

License to Thrill
Bond Girls, Costumes, and Representation
by
Andrea Severson

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2013 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Maureen Goggin, Chair
Ersula Ore
Kathleen Lamp

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2013

ABSTRACT

The connection between Hollywood costume design and the films of the 007/James Bond franchise, especially in regards to the changing perspective of the "Bond Girl", is an intricate relationship that has previously been little researched. In the most recent Bond films, in particular, the female characters have become more powerful than the early characters and their roles within the narratives have changed with their characters taking on stronger and more integral roles. This thesis seeks to examine the films of the 007/James Bond franchise and how the rhetoric of the franchise's costume design affects the representation of femininity and power in regards to the Bond Girls. After an overview of Bond history and costume theory, two films are analyzed as case studies: *Dr. No* (1962) which marks the beginning of the film franchise and *Casino Royale* (2006), which marks the more recent turn the films have taken. This thesis examines how the representations of Bond Girls and the use of costume design for their characters have changed over the course of the franchise from the days of Sean Connery to the recent reboot of the franchise with Daniel Craig as 007 James Bond. In addition to an examination of Bond Girl costume design, this thesis considers the role and influence of the costume designers. A designer's vision of a character is derived from both the writing and the physical features of the actresses before them. Here this thesis considers how the rhetorical choices made by designers have contributed to an understanding of the relationship between femininity and power. Finally it shows how the costumes effect the power of the female characters and how the Bond Girls of today (*Casino*

Royale) compare and/or contrast to Bond Girls of the past (*Dr. No*). This thesis combines the areas of feminist film theory and costume theory to provide an original rhetorical analysis of the Bond series in relation to costume design and examines the rhetorical statements made by the costume designers in their designs for the characters and how those statements influence the representations of the characters.

DEDICATION

To my Mother and Father, for their unending love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Thesis would never have been written without the help of the following:

My Committee, for their patience, guidance, and support.

My fellow graduate students in the Department of English, for their friendship, support, encouragement, and for reading all my drafts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
FEMINIST FILM THEORY, JAMES BOND, AND HIS WOMEN	3
COSTUME THEORY	8
DR. NO: THE BEGINNING	12
CASINO ROYALE: THE NEW ERA	23
CONCLUSION	47
NOTES.....	51
REFERENCES	53
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	56

Introduction

In 1962 audiences worldwide caught their first glimpse of Bond Girl, Honey Rider (played by Ursula Andress) as she stepped out of the ocean in a small bikini with a dagger strapped to her thigh in the inaugural Bond film *Dr. No*. In 2002, this iconic scene was recreated, down to the dagger, in *Die Another Day*, this time featuring Halle Berry as Bond Girl Jinx Johnson. Most recently, in 2005, *Casino Royale* featured another iconic scene of a character emerging from the ocean in a small swimsuit. Only this time, instead of a Bond Girl, it was James Bond himself, as played by the newest Bond, Daniel Craig. Together, these three variations on this scene demonstrate the costume design changes in gender representation and identity that the 007/James Bond franchise has undergone. Over its 50-year history the films have shifted from portraying female characters at the mercy of the villains and as sexual objects for Bond to strong women capable of taking care of themselves and a Bond who is just as sexually objectified (if not more so) as the Bond Girls.

The connection between Hollywood costume design and the films of the 007/James Bond franchise, especially in regards to the changing perspective of the “Bond Girl,” is an intricate relationship that has previously been little researched. In the most recent Bond films, in particular, the female characters have become more powerful than the early characters and their roles within the narratives have changed with their characters taking on stronger and more integral roles. This thesis seeks to examine the films of the 007/James Bond franchise and how the rhetoric of the franchise’s costume design constructs the

representation of femininity and power in regards to the Bond Girls. After an overview of Bond history and costume theory, I analyze two films as case studies: *Dr. No* (1962) which marks the beginning of the film franchise and *Casino Royale* (2006)¹, which marks the more recent turn the films have taken. I examine how the representations of Bond Girls and the use of costume design for their characters have changed over the course of the franchise from the days of Sean Connery to the recent reboot of the franchise with Daniel Craig as 007 James Bond. In addition to my examination of Bond Girl costume design, I consider the role and influence of the costume designers. A designer's vision of a character is derived from both the writing and the physical features of the actresses cast. Here I consider how the rhetorical choices made by designers have contributed to an understanding of the relationship between femininity and power. Finally I show how the costumes effect the power of the female characters and how the Bond Girls of today (*Casino Royale*) compare and contrast to Bond Girls of the past (*Dr. No*).

There have been many assumptions made about Bond Girls, and the actresses who play them, based on their appearance and representation in the films. It is assumed that Bond Girls are weak and unintelligent; incapable of making decisions or having any agency in their life, and that they are only meant to be sexual playthings for Bond himself. I argue that these representations and assumptions are partially created through the rhetoric of the costume design. Additionally, there has been a significant shift in the representations of the women of the Bond films in an effort to keep up with the social politics of identity

and demographic of the franchise over its fifty year history. While much has been written on James Bond and film theory, and a growing body of scholarship in the field of costume theory has emerged, no one seems to have linked them and scant attention has been given to women. In order to better understand the field of scholarship in regards to Bond Girls and costume design, it is important to first examine two key areas: feminist film theory (as it relates to Bond and his women) and costume theory. This paper combines the areas of feminist film theory and costume theory to provide an original rhetorical analysis of the Bond series in relation to costume design. I examine the rhetorical statements made by the costume designers in their designs for the characters and how those statements influence the representations of the characters.

Feminist Film Theory, James Bond, and His Women

Within the last forty years a large body of scholarship linking feminist studies and film theory has been developed. Annette Kuhn, Laura Mulvey, Melanie Walters, bell hooks, and Mary Ann Doane have all contributed to this area of scholarship and provide a strong foundation for this analysis. Annette Kuhn has done much work on issues of women and representation in cinema (1978 with AnnMarie Wolpe; 1985; 1994; 2002). Laura Mulvey, in “Visual Pleasure and the Narrative Cinema,” examines the gaze of the female spectator. Although not a film theorist Judith Butler, in *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, makes strong contributions to the field particularly in her examinations of women as subjects of feminism and the necessary order of sex, gender, and desire, which are valuable to the area of feminist film theory in terms

of the discussion of representation and visibility. Mary Ann Doane in *The Desire to Desire: The Woman's Film of the 1940s* and *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, and Psychoanalysis* also speaks to these issues as do several essays in *Multiple Voices in Feminist Film Criticism* edited by Diane Carson, Linda Dittmar, and Janice R. Welsch.

In *Women on Screen: Feminism and Femininity in Visual Culture* (edited by Melanie Walters), Lisa Funnell discusses female villains in the Bond films in “Negotiating Shifts in Feminism: The ‘Bad’ Girls of James Bond.” Funnell demonstrates how the Bond franchise has used the images of the sexually liberated woman since the 1960s to “illuminate the new freedoms that feminism has accorded women; while it does this, however, it also positions this [sexually liberated] woman as a locus for social anxieties about these freedoms— anxieties which are invariably borne out in her violent punishment and death” (199). This anxiety constrains the early Bond Girls. While Funnell’s argument applies to the female villains in the Bond films, it also can be applied to the female protagonists, most notably the character of Vesper (played by Eva Green) in *Casino Royale* (2006) as well as Agent Strawberry Fields (played by Gemma Arterton) in *Quantum of Solace* (2008). In “‘The Coldest Weapon of All’: The Bond Girl Villain in James Bond Films,” Tony W. Garland also examines the female villains of the Bond films, explaining that the Bond Girl villain and her connection to Bond, “[does] not rely on a set of absolute interactions; unlike the main villain, the Bond girl, or even Bond’s allies, her presence is not assured . . . she sometimes is completely absent, sometimes overshadows the Bond girl and the

villain, and sometimes has a relatively minor role” (181). This is a good description of the character Velenka (played by Ivana Milicevic) in *Casino Royale* who has a relatively minor role but major consequences for Bond.

Also picking up on this theme of violent women is Hilary Neroni in *The Violent Woman: Femininity, Narrative, and Violence in Contemporary American Cinema*. Neroni looks at violent female characters in a variety of films and genres and argues for a, “psychoanalytically influenced investigation into the larger issues surrounding violence in film and, at the same time, offers a broader exploration of the recent trend of the violent woman as she exists across multiple genres” (2). She devotes part of her chapter, “Violent Women in Love” to the Bond films, but focuses on the character of Lin (played by Michelle Yeoh) in *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1998).

Each of these pieces focuses on the implications of either the villainy or the violence of the Bond Girls, and ignores many of the positive aspects and representations. *The Violent Woman* was printed in 2005, before the 2006 release of *Casino Royale*, so Neroni is not able to comment on how that film may or may not operate outside the standard arguments. However, Funnell’s work does mention *Casino Royale*, although it focuses exclusively on the female villain Valenka. Garland also discusses *Casino Royale* but makes a different argument than in other works and focuses more on Vesper as a femme fatale than as a Bond Girl protagonist.

Rosie White, in *Violent Femmes Women as Spies in Popular Culture*, devotes part of her chapter, “Spies, lies, and sexual outlaws,” to Bond’s women

but focuses mainly on Bond and the purpose of the Bond Girls to “service Bond.” She also indicates how Bond’s “heteromascularity’ is dysfunctional. The repeated sexual conquests bespeak a narrative anxiety about Bond’s gender identity, which is inseparable in these fictions from his sexual performance” (26). Jeremy Packer and Sarah Sharma, “Postfeminism Galore: The Bond Girl as Weapon of Mass Consumption” in *Secret Agents: Popular Icons Beyond James Bond*, offer a different and intriguing perspective of the Bond Girl by arguing not for what Bond has done to her but rather how the “Bond Industrial Complex (BIC)” has positioned her as an “increasingly important postfeminist weapon in BIC’s arsenal for global market domination” (90). This is an interesting spin on the Bond Girl, one that applies not only to Bond Girls throughout the history of the franchise, but especially to Bond Girls of today as they are used for marketing purposes, not only to sell the films themselves but also products related to the films. It is interesting to note that most of these scholars have chosen to focus on either the female villains in particular or have only done an overview of Bond Girls in general. None have examined the female protagonists in the Bond films or discussed the power relationship between Bond himself and the female protagonist or how that relationship has changed over the course of the franchise’s history.

