Before and After For Your Eyes Only
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The James Bond franchise remains one of the most profitable film franchises of all time, and is one of continuing worldwide cultural significance. With twenty-five official Bond films – excluding Columbia Picture’s Casino Royale (1967) and Warner Brother’s Never Say Never Again (1983) – the action-spy series has provided exciting, escapist fare since 1962. Commonly cited as an integral part of the franchise’s success is its formulaic nature, with Kimberly A. Neuendorf et al. noting that “espionage, innovative gadgets, alcoholic beverages, fast cars, a demonic villain and a plethora of attractive women were instrumental in molding the ‘Bond formula’ that matriculated from print to celluloid” (2009, 747).

The plethora of attractive women, commonly referred to as “Bond Girls”, are among the most analysed components of the Bond formula. The definition of “Bond Girl” has regularly been debated, with Lisa Funnell claiming that

the term Bond Girl refers to a particular female character of the Bond film. She is a non-recurring character and lead female protagonist, central to the plot of the film and instrumental to the mission of James Bond. However, the defining feature of the Bond Girl is the strong, intimate, and intense relationship she builds with Bond. (2008, 63)
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However, this definition is restrictive and eliminates numerous female characters who have narrative significance in regard to their “romantic” relationship with Bond, and also presumes that these women’s relationships with Bond are strong, intimate, and intense, when in fact they often only exist to add a scene of sexual intercourse to the film. Funnell also highlights that the “Bond Girl” archetype is “not rigidly formulaic [...] the term has been over/misused in social, critical, and academic discourse to refer to nearly every woman who appears on screen regardless of her role, allegiance, or competency” (2018, 12). Funnell is correct in arguing the term’s overuse, as the term should not refer to any and every female character in a Bond film; this allows background characters with no significance to earn this title, as well as platonic female characters such as Judi Dench’s M and Moneypenny – who, it is established early on in the franchise, will never be allowed to consummate her affections towards Bond. The analysis in this article adheres closer to Neuendorf et al.’s definition of “Bond Girls”: “those who are viable romantic partners with James Bond and provide a focal point for narrative intrigue” (758). Therefore, a “Bond Girl” is someone who the audience considers a possible romantic partner for Bond due to some level of character development (eliminating background characters and those deemed platonic); whether the relationship is consummated or not is irrelevant.

What is commonly agreed upon in terms of “Bond Girl” analysis is that “the Bond films are clearly problematic texts” (Funnell 2015, 89). The presence of the “Bond Girl” has always been important to the individual films, as noted by Cynthia W. Walker: “[t]here has never been a Bond movie without a Bond girl. The women of Bond are as essential to the basic formula as the Walther PPK, the Aston Martin and that shaken not stirred Martini” (2014, 88). However, as Elisabeth Ladenson states, “it has often been noted that the women in the Bond stories are somewhat lacking in psychological nuance [...] for the most part they are nothing more than animated [...] dolls, whence the generic term ‘Bond Girls’” (2009, 224). Rather than fully fleshed out characters, the majority of the women in the Bond films are only defined by their relationship to Bond, and as such are an “adjunct” to Bond (Walker, 88; Neuendorf et al., 750). This is elaborated on in regard to the term itself, with Monica Germaná pinpointing that “the term ‘Girl’ also signals the apparent infantilization of women, whose ‘girlhood’ is not placed on the same hierarchical level as Bond’s ‘manhood’” (2020, 15) and Neuendorf et al. referring to it as a “pejorative term” (750).

However, as Erin Isely asserts, “while the earlier Bond films offer little more than the brazen objectification of their female characters, later films change the ways in which women are presented and seen” (2023, 12), resulting in
newer films containing “a self-awareness and toning down of the objectification of its female characters” (ibid., 2). While Neuendorf et al. warn that “the women of Bond continue to be portrayed in a rather limited and sex-stereotyped manner” and that, as a result, “seasoned Bond fans and new viewers alike are exposed to homogenous portrayals of women within old or new Bond films” (758), the presence of more independent, strong, intelligent, and three-dimensional characters has become more visible in the James Bond franchise. This article argues that *For Your Eyes Only* (1981), Roger Moore’s fifth outing as Bond and the first Bond film of the 1980s, is the specific film in which this shift from one-dimensional and formulaic female characters to fully realised characters begins to occur – although the franchise does still feature the occasional formulaic character. By analysing the “Bond Girls” that came before, providing an in-depth analysis of the women characters of *For Your Eyes Only*, and then providing an analysis of the “Bond Girls” of the films following, *For Your Eyes Only* can be seen as the most integral instalment for the representation of women in one of the most important film franchises in cinema history.

