: Lawrence & Wishart. 11–26.

Kleiber, Douglas A. & Susan L. Hutchinson (1999). “Heroic Masculinity in the Recovery from Spinal Cord Injury.” In *Talking Bodies. Men’s Narratives of the Body and Sport*. Ed. Andrew C. Sparkes and Martti Silvennoinen. Jyväskylä: SoPhi. 135–155.

MacKinnon, Kenneth (1997). *Uneasy Pleasures: The Male as Erotic Object*. London: Cygnus Arts.

Mulvey, Laura (1993, original 1973). “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema.” In *Contemporary Film Theory*. Ed. Antony Easthope. London: Longman. 111–124.

Nixon, Sean (1997). “Exhibiting Masculinity.” In *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London: Sage. 291–336.

Rowe, Allan (1999). “Film form and narrative.” In *An Introduction to Film Studies*. Ed. Jill Nelmes. 2nd ed. London: Routledge. 91–128.

Sedgwick, Eve (1985). *Between Men. English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Segal, Lynne (1990). *Slow motion: changing masculinities, changing men*. London: Virago.

Skeggs, Beverly (1993). “Theorizing Masculinity.” In *Mieheyden tiellä. Maskuliinisuus ja kulttuuri*. [On the way to manhood. Masculinity and culture.] Eds. Pirjo Ahokas, Martti Lahti and Jukka Sihvonen. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto. 13–35.

Spicer, Andrew (2001). *Typical Men: Representation of Masculinity in Popular British*

Culture. London: I. B. Tauris & Company Limited.

Storey, John (1998). *Cultural theory and popular culture*. London: Prentice Hall.

Van Zoonen, Liesbet (1994). *Feminist Media Studies*. London: Sage.

Wajcman, Judy (1991). *Feminism Confronts Technology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Whitehead, Stephen M. (2002). *Men and Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.