In addition to these texts that address the Bond Girl it is also important to take into account works on James Bond himself, such as Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott’s examination of the iconic character in *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero*. Investigating both the original novels and the

subsequent films, Bennett and Wollacott analyze the phenomenon of James Bond, including his relationship to the women he encounters. In James Bond in *World and Popular Culture: The Films are Not Enough*, edited by Robert G. Weiner, B. Lynn Whitfield, and Jack Becker, there are several chapters that involve issues of branding and fashion, identity, an extensive section on “Gender, Feminism, and the Women of Bond” that discusses issues of anti-feminist rhetoric, gender and authority, the competency of Bond Girls, and the evolution of the gaze through female spectatorship.

Finally, in her article “‘I Know Where You Keep Your Gun’: Daniel Craig as the Bond-Girl Hybrid in *Casino Royale*,” Funnell discusses the changing presentation of the Bond character since the casting of Daniel Craig in the title role, citing a scene early in *Casino Royale* (2006), where Craig as Bond rises out of the surf of the ocean in tight swimming trunks. She states, “through intertextual referencing of renown Bond Girl iconography, exemplified through Bond’s double emergence from the sea, Craig’s Bond is positioned as a visual spectacle and aligned with the Bond Girl character type rather than with his Bond predecessors in the filmic franchise” (456). The scene is reminiscent of Ursula Andress’ now iconic first scene in *Dr. No* (1962) where she arrives on the beach in a very small bikini. Funnell discusses the history of the film franchise and the various representations of the characters of Bond by different actors and argues that throughout *Casino Royale* continuous and intentional emphasis is placed on Bond’s body in a similar manner that had always been applied to the Bond Girls (463). This newer generation of Bond films has begun to flip the previously

accepted narrative and visual norms. While the Bond Girls have been positioned for the visual consumption of the heterosexual male moviegoer, Daniel Craig's incarnation of Bond is intended to be the equivalent for the contemporary heterosexual female moviegoer. This is a conscious choice made by the director and affected through the use of the cinematography and the costume design, both in the scene referenced above by Funnell, and similar scenes in *Casino Royale*.

Costume Theory

Costume design is an integral part of the production process and the costumes say much about the character and their role within the narrative of the film. The costume designer is just one of many talented artists required to successfully create a film. Yet, despite the centuries of history of costume design, first in theatre, then in film and television, there has been very little solid scholarship done in the areas of costume history and theory. As Deborah Nadoolman Landis explains in *Screencraft - Costume Design*:

At the root of the problem with existing film costume literature is a lack of understanding (or a basic misunderstanding) about what a costume is, and what it is not. Costumes are a tool a film director has to tell the story of the movie. Fashion and costume are not synonymous. They have directly opposing and contradictory purposes. Costumes are never clothes. This is a problematic concept for fashion writers, designers, and magazine editors, and a real stumbling block to being able to understand costume design in film.

(7)

This (unfortunately too common) misunderstanding and lack of differentiation between costume and fashion has made it difficult to make significant progress in the study of costume design in film. Likewise, the fact that costume design has largely been a female dominated field could have led to an assumption that costume design is women's work and thus its marginalization both in the industry and by scholars. Despite all those assumptions, we are beginning to see a change.

The work of design historians such as Nadoolman Landis, particularly in *Screencraft* and *Dressed: A Century of Hollywood Costume Design*, has begun to shift the perception of the field of costume design and the way it is studied. However, scholarship in the area of cinema and costuming is still only recently becoming a recognized and legitimate field of study. Theoretical discussions of film, costume, narrative, and character have only begun within the past twenty years or so. Just the same, a growing number of scholars (Gaines & Herzog, Bruzzi, Berry, Cook) have put forward solid works in the area. Discussions of how costume design effects representation and narrative are beginning to appear more frequently in published works.

Jane Gaines, in "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story" (*Fabrications: Costume and the Female Body*, eds. Gaines & Herzog) discusses the relationship between costume and narrative, saying, "costumes are fitted to the characters as a second skin, working in this capacity of the cause of narrative by relaying information to the view about a 'person'" (181). Gaines goes on to elaborate, "Although all characters, regardless of gender, are conceived as

'costumed' in motion pictures, a woman's dress and demeanor . . . indexes psychology; if costume represents interiority, it is she who is turned inside out on screen" (181). Although Gaines limits her essay to black and white contemporary films of early Hollywood it definitely applies to the Bond Girl. Everything a Bond Girl wears is meant to tell the audience something about her. In the Bond films, the costume often informs the audience about the character more than the dialogue and allows the audience to quickly learn about the character and their function within the narrative even although the character may say very little or be onscreen for a short period of time.

In the same edited collection, Jeanne Thomas Allen, in "Fig Leaves in Hollywood: Female Representation and Consumer Culture," makes interesting claims regarding costume and female representation and how it connects to consumer values. "Glamour unites Hollywood production technique to consumer values, particularly around the image of woman as the ultimate product for consumption and mark of social class distinction" (123). Using the Howard Hawks 1926 film *Fig Leaves*, Allen explains how, within the narrative of the film, "women's clothing becomes the ground of a struggle, both literal and figurative, for control of women's bodies" (122). Although this essay focuses on black and white films of the 1920s and 30s as well, many of its arguments could be applied to the films of the Bond franchise, particularly *Casino Royale*, which featured clothing and accessories from high-end fashion labels such as Roberto Cavalli, Brioni, Jenny Packham, Versace, and Omega.

In *Fashioning the Nation: Costume and Identity in British Cinema*, Pam Cook uses the third chapter, “Changing Places: Costume and Identity,” to examine the field of costume design and theory, explaining that within the field of cinema history, costume design is one of the most “under-researched areas” (41). She states, “There are some obvious reasons for the neglect: the importance accorded the director . . . to ‘the look’ of the finished product, and the domination of the 70s film theory by narrative analysis and literary notions of ‘the text’” (41). Speaking to the Bond films specifically in “‘Sean Connery Is James Bond’: Re-Fashioning British Masculinity in the 1960s” (*Fashioning Film Stars: Dress, Culture, Identity*, ed. Rachel Moseley) Pam Cook and Claire Hines apply costume theory to James Bond himself but do not address the Bond Girls. Stella Bruzzi, in *Undressing Cinema: Clothing and Identity in the Movies*, examines the relation between costume and the femme fatale in “Clothes, Power and the Modern Femme Fatale.” Bruzzi explains, “the symbolic iconography of the classic femme fatale is a limited, clearly demarcated register of clothes, based on the contrast of light and dark . . . frequent wardrobe changes . . . and the insertion of distinctive, often anachronistic garments or accessories” (126). In *Costume and Cinema: Dress Codes in Popular Film*, which discusses issues of costume and the cinema and costuming identity, Sarah Street makes the interesting point that if, “the audience has ‘suspended belief,’ it is possible that there might be an ‘imagined embodiment’ in process whereby the audience imagines that the character has exercised a degree of individual agency when deciding what to wear, just as they experience in their own lives” (7). This point relates back to what Jeanne Thomas

Allen discusses in “Fig Leaves in Hollywood,” and how costumes can be used as a way of reaching out to consumers.

Given the history and popularity of the James Bond franchise there is a great deal of scholarship on the films, the politics of the books, analysis of the character of Bond himself, as well as an array of feminist perspectives of the Bond Girls. However, while work has been done on the Bond Girls specifically, there has not been much done in relation to costume design and theory, or examinations on the rhetorical statements designers make with their designs and how that impacts the representations of the Bond Girls. Now I focus my attention to the examination of this thesis by first analyzing *Dr. No* (1962) and then *Casino Royale* (2006) to show the ways costumes function rhetorically within the narrative of each film.

Dr. No: The Beginning

Dr. No was released in October of 1962. Although not the first of the Ian Fleming novels it was the first to be adapted to the big screen by Albert R. “Cubby” Broccoli, Harry Saltzman, and Eon Productions, and would be the start of a 50-plus year relationship between audiences and James Bond. The film introduced Sean Connery² as James Bond and Swiss actress Ursula Andress as Honey Ryder. The film also starred Joseph Wiseman as Bond villain Dr. No, Jack Lord as CIA agent Felix Leiter, Bernard Lee as Bond’s boss M., John Kitzmiller as Quarrel, and introduced Lois Maxwell as M.’s secretary Miss Money Penny. It also featured Zena Marshall (Miss Taro), Eunice Gayson (Sylvia Trench), and Marguerite LeWars (Photographer) as additional Bond Girls throughout the film.

The plot of the film focused on British MI-6 secret agent James Bond and his attempts to solve the murder of a fellow agent and eventually take down criminal mastermind, Dr. No. Along the way Bond meets a number of characters, including several gorgeous women.

Costume designer Tessa Prendergast designed the film's costumes. Though a relative unknown at the time, Prendergast would eventually gain fame as the creator of one of the most iconic film costumes in cinema history—the ivory bikini worn by Ursula Andress. Born in Jamaica, and later studying and living in New York, Paris, and Italy, she returned to Jamaica to work as a clothing designer with a partner in the late 1950s. When the production company for Dr. No arrived, the filmmakers approached Prendergast to design costumes for the film, including the now famous bikini.³ It's suggestive that the filmmakers would choose a little known local designer to design the costumes. With an estimated budget of just over \$1 million, costume design likely was not a main area for spending. Bringing a designer in from Hollywood or London would have cost more and being a contemporary film—and not a large scale period drama—would also have been a factor in keeping wardrobe costs down. Nevertheless, Prendergast still delivered one of the most iconic costumes in Hollywood history and firmly established Honey Ryder as the quintessential Bond Girl.