**“BOND GIRLS” BEFORE *FOR YOUR EYES ONLY***

Erin Isely relates the portrayal of the “Bond Girl” in the films to the novels of Ian Fleming, which the films prior to *For Your Eyes Only* followed more closely: “the novels follow a now-familiar formula of saving the Western world while operating within exotic locations, as well as the conquering of both the villain and the title’s main love interest, or “Bond Girl”” (3). This formula remained almost exclusively unchanged during the films of the 1960s and 1970s. The one-dimensional “Bond Girl”, who (typically and inexplicably quickly) falls madly in love with Bond and exists only to follow after him like a puppy-dog, is embodied by many of the iconic women of these films.

Honey Ryder (Ursula Andress) of *Dr. No* (1962), while resourceful, appears only halfway through the film, and is kidnapped so that Bond has someone to save. Although Tatiana Romanova (Daniela Bianchi) is notable for killing villain Rosa Klebb (Lotte Lenya) in *From Russia with Love* (1963) – albeit out of desperation rather than determination – she falls for Bond through a photograph of him, and has little distinguishing personality traits outside of her obsession with him. This is also true for Mary Goodnight (Britt Ekland) of *The Man with the Golden Gun* (1974). Kissy Suzuki (Mie Hama), though implied to be a skilled fighter, is objectified in a bikini as Honey Ryder was, and is given very little screen time in *You Only Live Twice* (1967). Later women, such as Tiffany Case (Jill
St. John) of *Diamonds are Forever* (1971) and Holly Goodhead (Lois Chiles) of *Moonraker* (1979), start off with the suggestion that they will be characterised differently and then devolve, with Tiffany suddenly losing all intelligence and Holly’s status as scientist downplayed in favor of being Bond’s sidekick.

Outside of the main/lead “Bond Girl’s” are three other “Bond Girl” character types: minor love interests – usually sexual partners for Bond prior to his meeting the lead “Bond Girl”; sacrificial lambs, who are romantic interests of varying narrative significance that are killed by the film’s conclusion; and *femme fatales*, who are the henchwomen of the primary antagonists that Bond sleeps with and then kills or allows to die. These women are also formulaic and undeveloped in that their story notes are typically interchangeable. For example, Fiona Volpe (Luciana Paluzzi) of *Thunderball* (1965) and Helga Brandt (Karin Dor) of *You Only Live Twice* are both *femme fatales* who seduce Bond in order to gain information for the villain, and who are then punished for their transgression with death. Other *femme fatales*, such as Bambi (Lola Parson) and Thumper (Trina Parks) of *Diamonds are Forever* and Miss Taro (Zena Marshall) of *Dr. No* are arrested rather than killed, but still only exist as failed distractions for Bond planted by the villain. Jill Masterson (Shirley Eaton) of *Goldfinger* (1964), Andrea Anders (Maud Adams) of *The Man with the Golden Gun*, and Corinne Dufour (Corinne Clery) of *Moonraker* betray the villain to be with Bond, but are killed by the villain soon afterwards. Other minor “Bond Girls”, such as Sylvia Trench (Eunice Gayson) of *Dr. No*, Vida (Aliza Gur) and Zora (Martine Beswick) of *From Russia with Love*, Patricia Fearing (Molly Peters) of *Thunderball*, and Ruby Bartlett (Angela Scoular) of *On Her Majesty’s Secret Service* (1969) exist only to provide further evidence of Bond’s irresistible charm. Other sacrificial lambs align themselves with Bond and die due to their proximity to him, such as Aki (Akiko Wakabayashi) of *You Only Live Twice* and Manuela (Emily Bolton) of *Moonraker*.

All of this is not to say that there are not minor alterations of the “Bond Girl” formula prior to *For Your Eyes Only*. For instance, Rosie Carver (Gloria Hendry) of *Live and Let Die* (1973) is the first Black “Bond Girl”; however, the fact that Rosie is a double-agent fearful of voodoo who betrays Bond results in what James Chapman calls “an undeniable racist subtext” (2000, 140) that “simultaneously expose[s] and undermine[s] master/slave colonial hierarchies” (Germaná, 64). However, these minor alterations, whether problematic or not, do not change the fact that these women are relegated as adjunct to Bond rather than becoming fully developed characters.