The Women of Dr. No

The first Bond film introduced the world to the first two Bond Girls on screen: Ursula Andress as Honey Ryder and Lois Maxwell as Miss Money Penny. These two characters connected to Bond in opposite ways and served different

functions within the narrative of the film. *Dr. No* also presented a variety of supporting Bond Girls and Bond Girl Villains that would all cross paths with Bond, building him up as the masculine hero while also acting in minor ways to further the plot. The first female character seen by the audience is a secretary for MI-6, stationed in Jamaica, who is dressed in a simple blouse and pencil skirt. Her hair is stylishly done and her makeup is simple. Her costume is as sharp and efficient as the audience assumes she herself is. Her time onscreen is short lived and she is killed moments later, after assassins kill her boss. However, her death comes just after she established radio connection with MI-6 headquarters in London and the lack of response triggers an investigation that will eventually bring James Bond himself to Jamaica.

The scene shifts from the island of Jamaica to a casino in London. The camera pans around until it arrives at a card table surrounded by gamblers. The camera quickly focuses on a beautiful woman, Sylvia Trench at the center of the table. Her hair is done up in an elaborate bouffant style and adorned with a diamond hairpin in the back. She is in a one shouldered, pleated chiffon knee-length gown in a vibrant coral/pink color. She wears large diamond earrings and a diamond broach pinned to the shoulder of her dress. Her lipstick and nail polish match the color of her dress and the rest of her makeup is dramatic; she is clearly the most elegant and glamorous woman in the room, attracting the attention of everyone else present. In the choice of color for the dress Prendergast is ensuring that Miss Trench will be the most noticeable woman in the room, and by coordinating her nail polish and lipstick it further enhances the look of

perfection Miss Trench possesses. Eventually the camera turns and the audience sees that James Bond is serving as the card dealer and there is an obvious chemistry between the two. In the end, she and Bond get up to leave, walking out together. The long shot of the camera reveals that Miss Trench's outfit is completed by a gold clutch handbag with matching gold shoes and a soft, pale brown fur stole. The design choice by Prendergast of Miss Trench's beautifully constructed and coordinated costume matches the formality of Bond's tuxedo and indicates a confidence and passion that is further demonstrated in the chemistry between the two characters.

The scene quickly changes and the action shifts to the outer office of Bond's Boss, referred to as M, at MI-6 headquarters. Bond enters and greets Miss Money Penny who is wearing a navy blue sleeveless dress with a teal Peter Pan collar, simple pearl earrings, bracelet and rings, and plain makeup. Prendergast's choice of this look puts Miss Money Penny in a stark contrast to Miss Trench and further enhances the difference in the relationship between Money Penny and Bond compared to his interactions with Miss Trench. Money Penny and Bond are very flirtatious and flattering to each other and their admiration seems mutual. The audience gets the sense of a genuine affection and friendship and that Money Penny is "different" from the other women Bond associates with. Throughout Bond's interactions with Money Penny (in this film and others) the Bond audience gets the sense that Bond has respect for Money Penny and the ongoing relationship they have. The other women seem to be nothing more than momentary distractions and pleasures that will quickly fade away.

After returning home Bond finds Miss Trench in his bedroom wearing nothing but one of his white shirts and her high heels. She has snuck in, presumably with the intention of seducing Bond. The two kiss and the scene fades out. With this, Prendergast builds on the sex appeal of Miss Trench that was established by her first look and continues to build up the differences between Miss Trench and Miss Money Penny. The film's juxtaposition of Sylvia Trench and Miss Money Penny provides the audience with an example of the kind of woman Bond can possess and the kind of woman he can't. Within the world of Bond there have always been women who easily fall into his bed and others who keep him at a distance. Throughout the rest of the film the audience will meet other contrasting women like these.

Once arriving in Jamaica, Bond meets a few other important women, each of whom will play an integral role in the development of the plot. First there is the mystery woman, listed in the credits only as the "Photographer," who is loitering around the airport with a camera, pretending to take pictures of arriving tourists but in fact is there to spy on Bond. She is wearing a form fitting, bright green sheath dress and Prendergast has clearly meant for the Photographer to stand out from the crowd—and Bond—who are all wearing mainly blues and grays. Later she shows up again at a beach club wearing an even more noticeable bright pink cheongsam, a Chinese influenced style of dress. It is form fitting, knee length, and has a high slit on the side. Both of her outfits are designed to call attention to her. Through her choice of color and silhouette Prendergast has designed the Photographer to be noticeable to both Bond and the audience immediately each

time she is onscreen. Although she doesn't have much dialogue, and the audience never learns her name, Prendergast has nevertheless created a highly visible presence during her scenes.

Later Bond meets Miss Taro, the secretary of a man of whom Bond is suspicious. He intends to use Miss Taro to get information but very quickly the audience learns that she also has intentions for him. When Miss Taro is first seen on screen she is wearing an off white blouse and skirt with red belt and red bracelet and her hair is stylishly done up. Later the audience sees her getting ready for her date with Bond wearing a white kimono bathrobe, satin white underpants, and gold slip on-shoes. Her elaborate up-do is gone and her hair is now loose around her shoulders. She is on the phone, giving Bond directions to her house, while lounging on her bed. When Bond arrives she is still getting ready and is wearing a strapless white "towel" dress. It is made out of terry cloth, like a towel, but has a cut and silhouette of a 1960s sheath dress. All of this is carefully calculated and designed to lure Bond in. Although Bond is using her for information, Miss Taro is working behind Bond's back on behalf of Dr. No. It's a mutual seduction, with each of them using the other for another purpose. However, it is Bond who ends up having the upper hand. Although already suspicious of her motives and believing she is working somehow for the villain, Bond still takes advantage of the situation and has sex with Miss Taro. Bond then has her taken into custody by the police as they leave for their date. In this last shot of Miss Taro, she wears a blue cheongsam dress; the first all over color the audience sees her wear. The choice by Prendergast to keep Miss Taro primarily in

white until the last moment allows the blue dress to be a noticeable difference to the previous costumes and the Asian style of dress further marks her as 'other' while the blue color seems to blend in with the darkness of the evening scene, making her even more invisible and erasing any threat she had posed.

Finally, an hour and two minutes into the film, we meet Andress' character. After sneaking on to the mysterious island the night before and falling asleep among the trees, Bond is awakened to the sound of Honey Ryder singing as she emerges from the ocean surf wearing a small, beige colored bikini. The top ties between her breasts and the bottom features a belt that holds her dagger in place on her hip. Andress recalls working with Prendergast:

When I got there, we had no wardrobe! So we had to get right away the bikini, right away the little dress for the Chinese dress, and it was so strange, there was a girl who had a boutique, and she was also making dresses, and she was a friend of mine from Rome!

Tessa Prendergast was her name, and we made it together...because I had a sort of athletic figure, so I didn't like it this way or that way, so we sewed the bikini together. (Audio Commentary)

The details of the gathered fabric and bow on the upper portion of the bikini give it a feminine appearance but that is quickly balanced by the wide belt and dagger on her hip. The intention was to clearly identify Honey as being a woman with the strength and ability to defend herself. The designer and director could have mitigated that effect by having her be unarmed or by having the dagger positioned behind her back and out of view for the audience. By placing it on her

hip and having her draw it out against Bond, the filmmakers make an intentional choice to give Honey that dangerous edge to her character and this choice is fully represented in her costume.

Her body is tanned and her blond hair is still wet from the ocean. Bond attempts to flatter Honey and convince her that he is not trying to steal the shells she is collecting but, unlike the previous women of the film, Honey is not taken in by Bond's flattery and charm. Also, although some of the earlier women had malicious intent towards Bond and were working for the villain, Honey is the first to pose an immediate physical threat by being armed. Although Bond would certainly be able to disarm her, it is still important that she is at least in the position to be a threat, even if she's not a very strong one. She is one of the least dressed characters the audience has seen so far. However, her apparent strength and confidence make her seem like more than just a sexual object, as the other women have been, and positions her on slightly more equal ground with Bond.

After a brief introductory scene between the two, Bond and Honey come under fire from Dr. No's security, changing the tone of the scene suddenly. The two, joined by Bond's friend Quarrel (played by John Kitzmiller), move further into the island to hide. Honey grabs a shirt from her boat but the attempt at modesty fails as soon as she gets the white shirt wet. However, this move shows that Honey is concerned about running around in only a bikini and is at least trying to cover up while also allowing the filmmakers to still have their Bond Girl appear sexy and alluring to the audience.

After they escape into the jungle, Honey and Bond enjoy a quiet moment and Honey's complexities and strength are further demonstrated while she shares details from her past. Although Honey admits that she doesn't have a traditional education, she still defends her intelligence explaining to Bond that she's read the encyclopedia, starting with "A," is currently up to "T" and probably knows more than Bond anyway (*Dr. No*). Nestled safely into the dark green foliage, providing a more intimate space for their conversation, Honey demonstrates confidence in her intelligence and abilities despite surviving great hardship. She tells Bond that she worked alongside her father as a child and has been on her own ever since he was killed. She then shares that while working on her own after her father's murder, she was raped. Throughout all of this Honey is very matter-of-fact and unemotional, further stating that after the rape she placed a black widow spider under the rapist's mosquito net and it took him "a whole week to die" (*Dr. No*). During this scene Prendergast's motivation to have Honey grab the shirt from her boat is apparent. Throughout this emotional scene between Honey and Bond, Honey is wearing the shirt, which is now dry and covering her, allowing the focus to be on the scene and the details she is sharing with Bond rather than on her body. Both the audience and Bond can tell that Honey is not a woman to trifle with and is definitely more than just a pretty face. However, there is a naïveté to her character that ultimately makes it hard to take her too seriously opposite an educated professional like Bond.

Later Bond and Honey are captured by Dr. No's security. They are taken back to his base where they are stripped and sent through a decontamination

process. After, they are wrapped in blue bathrobes and later given a fresh change of clothing. Honey's next outfit is a light pink floral cheongsam top with bright pink pants. The shift in color seems to suggest an attempt by Prendergast to bring back her femininity as contrast to the previous costume and the implied strength of the belt and dagger. The change in outfit also signifies a change in behavior. No longer in her normal environment and stripped of her dagger, Honey is not as confident as before. The filmmakers suggest that now that she is not in a familiar situation, she needs a man to protect her and highlight this choice by putting her in pink. As Bond and Honey are led out of their room, Honey reaches for Bond's hand and in the elevator presses against his body as if for protection and reassurance. This continues during dinner with Dr. No, where the men maintain an engaging conversation while Honey remains quiet. She remains silent until Dr. No has her removed from the dinner, even then she never says much more than "no" repeatedly. By Bond's side she can be brave and in control, but separated from him, she becomes a stereotypical damsel in distress. Although her dialogue at this point is simple, the repetitive "no" indicates a strong desire to stay near Bond. This switch in Honey's behavior is further backed up by the femininity that Prendergast has designed in her outfit.

After Honey's removal from dinner, Bond and Dr. No talk some more before Dr. No has Bond locked away as well. Bond quickly works to escape from the room that Dr. No imprisons him in and then sets up the destruction of Dr. No's facility on the island. In the chaos of everyone trying to escape the island, Bond manages to rescue Honey, from where she has been chained to the cement dock

as the water is rising, and get off the island. Honey is wearing the same top but no pants, save for a pair of underwear out of the same fabric as the top. She continues to depend on Bond to get her out of the dangerous situation. They are soon rescued by the Royal Navy and in one final display of confidence and independence, as the boat of Navy sailors pulls up Honey puts her hands on her hips and props one foot up on the bench in front of her, making her appear more the brave captain than former captive, while Bond remains seated behind her. The film ends with Bond and Honey kissing in the small boat they escaped the island in. Overall, Honey is a woman comfortable in her own skin and confident in her abilities. Although jokes are made at her expense, she shrugs them off with an attitude that makes it seem as if she doesn't care and is above anything that other people think of her. Her costumes, in their various states of disarray, indicate the duality of her character—and the ways the costume designer and producers manipulate that duality. Honey is part loner/"tough-girl" who can take care of herself, and another part psychologically damaged and naïve, wanting/needing a strong, protective male figure. She's allowed to be strong and independent but only to a point. Each time an attempt at modesty is made—putting a shirt over the bikini, changing into a shirt and pant ensemble—something happens to make the costume suggestive again. The white shirt becomes transparent in the water and somehow Honey has lost her pants by the time she reconnects with Bond towards the end of the film. It's never explained where her pants went: Was she trying to escape? Did she try to use them to strangle a guard? Were guards trying to rape her? The audience never knows, so

the end effect is that Honey once again comes across as a sexualized object, meant to be rescued by Bond and kiss him in a boat.

Overall, the costumes in *Dr. No* demonstrate a sense of glamour, and an edge, that future Bond films would continue to build on. With one tiny bikini, Prendergast managed to create an iconic look that would remain a definitive Bond Girl image throughout the franchise's 50-year history, as well as be replicated in future films. *Dr. No* introduced the first of many Bond Girls and in many cases throughout the film; the costumes were required to share character information with the audience in place of extensive dialogue. The designs are uniquely feminine yet each one specifically represents some psychological aspect of the character wearing it. Ultimately, the costumes of all the Bond Girls in *Dr. No*, had the delicate task of creating clear and effective looks for each of the characters as well as set the standard for all Bond Girls to come. A standard that would be raised with each Bond film to follow, and one that would reach new heights in 2006 with the release of *Casino Royale*.

Casino Royale: The New Era

Casino Royale was released in November 2006 and has earned the franchise more than a half billion dollars in the worldwide box office. It introduced Daniel Craig as the new James Bond, Eva Green as Vesper Lynd, Caterina Murino as Solange, and saw the return of Judi Dench as Bond's boss M. The film allowed executive producers Barbara Broccoli and Michael G. Wilson to not only reboot the franchise with a new Bond but also provided the chance to finally film the first of Ian Fleming's novels and tell the story of how Bond began.⁴ Set in the

present day, the film presents a new Bond for a new era, showing Bond earning his 007/“license to kill” status and his hunt to track down and capture “Le Chiffre,” a man responsible for terrorist activities and a link to deeper criminal ties. Throughout the course of the film Bond meets Solange and uses her for information on her villainous husband and then meets his match in Vesper Lynd, an officer for the Treasury who attends a high stake poker game with Bond. The film visits a variety of locations and presents a diverse cast of characters, each with their own distinct look designed by costume designer Lindy Hemming.

Hemming was an experienced and known designer who was able to tackle complex challenges in a film. She had designed costumes for films such as *Lara Croft: Tomb Raider* (2001), *Batman Begins* (2005, and later the rest *The Dark Knight* trilogy, 2008, 2012), as well as previous Bond films *GoldenEye* (1995), *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997), *The World is Not Enough* (1999) and *Die Another Day* (2002). She was thus able to tackle the unique challenges any Bond film presents by being both a contemporary fictional narrative, partially based in reality, and an espionage fantasy set in a glamorous world. Reunited with *GoldenEye* director Martin Campbell, their collaboration on *Casino Royale* resulted in complex and richly detailed costumes that clearly provide character information to the audience and have a clear sense of design without looking too contrived or too bland. In the years since *Dr. No*, the field of costume design in general has grown more detailed and nuanced. As a result, Hemming’s designs for *Casino Royale* are more intricate and meticulous than the designs I’ve previously discussed for *Dr. No*. Hemming’s designs evoke the history and

glamour of the Bond films and create a timeless effect for *Casino Royale* that allows it to seamlessly fit in with the previous films in the history of the Bond franchise. Hemming was also able to collaborate with major fashion labels, such as Roberto Cavalli, Versace, and Jenny Packham, who provided gowns for several of the Bond Girls in *Casino Royale*, which adds to the glamour of the film and its characters.

Casino Royale presents audiences with four distinct and contrasting Bond Girls and their costumes become a key visual element in portraying the function and purpose of each woman. Judi Dench, as M, fulfilling the role and function of Bond's boss and authority figure. The wife of Bond Villain Alex Dimitrios, Solange, is the broken innocent who is in a loveless marriage and is willing to give away information about her husband in exchange for a night with Bond. Valenka, girlfriend of the primary Bond villain "Le Chiffre," is virtually silent throughout the film but in her silence nevertheless proves to be one of the greatest dangers to Bond and just as much of a villain as her lover. Vesper Lynd, the enigmatic accountant and HRM Treasury representative working with Bond walks the line between Bond Girl Hero and Bond Girl Villain. These four women represent different female archetypes within the Bond franchise and *Casino Royale* itself.

Judi Dench as M

Until the production of the *Golden Eye*, the role of M was played by men. In 1995 Judi Dench was cast as M, Bond's boss and authority figure. In *Casino Royal*, M appears throughout the film, often seen to be running the show over the phone back at MI-6 headquarters in London while Bond chases the villains from

Madagascar to the Bahamas to Miami and then to Montenegro. The audience first sees M in Parliament as she exits a committee meeting angrily complaining about Bond to her assistant. She has just had to defend Bond's actions in Madagascar where he set off an explosion at an embassy, which has now landed on the front page of the newspapers in London. M is wearing a slim cut black trouser suit, with low V-neck in front ending in a hint of lace and intricate detailing on the lapel. She wears low-heeled shoes and minimal silver jewelry. Her costume is stylish although toned down by the all black color and is the epitome of the modern power suit. Walking out of the meeting she is ranting to her assistant about Bond's blowing up the embassy. Her speech demonstrates that she is very powerful and thinks herself above many of the politicians who had just been questioning her. With this choice of suit Hemming visually establishes M's power and illustrates to the audience that she is not a woman who should be taken lightly.

Later M arrives home to find Bond waiting for her in the dark. She is wearing the same suit but is now also wearing a light gray, loose fitting overcoat. Hemming's choice of color sets her apart visually from Bond and the density of the fabric gives the costume a weight that grounds Judi Dench's performance. Although Dench is a very petite woman, the power exuded in her costume allows her to dominate Bond, and play the authority figure. Putting him in his place, and reminding him of the bigger picture, M instructs Bond to disappear until she can figure out what to do with him. In the past, when M had been portrayed by a man, the relationship between Bond and M had been more of a traditional,

heterosexual, masculine employee/boss relationship. Since the introduction of Dench as M the two characters had begun to have more of a parent/petulant child relationship, particularly in *Casino Royale*, where emphasis has been put on the fact that Bond is younger, and just starting his career as a 007, while M is significantly older and as such has both age and authority to hold over him.⁵

For the most part, M is seen wearing black and gray and usually pant suits (from what the audience can tell, since most of her scenes are also shot from the waist up). However, there are a couple noticeable exceptions. Shortly after Bond arrives in the Bahamas, M is awakened at home by her assistant who is tracking Bond's movements from MI-6 headquarters. Accessing her computer from her bedside M is seen wearing a men's style dark red satin pajama top—and presumably, matching pajama pants. Hemming's choice of the men's style of the pajamas further illustrate her more masculine authority as a high-up figure in MI-6 while the color choice demonstrates a feminine strength. The dark red gives it a feminine twist without making her seem too feminine or weak. A few scenes later M travels to the Bahamas to meet up with Bond, this time wearing an ivory linen jacket with a woven print detail along with a dark gray top and lighter gray skirt that falls just below the knee, along with low heels and a simple silver necklace. As with the suits and the pajamas there is never an attempt to oversexualize or objectify M—that is not her purpose within the narrative. Rather, as with all of her preceding and succeeding costumes, the overall effect of the design arc for M is to create an image of strength and authority that M holds over all the characters in the film and to perpetuate the image of M that has been created in

all of Dench's previous Bond films starting with *GoldenEye*. Hemming's designs allow M to be feminine but through the use of fabric, color, and silhouette Hemming creates a look that is powerful and commanding.