Pussy Galore (Honor Blackman) of *Goldfinger* and Anya Amasova (Barbara Bach) of *The Spy Who Loved Me* (1977) are two integral “Bond Girls" that many fans
and critics posit as breaking the formula, but who, I argue, actually adhere to it. Blackman is rightfully heralded as providing a bravura performance as Galore and remains a popular character within the fandom; she is depicted as an intelligent pilot who, while working for villain Auric Goldfinger (Gert Frobe), has a mind of her own and stands up to Bond. However, her strength quickly devolves and she becomes one of the most problematic characters in the entire franchise. While it is explicitly stated that Galore is lesbian in the novel, this is only hinted at in the film; however, as Ladenson observes, “Pussy Galore offers one of the most arresting images of lesbianism in popular culture in the twentieth century” (225). Although she tells Bond that his charms would fail to work on her, Bond eventually forces himself on her in a barn, in which she fiercely resists before “succumbing” to Bond in one of the more blatant scenes of assault in the franchise. Galore then transitions from the villain’s sidekick to the lead “Bond Girl”. With her prior fortitude presenting a threat, “Bond conquers the threat and maintains his heterosexuality” (Isely, 9). Ladenson elaborates on this, arguing that Galore “abandons both criminality […] and homosexuality […] not because she sees the error of her ways but because in Bond she finds the Real Man she hadn’t known she was looking for” (232). While perhaps a memorable character, Pussy Galore is not only a textbook example of a “banal, replaceable […] generic Bond Girl” (Ladenson, 234), but a character surrounded by homophobic and misogynistic themes, and the victim of a blatant sexual assault by the franchise’s hero.

Anya Amasova is presented as both Bond’s “opposite number in the KGB” and as more “cool-headed and capable than the feather brained heroines of early 1970s films” (Chapman, 159). Amasova, also known as Agent XXX, is able to best Bond several times early in the film, including by stealing microfilm from him and knocking him out via paralysing cigarette smoke, and also possesses more knowledge than Bond about the villain’s headquarters. However, by the end of the film, Bond has saved her twice – once from Jaws (Richard Kiel) on a train, and once from Stromberg (Curt Jurgens) in the final battle, for which Anya is sidelined. Funnell notes that “many professional women appear to be taken down a notch by Bond, such as Agent XXX” (2015, 90), while Chapman highlights that “her character is subordinated to Bond, both professionally and sexually” (159). This is most evident in that Amasova had sworn vengeance on Bond for his murder of her lover earlier in the film, but in the film’s final scenes she instead falls into bed with him. Claire Hines concludes that
by the final scenes [Amasova] has effectively been repositioned from a top-level enemy agent who vowed to kill Bond in revenge for the death of her lover, to yet another damsel in distress for him to save, and a willing bedmate unable to resist his charms. (172)

Daniel Ferreras Savoye notes that though Amasova “would seem to indicate a progression towards a stronger female counterpart” (2013, 99), she is reduced to a stereotype by the film’s end, like Galore was before her.

There are two “Bond Girls” who can be considered significant enough departures from the formula to determine that formulaic female characters were not an absolute prior to *For Your Eyes Only*. The first, Domino Derval (Claudine Auger), is villain Largo’s (Adolfo Celi) mistress in *Thunderball*. While initially portrayed as a kept woman for Largo, his murder of her brother and Bond’s arrival in her life encourages her to reclaim her own agency and leave Largo. She aids Bond multiple times and is eventually kidnapped and tortured by Largo. However, Domino is able to escape with the help of someone other than Bond and coldly murders Largo with a spear gun just before he can kill Bond. While there are seduction elements present between Bond and Domino, her choice to betray Largo and assist Bond is framed as originating from a desire for revenge for the murder of her brother rather than because she succumbed to Bond’s wiles. As opposed to Tatiana Romanova who killed Rosa Klebb out of desperation, Domino makes a choice to kill Largo, just as she makes a choice to sleep with Bond. Their relationship is therefore portrayed as one in which Domino has agency, and, as such, Domino remains the only “Bond Girl” of the Connery era to present progressive traits that align with positive representation of women antithetical to the “Bond Girl” formula.