Bond Girl Villains: Solange and Valenka

Caterina Murino as Solange and Ivana Milicevic as Valenka both play the wife and girlfriend—respectively—of two of the main Bond villains in *Casino Royale*. However, their costumes create a different perspective of each woman and her function within the narrative—Valenka as the edgy, mysterious, and dangerous girlfriend of international criminal Le Chiffre and Solange as the misguided, damaged lost soul who married the bad guy instead of one of the nice guys.⁶ Together, these characters provide an interesting contrast to each other and to the other Bond Girls in the film.

Valenka is the first Bond Girl that the audience sees in the film. Valenka is the epitome of the classic Bond Girl—beautiful, sexy, and virtually silent. In her first scene, the film makes a quick cut from Bond, narrowly escaping capture at the embassy in Madagascar to Valenka coming out of the ocean and climbing onto the yacht she is staying on with Le Chiffre. As she splashes out of the water, her body silhouetted against the setting sun in the distance, Hemming has chosen for her to wear a one piece—but small—metallic electric blue swimsuit. She enters the room where Le Chiffre is playing cards and later can be seen taking a shower in the background. However, she is still wearing the suit and there isn't any additional attempt to sexualize or objectify her. At this point the film cuts away and spends some time focusing on other characters and subplots, eventually

returning to Valenka in Montenegro. During a break from the poker game, Le Chiffre returns to his hotel room at the request of Valenka only to be caught by the villainous Steven Obanno. Obanno and his associate have used her to lure Le Chiffre away from the table and threaten to cut off her hand if he doesn't get them the money he lost. The lighting in the scene is low and all the men are wearing dark suits, in contrast Valenka stands out in a yellow gown, designed by Roberto Cavalli. It has cut outs on the sides and very minimally covers her upper body. The gown also has crystal stone and bead detailing down the front of the dress and a long, flowing skirt. Her blond, asymmetric hairstyle also stands out in the darkness of the surroundings. In this scene the brightness of the color as well as the sexy cut of the dress gives the impression of a person who is trying to fit in to a world of wealth and privilege but is perhaps, trying too hard. Hemming has designed and gathered costumes that are flashy and over the top and ensured that all of Valenka's costumes show lots of skin and little restraint.

Her last look is a teal metallic jump suit consisting of intricately wrapped and strategically placed strips of fabric that wind down into wide-legged trouser bottoms. Her makeup is dark and dramatic and her hair falls over one eye. Although Valenka is quiet, she is not an innocent bystander, caught up in her boyfriend's troubles. Rather, she is a tool used by Le Chiffre and by other villains, and she can be just as dangerous. Halfway through the poker game, Valenka slips some poison into Bond's drink in an attempt to eliminate him. She doesn't succeed, but the point is made and Bond learns a lesson, as does the audience, that even the trophy girlfriend can be a threat. Hemming's choice of this costume

will continue to reflect the darkness of Valenka's character later in the film as Valenka assists Le Chiffre and his men to abduct Bond and Vesper Lynd. Unlike Solange (who will be discussed next), Valenka is a willing participant who is fully aware of the nefarious actions of her lover and assists him in carrying them. Hemming has designed a costume arc that represents that through the use of color, metallic textures, beaded and rhinestone detailing, and revealing silhouettes.

In contrast to Valenka, Solange is painted as the innocent bystander who married the wrong person. The first time the audience sees Solange is in CCTV footage that Bond reviews at the resort in the Bahamas while trying to track her husband Alex Dimitrios. She is wearing gold toned strap sandals, white Capri pants, a white tank top with a fuchsia and white floral top, carrying a light pink handbag. Her hair is down. She looks every inch the wealthy country club, trophy wife. The vibrant color tones also indicate a youthful energy and optimism. Bond later spots her on the beach, while surveilling her home. She is riding a horse in the surf, being chased by some of the local children. She wears a small green sequined and beaded bikini with a matching chiffon sarong and her hair is down and flowing in the wind behind her. In this scene Solange is an object to be admired by the children, lusted after by Bond, and watched possessively by her husband from the balcony behind her. Hemming establishes Solange as feminine and fragile with her choice of bright, vibrant colors and soft, fluid fabrics.

Later, while Bond is playing poker with her husband, Solange arrives wearing a satin gown (designed by British designer, Jenny Packham) in a vibrant

pomegranate color. The gown has a plunging neckline and a high slit in the full skirt that floats around her legs as she walks. It has beading on the straps and laces down the low back. Her makeup is dramatic and her hair is draped about her shoulders. Walking into the room she goes to her husband to kiss him for good luck, but as he is already losing he brushes her off and dismisses her to the corner of the bar. As with the bikini, the flashy and sexy gown serve to objectify Solange and she comes across as the trophy left to gather dust in the corner. After Dimitrios loses and storms home without her, Solange is left behind to be picked up by Bond, who hopes to use her for information. It is in her interactions with Bond that Solange's gown begins to really stand out. As the film's designer explains, the fabric color had been chosen to complement Caterina Murino's skin tone, with the further knowledge that the scene would be shot at night and the color would need to coordinate with the greenery and night colors around Murino. They also limited the colors around Murino in the room when she first enters to make her the focus. In the hotel room, when Bond and Solange are kissing on the floor by the open patio door, the low, laced-up back adds an extra element to the scene. As Hemming explains, "I wanted [the dress] desperately because I thought the sex scene that followed with Solange and Bond, after the casino, it would be a marvelous filmic thing to look at the back, as she's on top of Bond, which I was told she would be on top of him rather than him on top of her" (Crew Commentary). In the hotel room, when Solange and Bond are rolling around on the floor, the color pops even more, as does the shininess of the satin.

Hemming explains that she chose the pomegranate colored satin version of the dress because it gave a:

fantastic lighting quality, and for instance if she was in a black dress or a dark dress you wouldn't get the silhouetting of his body the way you do and you wouldn't get that sexy drapery and lighting quality...I think satin tells you that somebody's trying to be sexy anyway, it sort of gives you a slightly 'underwear' feeling without her being in underwear. (Crew Commentary)

Solange soon gets a call from her husband and tells Bond that Dimitrios is on the last flight to Miami and—knowing Bond's intentions—let's him know that he will have “all night to question” her (*Casino Royale*). The audience sees Solange slinking into the bedroom while Bond orders champagne “for one” and rushes after Dimitrios. Bond never actually sleeps with her the way it was insinuated that Connery's Bond had slept with Miss Taro for information about Dr. No. However, unfortunately for Solange, she does not meet the same gentle fate as Miss Taro. Instead, the next time the audience sees Solange she is dead and twisted in a hammock, assumed to have been tortured for information about Bond and then killed and left as a message. From first scene to last, the rhetoric of Solange's costumes is that she is never much more than a pretty object to be discarded once she has served her purpose.

Vesper Lynd – Bond Girl or Bond Girl Villain?

In contrast to both Valenka and Solange, Vesper Lynd is a complex character whose costumes slowly reveal a deep and dynamic character who serves

as both love interest and, ultimately, betrayer of James Bond. Vesper's complexity and duality also make her hard to classify. Considering the other female characters in the film, it's easy to consider her the leading Bond Girl, but her ultimate betrayal of Bond has led some to cast her as the Bond Girl Villain (Garland). The character of Vesper does have much in common with the femme fatale characters in film noir classics but for the purposes of this paper I analyze her from the perspective of the Bond Girl as she serves that function narratively up until the last few moments of the film.

Similar to Honey Ryder, the audience doesn't meet Vesper until well into the film and by that time Craig's Bond has already flirted with several women and nearly slept with at least one. Although unlike Connery's Bond, Craig's incarnation hasn't actually had sex with anyone up to this point. When Vesper first meets Bond they are on a train bound for Casino Royale in Montenegro. He is already seated at a table in the dining car waiting for her when she suddenly slides into frame, casually tossing her black leather handbag into the empty seat beside her. Her hair is pulled back into a low bun and she wears minimal makeup just a natural lip color and very light smoky eye shadow. Her outfit is a slim cut black suit jacket with the collar turned up and belted at the waist with a thick leather belt paired with long, wide-legged black trousers. The only jewelry she has on is the Algerian love knot necklace she wears throughout most of the film. Half way through the scene, after Bond has lectured Vesper on the ins and outs of

playing poker and the art of “bluffing,” he demonstrates his skill in reading people by telling Vesper what he can surmise from her appearance:

James Bond: About you Miss Lynd? Well, your beauty’s a problem, you worry you won’t be taken seriously.

Vesper: Which one can say of any attractive woman with half a brain.

James Bond: True. But this one overcompensates by wearing slightly masculine clothing. Being more aggressive than her female colleagues. Which gives her a somewhat prickly demeanor, and ironically enough, makes it less likely for her to be accepted and promoted by her male superiors, who mistake her insecurities for arrogance. Now, I'd have normally gone with ‘only child,’ but by the way you ignored the quip about your parents... I'm going to have to go with ‘orphan.’

Vesper: All right...by the cut of your suit, you went to Oxford or wherever. Naturally you think human beings dress like that. But you wear it with such disdain, my guess is you didn't come from money, and your school friends never let you forget it. Which means that you were at that school by the grace of someone else's charity: hence that chip on your shoulder. And since your first thought about me ran to ‘orphan,’ that's what I'd say you are. (*Casino Royale*)

This part of the scene not only demonstrates the witty banter between Bond and Vesper but also shows the direct ways that costuming functions within the narrative. Both characters use the other's outfit to create an impression of each other. While Vesper's history is unknown, her assessment of Bond's past is accurate and Bond's facial expression gives that fact away to the audience. By the end of this exchange Vesper has managed to learn something about Bond without revealing much about herself. The two characters, in this scene, demonstrate one of the major ideas in the film, being able to read and outplay your opponent, and in this particular battle, Vesper has read Bond better than he read her, something that would cost him dearly by the end of the film. This poker posturing is reinforced by their costumes and the juxtaposition of Bond's three-piece dark suit and Vesper's structured, low cut, black power suit, demonstrate that this character is more of a match for Bond than other Bond Girls of the past have been. For this first look at Vesper, Hemming has created a powerful look through the choice of the color black and the use of a heavier fabric for the suit. This gives a density to the suit that balances off the strength of the suit worn by Bond. Between Bond's analysis, their witty conversation, and what can be seen by the audience of Vesper through her costume, the first impression is that Vesper is a complex woman who is more than just what can be seen as well as unlike any of the women the audience has seen up to this point.

Arriving in Montenegro, Vesper is in a dress of some kind, covered by a black trench coat with the belt tied at her waist, a black fedora, the same black handbag, black stockings and black heels. She is still wearing the same necklace

but has added simple drop earrings. Her eye makeup is heavier, she has red lipstick, and her hair is up in a French twist swept back from her face. The total look created by Hemming is very reminiscent of classic film noir with Vesper looking like a typical femme fatale, which adds to the mystery of her character. This is a clear visual choice by Hemming and the director to keep Vesper visually set apart from the other women and to keep both the audience and Bond guessing about her actual function and role in the film. She looks strong and powerful, and has no problem keeping up with Bond in their verbal sparring. After refusing to be called “Stephanie Broadchest” as part of their aliases—an homage to the Bond Girl names in the past—Vesper makes it clear that Bond will need more than charm to win her over. When she finds out they will be staying as a couple in the hotel, Vesper is quick to come up with a counter-cover, putting Bond in his place, although he, in turn, is quick to reassure her:

Vesper: Since my family is strict Roman Catholic, for appearances sake it will have to be a two-bedroom suite.

Bond: I do hate it when religion comes between us.

Vesper: Religion and a securely locked door. Am I going to have a problem with you Mr. Bond?

Bond: Don't worry; you're not my type.

Vesper: Smart?

Bond: Single. *(Casino Royale)*

Unlike Solange, Vesper seems to have no interest, sexual or otherwise, in Bond. And unlike Honey Ryder, Vesper has the educated intelligence to hold her own against Bond, rather than sound like a naïve child with street smarts.

Later, Bond and Vesper meet Bond's contact in Montenegro, Rene Mathis. Vesper has changed to a cream skirt suit with the jacket belted around the waist with a thick black leather belt, presumably the same belt from the train suit. She also wears the same necklace and carries the same black handbag. Though the color choice is opposite of what the audience has seen so far, it's just the other end of the spectrum and is still an extreme choice for her character. Neither black nor white reveals much about her true intentions. However it further demonstrates that Vesper possesses a spare elegance. She is a character who doesn't have to try to look beautiful and often seems to downplay her looks, as Bond had suggested in the train scene.

Back in the hotel bathroom, getting ready for the start of the poker game, Vesper wears a short white satin bathrobe and the necklace. She is still applying her makeup for the evening. Bond brings her a dark purple evening gown to wear to the poker game that evening and tells her that he needs her to look amazing when she comes down so that all the other players are thinking of her dress and "not their cards." He asks, "Can you do that for me?" to which she replies with a smirk, "I'll try" (*Casino Royale*). Typical to his character, Bond is trying to objectify Vesper and use her for his own means. Very quickly he finds his move turned against him as he goes to his room in the suite and finds a tuxedo lying on

the bed for him. Taking the jacket back to the bathroom to question Vesper they share the following exchange:

Bond: I have a dinner jacket.

Vesper: There are dinner jackets and dinner jackets; this is the latter. And I need you looking like a man who belongs at that table.

Bond: How?...It's tailored.

Vesper: I sized you up the moment we met. (*Casino Royale*)

With this exchange, Vesper manages to use the iconic Bond tuxedo to turn the objectification back around to Bond. She also knows that part of Bond's success in the game will be in his looking the part. By saying that he needs to look like he belongs at the table she brings their previous conversation about bluffing and reading the other players back to mind. The clothing, for both of them, becomes a tool and part of the poker posturing they are both engaged in, both at the table and away from it.

Vesper eventually arrives at the game in the aubergine Roberto Cavalli gown that Bond had chosen for her. Bias cut, it clings to her body as she moves and features a plunging neckline in front with crystal and beaded detail and a low open back. Her hair is down and her makeup is very dramatic. Again, she wears the same necklace. The deep purple color is the first real color the audience sees her in and while the dress is very alluring, there is a sarcasm to the way she goes up to kiss Bond at the table that tells the audience that while she is going along with his plan, she refuses to let herself be objectified. While she seems to be

aware of all of the attention she is getting, she shows disdain in the way she interacts with the other characters. The game takes a one-hour break and Bond makes a show of leaving the room with Vesper, being very seductive and flirtatious. While trying to spy on Le Chiffre outside his hotel room, Bond and Vesper get caught by Obanno and his henchman which leads to a grueling fight scene in the stairwell.

In this scene the costumes magnify the situation for each character. Bond is still able to be active in his tuxedo, even going so far as to use his jacket to help defend himself against the machete being wielded by Obanno. Vesper races down the stairs, trying to stay ahead of the action, dropping her chiffon wrap during her flight down. Although she looks helpless in her sexy dress, Vesper is not afraid to lend a hand. Unlike Honey Ryder who stood back and allowed Bond to do all the dirty work, Vesper rushes in and wrestles the gun away from Obanno while Bond grips him around the neck. However, while Bond is used to death and killing as a part of his job, Vesper's part in the death of Obanno takes its toll on her. When Bond returns to the hotel room after finishing the last round of poker for the night, he finds Vesper sitting in the shower in her dress and clutching her knees to her chest, visibly upset about what she has just been through. Bond joins her in the shower and comforts her, both are fully dressed. While the shower scene with Bond and Solange is the most sexual scene in the film—up to this part—the shower scene is arguably the most intimate scene of the film. It also establishes a shift in relations between the two characters.

Throughout this series of scenes this gown serves a number of different functions. In Hemming's choice of this gown for these scenes she has chosen a gown with a silhouette that enhances Vesper's sexual qualities and attractiveness when she enters the playing room. She is on display to everyone in the room and is made to be an object of desire. During the fight scene it illustrates her fragility. The silk chiffon fabric billows and floats behind her as she flees the fight and is a visual representation of Vesper's own breakability. Finally, in the shower scene, the color plays an important role. While the dark purple was a striking feature of the dress in the casino, when wet the color is muted and allows the dress to fade from the audience's attention, allowing the focus to be on the emotional performance of Eva Green as the walls between Vesper and Bond begin to come down. This dress illustrates the challenges that designers face frequently where one costume must serve several narrative functions and the use of color, mass, and silhouette are all integral parts of the complete look.

The next evening, when the poker game resumes, Vesper is dressed in a black Versace evening gown with a low sweetheart neckline and wide straps that go into an intricate crossing pattern in the open back. Her hair is up in an elaborate chignon and she once again wears dramatic makeup along with larger drop earrings and the same necklace. Left to dress for herself, Hemming has put Vesper back to her usual black and the severity of her hairstyle also makes her come across as more businesslike. She is no longer vulnerable or needing Bond's sympathy or comfort. With this reverting back to her usual style Hemming's

choice for Vesper's costume suggests that she is once again her professional, methodical, and captivatingly conservative self.

After Bond loses the game, he and Vesper share a charged scene on the balcony as he tries to convince her to release the money to buy back into the game. It is pertinent to remember that Vesper's purpose at the game is as the representative of the Treasury and is the keeper of the money. This is a power that she holds over Bond and her function is visually represented by the severity of her costume, in both cut and color. For this scene Hemming has added a black lace and beaded jacket covering her shoulders and upper arms, which provides not only coverage but extra weight. When charm doesn't work, Bond argues with Vesper but she still refuses to give him the additional five million. The dress functions to visually back up her authority, with the strong color and minimal details, but also keeps the focus on her face and performance rather than distract the audience. Although the audience doesn't know it yet, Vesper is trying to save his life by ensuring he doesn't continue the game. Then Bond switches to bullying tactics, Vesper remains defiant and continues to refuse to transfer the money. It's a bold move, one that is visually backed up by the powerful, all black ensemble. Where the aubergine Cavalli gown made a louder statement, this Versace gown is more subtle but still speaks volumes towards Vesper's power and authority in this scene.

After Bond buys himself back into the game with money from CIA agent Felix Leiter, and after Vesper saves Bond's life when Valenka poisons him, Bond finally wins the game. He and Vesper share a late night celebratory dinner and

have a serious conversation about the nature of Bond's work. Again, these characters share an intimate scene that is not sexual at all in its nature and is very different from any of the conversations that Connery's Bond had with any of the Bond Girls in *Dr. No*. Later in the conversation, Bond tells Vesper that he finally figured out the significance of her necklace and that he knows someone special must have given it to her. Vesper tries to shrug it off, saying she just thought it was something pretty, but it is clear to both Bond and the audience that there is something more to the necklace.

The dinner scene ends when Vesper gets a text from Mathis. However, this is a ruse and Bond realizes, rushing out of the hotel just in time to see Vesper being thrown into a car. A car chase ensues and Bond ends up crashing the car to avoid hitting Vesper who has been left tied up in the middle of the road. Le Chiffre and his men take the two to a barge along the water. Like Honey Ryder in *Dr. No*, Vesper is taken away and separated from Bond while Bond is stripped naked and tied to a chair. A couple of times Bond and the audience hear her screaming in the distance and her off screen screams are used against Bond. Another difference here is that while Connery's Bond showed mild concern for Honey Ryder when they were caught on the island and kidnapped by Dr. No, Craig's Bond demonstrates visceral anger towards Le Chiffre and concern for Vesper.