Meanwhile, Tracy di Vincenzo (Diana Rigg) of *On Her Majesty’s Secret Service* became the only woman – prior to the Craig era – that Bond is shown to truly be in love with, and is the only woman that Bond actually marries (not counting the faux wedding in *You Only Live Twice*). In George Lazenby’s only outing as Bond, Tracy is at first depicted as a suicidal young woman that Bond romances in order to gain information about his arch-nemesis Blofeld (Telly Savalas) from her father, Draco (Gabriele Ferzetti). However, over time, Bond develops genuine feelings for Tracy and, by the film’s end, chooses to abandon his bachelor lifestyle and marry Tracy. Stephen Nepa comments that “[Bond’s] gentleness towards di Vincenzo, who challenges him sexually and otherwise, reverses the 007 tradition of keeping women in their place, sexually or violently. With genuine feelings for one another, their nuptials are legitimized” (2015, 192).
Tracy’s character is an anomaly to the “Bond Girl” formula in that she is not portrayed as disposable nor as an adjunct to Bond. She is as integral to Bond’s narrative as Bond is to hers, presenting them as equals. Nepa argues that Tracy “is one of the most competent Bond Girls, [and is] also the last to exude the independence and liberation of post-war feminism” (ibid., 194). Though Tracy is killed at the end of the film, her narrative significance is felt in several later Bond films and provides a blueprint for Vesper Lynd (Eva Green) in Casino Royale (2006) and Madeleine Swann (Lea Seydoux) in Spectre (2015) and No Time to Die (2021). While Nepa proposes that “after [On Her Majesty’s Secret Service], the Bond Girl underwent a paradigmatic shift rather than a reversion” (194), it is not until For Your Eyes Only that more anomalies to the “Bond Girl” formula akin to Domino and Tracy appear.

THE “BOND GIRLS” OF FOR YOUR EYES ONLY

Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott point out that “For Your Eyes Only abandoned comic parody, for the greater part, to concentrate on a ‘straight’ Bond adventure story” (2009, 29). Coming off of the campiness that was Moonraker, For Your Eyes Only is a much more grounded and intense story; this intensity and “realness” also extends into the portrayal of the film’s “Bond Girls”. This analysis is not the first to argue the importance of For Your Eyes Only; Fernando Gabriel Pagnoni Berns highlights that “For Your Eyes Only presents a noticeably different representation of the Bond Girl” (2015, 121). However, Berns limits his argument to only one of the female characters in the film and conflates its importance with Octopussy (1983) and A View to a Kill (1985). Whereas there were only two departures from the “Bond Girl” formula in all of the films of the 1960s and 1970s, there are four total in For Your Eyes Only.

The first is the narrative return of Tracy, with Bond visiting her gravesite. While Tracy was mentioned in The Spy Who Loved Me and would later be mentioned in Licence to Kill (1989), neither film called her by name, and her existence was ignored in every other film. For Your Eyes Only begins with Bond visiting Tracy’s tombstone – engraved with the words “We Have All the Time in the World”, the musical theme by Louis Armstrong in On Her Majesty’s Secret Service. With a solemn look on Bond’s face, Tracy’s narrative significance is expanded upon from On Her Majesty’s Secret Service and further solidifies her importance as a character in the franchise. The scene continues with a man heavily implied to be Tracy’s (indirect) murderer, Blofeld (John Hollis), remotely commandeering the helicopter that was sent to pick up Bond from Tracy’s grave. Having escaped
Bond’s capture in the earlier films, Blofeld nearly kills Bond by crashing the helicopter, but Bond is able to regain control of the aircraft, find Blofeld on a rooftop in his wheelchair, pick him up using the helicopter’s landing skids, and drop him down a chimney shaft, killing him once and for all. While completely unrelated to the rest of the film, this opening scene allows Bond revenge for the death of his wife and gives both Bond and the audience closure regarding the character. Therefore, Tracy’s “appearance” in the film connects the Lazenby Bond era to the Moore Bond era and further positions her as the “Bond Girl” who shared the most intimate relationship with Bond, one that required him to defeat her murderer twelve years after her death. It also marks the only time that a previous “Bond Girl” is directly referenced until the Craig era; other than Sylvia Trench, who briefly appears in an early scene in *From Russia with Love* after appearing in *Dr. No*, Bond’s love interests are forgotten in each subsequent film.

The second “Bond Girl” is Melina Havelock (Carole Bouquet), the female lead of *For Your Eyes Only*. Melina is presented as a daughter seeking revenge for the death of her parents by the film’s villain. Like Domino, this revenge drives her narrative so much that it “takes precedence over the romance between Bond and herself” (Chapman, 177). Melina is given her own identity and aspirations separate from Bond, claiming that her desire for revenge could never be understood by Bond as he is English and she is half-Greek, meaning that she must avenge her loved ones like the mythic figure Elektra. Beyond this identification with ethnic identity, Melina is “presented as one of the strongest Bond Girls in the franchise, [and] is actually on par with Bond” (Berns, 121). Whereas Bond typically saves the lead “Bond Girl” from danger, it is Melina who saves him multiple times – first shooting one of the villain’s henchmen in the forest as Bond runs from him, and killing another henchman trying to kill Bond while he is scaling the side of a mountain to infiltrate the villain’s lair. Bond does aid her several times, such as when he fights off a group of bikers trying to attack her – although she does jump out of their way, saving herself first. However, she is not “a damsel in distress since she is never captured or held hostage by the villain” (ibid.) and is instead “shown to be competent and resourceful” (Chapman, 177). When Bond’s ally Columbo (Topol) notes that the mission will be tough because they only have five men, Melina retorts that there is also one woman, asserting both her prowess at fighting and equality with the male characters.