Later, after Bond and Vesper are rescued and Bond is recovering in a medical facility, the relationship between the two characters has changed from that of business acquaintances to that of intimates. Vesper's costumes change as

well. In a scene of the two characters sitting outside and talking while Bond rests, Vesper wears an earthy green dress with a timeless 1950s style. She is still wearing the necklace, although half of it is covered up by the high neckline of the dress. Although an attractive cut, it's a very modest style. In this scene the audience sees the simple elegance Vesper possesses. Hemming does not try to make Vesper look glamorous; Hemming accessorizes her only with simple green and gold drop earrings and very natural makeup. Overall the scene is very emotional and honest as the characters finally reveal their feelings towards each other. Her natural look and simple costume plays well with the location and honest emotions being displayed by Bond. The film then cuts to the next scene of Bond and Vesper kissing passionately. The tone is very playful and energetic. Vesper is now wearing a blue floral dress that comes to the knee and has a fullness to the skirt continuing Hemming's choice of a new theme of brighter colors and earthy tones and prints. It's a complete opposite to all the costumes the audience had previously seen her in. Then the film cuts again to a new scene of Bond and Vesper on the beach. Given the nature of the location, the audience would expect to see Vesper in a classic Bond Girl bikini or some other sort of sexy swimsuit (like Valenka's towards the beginning of the film). However, Hemming has chosen for Vesper to wear a white gauzy cover-up. The only skin that is visible is her legs, which are mostly out of frame throughout the scene. This scene is another emotional scene, in which Bond admits that he loves Vesper and asks her to travel around the world with him. He's willing to give up his life and career as an MI-6 agent to be with her. Once again Hemming's costume choice for Vesper

reflects the seriousness and maturity of the scene. Rather than sexualize and objectify Vesper, her costume protects and covers her and puts the focus on the characters and the information being shared in the scene. Because Bond and the filmmakers take Vesper seriously in the scene, the audience is encouraged to do the same.

Bond and Vesper travel to Venice and it is here where the audience sees the most sexualized presentation of Vesper. In their hotel room Vesper and Bond are kissing in bed and discussing their plans for the day; they are a tangle of arms and legs under the bed sheets. Vesper gets out of bed, playfully tossing a pillow back at Bond, and puts on a red wrap dress. The color is a vibrant shift from the more earthy tones that she had been wearing in the immediate scenes preceding this one. For the first time, the audience gets the slightest hint of breast as Vesper fastens the dress, although it is still less of a flash than audiences saw of Honey Ryder in the decontamination scene of *Dr. No*. The dress is a simple wrap dress that comes to the knees, wraps into a modest V-neck in the front with a thin belt around the waist. She is no longer wearing the necklace, telling Bond, “It was time” to take it off and move on. She has simple black sandals and a graphic tote bag and a red cardigan tossed over the bag. Although Vesper tells Bond she’s going to get supplies, Bond soon discovers by reading a text on her phone—which she left behind—that she’s meeting someone. At the same time, M calls Bond to let him know the money from the poker game had never been transferred back to the Treasury and Bond realizes that the money has been stolen.

Bond races after Vesper and the red dress becomes a gimmick Hemming uses to pull the audience's attention. The red color stands out among the crowd as Bond is following her and later stands out among all the villains wearing dark colors and the light colored stone of the set. It's the brightest and most vivid color Vesper has worn throughout the entire film and demonstrates the depths of her betrayal. Now that the truth of her character has been revealed, the vibrancy of the color serves as a visual marker of the difference in her character. Her character has changed from dutiful public servant to traitor and Hemming's choice of the bright red becomes a visual point of reference to drive that idea into the minds of the audience.

Forced into a standoff against the villains, Bond's objective is to get the money that has been stolen, and he seems just as happy to kill Vesper as the villains are. Vesper is locked in an elevator as the Venetian palazzo begins to sink around her while Bond fights with the villains. The elevator eventually falls below the water and Bond, having defeated the bad guys, jumps in to save her despite his willingness to kill her moments before. Underwater, the red continues to pop against the dark blues and blacks in the surrounding environment. Knowing her fate if she survives, Vesper ultimately sacrifices herself.⁸ Too late, Bond manages to retrieve her from the water. Despite his frantic attempts to revive her, it is clear that he has lost her. Lying dead, and soaking wet, Vesper in the red dress strikes a contrast against Bond in black. Even in death, the red continues to make a visual statement seeming to represent both her betrayal as well as Bond's anger towards her.

Throughout the film, the audience watches Vesper's costumes go through a complete character arc that demonstrates visually the path that she is taking emotionally. Arguably one of the most complicated Bond Girls in the franchise's history, designer Lindy Hemming visually illustrates Vesper's complexities through the costume choices and give added depth to Eva Green's performance.

The Bond Girls of Casino Royale

In *Casino Royale*, the four Bond Girls discussed for this analysis—M, Solange, Valenka, and Vesper—represent one of the Bond Girl archetypes. Their costumes are one of the main tools used to illustrate these archetypes. In each case the relationship between character and costume is very close, with the costume sometimes telling the audience more about the character than the character does themselves. M's rant on Bond in the halls of Parliament is made more eviscerating by the severity of the cut and color of her pantsuit. Solange's fragility is displayed through the bright colors and soft patterns of her resort wear. Valenka is ruthless in her silence and her sexy and alluring costumes provide a subtle juxtaposition to her murderous intent. Vesper, the most nuanced and complicated of all the Bond Girls in *Casino Royal*—and perhaps the franchise as a whole—is represented through her costumes with a finesse and attention to detail that is just as alluring and enigmatic as she is herself. The costumes work in tandem with the details provided by the script and back up the work done by the cast and the rest of the production team, helping to create a complete mise-en-scène that allows the audience to immerse themselves into the world of James Bond. The design work of Lindy Hemming is done with such precision that the

audience barely takes note of the designs and focuses on the characters instead, the perfect example of good costume design. As costume designer, Hemming—along with the director—is responsible for creating character through clothing and, by extension, constructing normative notions of female and male sexuality as well as gender roles. Her designs for the Bond Girls, and Bond himself, uphold—and sometimes challenge—previous ideas and constructions of these characters and archetypes. *Casino Royale* presents representations of some of the strongest and most powerful female characters in the franchise’s history as well as a Bond who is much more sexualized and objectified than any of his incarnations in the past. As Lisa Funnell points out, “through intertextual referencing of renowned Bond Girl iconography, exemplified through Bond’s double emergence from the sea, Craig’s Bond is positioned as a visual spectacle and aligned with the Bond Girl character type rather than with his Bond predecessors in the filmic franchise,” (“I Know Where You Keep Your Gun” 456). The costume design for the film aids in this visual spectacle by assisting in aligning Craig’s Bond with the Bond Girl type, each look the result of a careful choice on the part of the Hemming. With *Casino Royale*, filmmakers restart the franchise and create a Bond that can carry well into the 21st century. Through careful costuming they created complex characters, both male and female.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to explore the rhetoric of the costumes of the 007/James Bond film franchise and the ways the costumes speak to the representation of power and femininity/masculinity of the film’s characters.

While many of the key elements of the franchise have stayed consistent over its 50-year history, others have made important and dramatic changes. Characters have become more complex and have evolved with the ever-changing society they represent. The differences between characters such as Honey Ryder and Vesper Lynd and their portrayals on screen are numerous and most especially evident in their costuming. Honey is brash and outspoken, not afraid to tell Bond what she thinks or to take action to defend herself, but is emotionally wounded from her difficult past. Having her costumes alternate consistently between various states of dress and undress illustrate her balance between independence from and dependence on Bond throughout the second half of the film. Vesper, confident although she may be, is still much more physically dependent on Bond than Honey first appeared to be. However, very early on Vesper reveals to be Bond's intellectual equal, at least, if not his better. Vesper's costumes illustrate her professional savvy and intelligence as well as reflecting her underlying mystique that draws in both Bond and the audience. Although this paper has focused on *Dr. No* (1962) and *Casino Royale* (2006) further studies on where specific shifts began to occur during the franchise's 50 year history would not only chart a history for the Bond franchise but also a history of costume design in general.

The field of costume design underwent many changes during the latter part of the 20th century and the 007/James Bond franchise was a witness to, and an example of, many of those changes. The differences in the costuming from *Dr. No* and *Casino Royale* are many. While the foundations of design haven't changed much, attention and focus on design, as well as funding from the budget, have

increased over the years. These changes are especially evident in *Casino Royale*, which stands out as a much more powerful example of effective costume design than *Dr. No*. The changes in the field have allowed the costumes to have greater rhetorical effectiveness and the designer to make more specific rhetorical statements with the costumes. Overall, the costume design of these films has allowed for stronger and more complex representations of the power and femininity of the female characters.

An increased focus on famous brands and fashion labels has also occurred over the years such as Bond wearing only Omega watches and Brioni suits in *Casino Royale* or the use of major designers/design houses like Jenny Packham, Roberto Cavalli, and Versace to help create the costumes for the films characters. Likewise, the use of the cast of each new film to promote products associated with the film, such as the Omega watch ad campaign featuring Daniel Craig or the Heineken beer campaign featuring Eva Green as Vesper Lynd to project these characters into the daily lives of the audience and to sell the idea of the glamorous life they live.

Additionally, a deeper study of the Daniel Craig era of the 007/James Bond franchise, particularly the arc of the first three films of his run (*Casino Royale*, 2006; *Quantum of Solace*, 2008; and *Skyfall*, 2012) would provide an interesting analysis of the ways that the 007/James Bond franchise has transitioned into the 21st century. The films have also become strong examples of excellence in costume design and the power that designers have to speak volumes about characters before they even begin to speak on screen. By examining films like

those in the 007/James Bond film franchise, and the designers that create these iconic costumes, scholars can have a better understanding of the ways that costumes function in the narrative of the film and what they might have to say to the audience that is consuming that spectacle.

NOTES

¹ Prior to the time of this paper the 23rd Bond film, *Skyfall* (2012) was released. While the choice to start this analysis with the first film, *Dr. No* (1962) was simple, the choice of the second case study was more difficult. Both *Casino Royale* and *Skyfall* have compelling and useful implications towards my argument but I ultimately chose *Casino Royale* for a few reasons. First, while the representations of the “empowered” Bond Girl began as early as the Timothy Dalton era and continued into the Pierce Brosnan era, it was in *Casino Royale* and the beginning of the Daniel Craig era and the reboot of the franchise that the Bond films began to move in a new direction. Second, the depictions of the Bond Girls in *Casino Royale* provide a more complex analysis than in *Skyfall*. Third, *Skyfall* is ultimately the story of concluding the relationship between Bond and his boss M (played by Judi Dench since 1995). Fourth, *Skyfall* is a complicated text, worthy of analysis on its own due to its return to the classic Bond formula. The three main Bond Girls in *Skyfall* are M, Sévérine (played by Bérénice Lim Marlohe), and Eve (played by Naomie Harris). While many scholars consider M a Bond Girl, the relationship of both boss/employee and mother-figure/son set M apart from other Bond Girls. Sévérine, is perhaps the most classic depiction of a Bond Girl seen in years in that her sole function is to lure Bond to the villain and after she has served her purpose, she is killed. Eve, begins as a depiction of a modern Bond Girl in that she is a field agent, set on a near equal level to Bond, however, by the end of the film the audience learns that she is actually Eve Moneypenny, M’s secretary (the character was originated by Lois Maxwell and last seen in *Die Another Day* (2002) played by Samantha Bond). Miss Moneypenny is also set apart from the typical Bond Girls in that she has never had a romantic relationship with Bond himself, they’re relationship is defined by the flirtation between them that is never acted upon. Therefore, while *Skyfall* would have much to investigate in the area of feminist film studies, for the purpose of this paper—costume rhetoric—*Casino Royale* is a better choice.

² Though CBS had produced a made-for-television version of *Casino Royale* in 1954, starring Barry Nelson as “Jimmy” Bond, *Dr. No* was the first time the character received major attention in a film and Connery is considered the first actor to seriously fulfill the role.

³ In addition to design, Prendergast had a brief career as an actor and later as the owner of a private drinking club in London, which she ran until her passing in 2001. See “Tessa Welborn.”

⁴ Initially, Ian Fleming didn’t sell the rights to all the books to one person, and Gregory Ratoff would purchase *Casino Royale* with the majority of the other books purchased by Albert R. Broccoli and Harry Saltzman (with Kevin McClory owning *Thunderball*). While Broccoli, Saltzman and McClory would strike a deal that would allow *Thunderball* to be produced, no such deal could ever be made for *Casino Royale* as the rights would get passed from producer to producer and then film studio to film studio. It wouldn’t be until 2001 that the rights would finally come full circle as Sony—the holders of *Casino Royale*—became shareholders of MGM—the company that Eon Productions and the Bond franchise worked with—finally bringing the film rights and the Bond producers under the same roof. See “The Road to *Casino Royale*”.

⁵ In *GoldenEye* (1995) Judi Dench as M refers to Pierce Brosnan’s Bond as a “sexist, misogynist dinosaur” but by the time of *Skyfall* (2012) M has become a definite mother figure to Daniel Craig’s incarnation of Bond.

⁶ Solange mentions this herself while being seduced by Bond in his hotel room. She asks him, “What is it about bad men? You...my husband. I had so many chances to be happy, so many nice guys. Why can't nice guys be more like you?” (*Casino Royale*)

⁷ In this new incarnation of Bond the female characters have relatively normal names. This insertion of the alias name “Stephanie Broadchest” serves as an homage to the names of Bond Girls of the past that were sexual innuendoes or double entendres like Honey Ryder, Pussy Galore, Plenty O’Toole, or Xenia Onatopp.

⁸ Though her sacrifice at the end of *Casino Royale* seems selfish and a move to spare herself from dealing with the consequences of her betrayal—of both Bond and MI-6—in the next Bond film, *Quantum of Solace* it is revealed that her motives might have been deeper. At the beginning of *Quantum of Solace*, after bringing in Mr. White—the man Bond captures at the end of *Casino Royale*—Mr. White reveals to Bond and M that had Vesper not killed herself he and the

organization he works for would have gotten Bond as well, thinking that Bond would have done anything for Vesper. If this were true, then Vesper's sacrifice would have been one of love rather than guilt.

REFERENCES

- Allen, Jeanne Thomas. "Fig Leaves in Hollywood: Female Representation and Consumer Culture." *Fabrications: Costume and the Female Body*. Eds. Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Bennett, Tony, and Janet Woollacott. *Bond and Beyond: the Political Career of a Popular Hero*. Hampshire: Macmillan Education, 1987. Print.
- Bond Girls Are Forever*. Dir. John Watkin. Perf. Maryam D'Abo. Planet Grande Pictures, 2002. DVD.
- Britton, Wesley A. *Beyond Bond: Spies in Fiction and Film*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005. Print.
- Bruzzi, Stella. *Undressing Cinema: Clothing and Identity in the Movies*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Carson, Diane, Linda Dittmar, and Janice Welsch. *Multiple Voices in Feminist Film Criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1994. Print.
- Casino Royale*. Dir. Martin Campbell. Perf. Daniel Craig, Eva Green, Judi Dench, Mads Mikkelsen. Columbia Pictures, 2006. DVD.
- Cook, Pam and Claire Hines. "'Sean Connery Is James Bond': Re-Fashioning British Masculinity in the 1960s." *Fashioning Film Stars: Dress, Culture, Identity*. Ed. Rachel Moseley. London: BFI, 2005.
- Crawley, Joanna. "Stars Gather For James Bond Bidding War At Memorabilia Auction." Entertainmentwise. Giant Digital, 6 Oct. 2012. Web. 03 Dec. 2012. <<http://www.entertainmentwise.com/news/90119/Stars-Gather-For-James-Bond-Bidding-War-At-Memorabilia-Auction>>.
- "Crew Commentary." *Casino Royale*. Dir. Martin Campbell. Columbia, 2006. DVD. Disc 1.
- Doane, Mary Ann. *The Desire to Desire: The Woman's Film of the 1940s*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- . *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, Psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.

- Dr. No*. Dir. Terence Young. Perf. Sean Connery, Ursula Andress, Joseph Wiseman. United Artists Corporation, 1962. DVD.
- Funnell, Lisa. "Negotiating Shifts in Feminism: The 'Bad' Girls of James Bond." *Women on Screen: Feminism and Femininity in Visual Culture*. Ed. Melanie Walters. Palgrave: Macmillan, 2011. 23 October 2011 <<http://lib.myilibrary.com?ID=302833>>
- . "‘I Know Where You Keep Your Gun’: Daniel Craig as the Bond-Girl Hybrid in *Casino Royale*." *Journal of Popular Culture* 44.3 (2011): 455-472. Print.
- Gaines, Jane. "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story." *Fabrications: Costume and the Female Body*. Eds. Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Garland, Tony W. "‘The Coldest Weapon of All’: The Bond Girl Villain in James Bond Films." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 37.4 (2010): 179-188. Print.
- GoldenEye*. Dir. Martin Campbell. Perf. Pierce Brosnan, Sean Bean, Izabella Scorupco, Famke Janssen, Judi Dench. MGM, 1995.
- Head, Edith, and Paddy Calistro. *Edith Head's Hollywood*. New York: Dutton, 1983. Print.
- Kuhn, Annete. *The Power of the Image: Essays on Representation and Sexuality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985. Print.
- . *Women's Pictures: Feminism and Cinema*. London: Verso, 1994. Print.
- . *An Everyday Magic: Cinema and Cultural Memory*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2002. Print.
- Kuhn, Annette and AnnMarie Wolpe. *Feminism and Materialism Women and Modes of Production*. London: Routledge & Paul, 1978. Print.
- Landis, Deborah Nadoolman. *Screencraft - Costume Design*. Burlington: Focal Press, 2003. Print.
- . *Dressed: A Century of Hollywood Costume Design*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007. Print.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Media and Cultural Studies: Keywords*. By Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner. Malden: Blackwell, 2006. 343-52. Print.

- Packer, Jeremy, and Sarah Sharma. "Postfeminism Galore: The Bond Girl as Weapon of Mass Consumption." *Secret Agents: Popular Icons beyond James Bond*. Ed. Jeremy Packer. New York: Peter Lang, 2009. 89-110. Print.
- Quantum of Solace*. Dir. Marc Forster. Perf. Daniel Craig, Olga Kurylenko, Mathieu Amalric, Judi Dench, Giancarlo Giannini, Gemma Arterton. MGM, 2008.
- Rubin, Natasha. "Deborah Landis." Message to author. 17 Nov. 2011. E-mail.
- Street, Sarah. *Costume and Cinema: Dress Codes in Popular Film*. London: Wallflower, 2001.
- "Skyfall (2012) - IMDb." The Internet Movie Database (IMDb). 2011. Web. 02 Dec. 2011. <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1074638/>>.
- "Tessa Welborn." The Telegraph. Telegraph Media Group, 23 July 2001. Web. 5 Jan. 2013. <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/obituaries/1334923/Tessa-Welborn.html>>.
- "The Road to Casino Royale." Prod. John Cork. *Casino Royale*. Dir. Martin Campbell. Columbia, 2006. DVD. Disc 3.
- "Ursula's 007 Bikini Sold in Auction." BBC News. BBC, 15 Feb. 2001. Web. 03 Dec. 2012. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1170800.stm>>.
- Weiner, Robert G., B. Lynn Whitfield, and Jack Becker, eds. *James Bond in World and Popular Culture: The Films are Not Enough*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010. Print.
- White, Rosie. *Violent Femmes: Women as Spies in Popular Culture*. London: Routledge, 2007. Print.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Andrea Severson has been living in Phoenix since 1997. She has a Master of Arts degree in Media Arts from the University of Arizona where her research was focused on fashion and costume theory and history and the use of design in film and television. She is about to complete a Master of Arts in English: Rhetoric and Composition at Arizona State University, focusing on fashion rhetoric, with the intention of pursuing her doctorate next. She also has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Theatre Arts from Arizona State University where she studied costume design and production. She has worked as an adjunct instructor for the Maricopa County Community College District since 2010, teaching a variety of theatre production and history courses including, Introduction to Theatre, Modern Drama, Acting I, and Theatre Makeup. In addition to her work in education she also has worked for more than ten years as a freelance costume designer working on various theatrical and film projects around Phoenix and Tucson and serves as the costume shop supervisor and resident designer at Paradise Valley Community College. She has also been a member of the Arizona Costume Institute since 2010 and has served on the Board of Directors for the ACI since 2011.