Germaná compares the relationship between Melina and *Thunderball’s* Domino through their choice of weapons:
To Bond Girls, weapons can indeed serve as accessories to symbolize their potential threat; other times, however, this phallic threat is reified. This is the case with Melina Havelock who [...] uses her crossbow to avenge her parent’s death, or Domino, who ends up killing the villain [...] literally penetrating him with a spear gun, and thus saving James Bond. (199)

Bond also displays a respect for Melina rarely seen with other “Bond Girls”. While Bond tries to dissuade her from seeking revenge, as it may hurt her as well, he never condescends to her, and in the final scene in which Melina holds the villain Kristatos (Julian Glover) at crossbow-point, Bond steps out of the way to allow her to make her own choice (Columbo kills Kristatos instead, sparing both Bond and Melina from doing it themselves).

Bond and Melina’s relationship, like the one between Bond and Tracy, is developed organically. Bond and Melina do not engage in intercourse until the final scene – an occurrence that had only happened with Honey Ryder and Kissy Suzuki prior – which itself is only suggested as occurring offscreen once the credits roll. Instead, Bond and Melina are shown lying next to each other on her yacht kissing. When Melina suggests they take a moonlight swim, they stand up and disrobe before jumping into the ocean. Bond is not in a dominant position in either moment: they lie next to each other kissing, and then stand face-to-face, literally on equal footing. While Berns contends that before this moment, Melina “has never shown sexual interest in Bond, so their interaction comes across as being somewhat forced” (122), this consummation, and Melina’s interest in Bond, feels like a natural progression over the course of the film, especially in relation to the rushed nature of Bond’s relationship with previous “Bond Girls”. Having avenged her loved ones, Melina makes a choice to pursue Bond, rather than him choosing her like he has done with the majority of previous “Bond Girls”. One of the most positive representations of a woman in the Bond franchise to this day, “Melina Havelock [...] is one of the few Bond Girls that do not jeopardize Bond’s mission by making mistakes. With her deadly crossbow and intelligence, Havelock takes the lead on occasions and helps to ensure the success of Bond’s mission” (ibid., 119).

The third “Bond Girl” – though perhaps a controversial character to assign this designation – is Bibi (Lynn-Holly Johnson), a young figure skater and protégé of Kristatos. Upon his arrival in Cortina, Bibi immediately becomes infatuated with Bond. Bibi appears in Bond’s hotel room and disrobes in front of him before getting into his bed, telling him that she will do anything for him. Bond,
however, refuses her, making Bibi the first potential love interest that Bond has blatantly rejected. While she is significantly younger than Bond – either 16 or 18 depending on the source – she would have still been of legal age in Cortina, making her a valid possibility to fulfill the “Bond Girl” stereotype. Instead, Bond is shown to be extremely uncomfortable with being the target of her affections. Bond attempts to let her down gently by telling her that Kristatos would not approve, and upon a comment from Bibi about not being a virgin, Bond tells her to put her clothes back on so he can take her for ice cream, purposefully infantilising her. While Bibi does embody the obsessed-with-Bond component of the “Bond Girl” formula – perhaps more than any prior character – his rejection of her highlights that the normally promiscuous man has scruples in regard to his sexual partners and has no interest in taking advantage of a young girl. Bibi Dahl – her name a euphemism for “baby doll” – remains the only Lolita-figure in the Bond franchise. Bibi also exists as proof that the potential relationship between Bond and a female character does not have to be consummated for her to be considered a “Bond Girl”.

The final “Bond Girl” of For Your Eyes Only is Countess Lisl von Schlaf (Cassandra Harris), Columbo’s mistress who seduces Bond on Columbo’s orders so as to gain information from him. While initially positioned as a possible femme fatale – due to the narrative suggestion early on that Columbo is the film’s villain, not Kristatos – Lisl instead becomes a sacrificial lamb. After spending the evening together, Bond and Lisl take a morning walk along the beach. They are then attacked by Kristatos’s henchmen, one of whom runs Lisl over with a vehicle after she attempts to run to safety. Where Lisl breaks the “Bond Girl” formula is through Bond’s emotionally intimate treatment of her. While some of the lead “Bond Girls” are treated as less disposable compared to others, the minor love interests and sacrificial lambs were typically only sexual partners. However, when Bond and Lisl walk along the beach, Bond reaches out and takes Lisl’s hand as they continue walking. After Lisl offers him her car so that he can leave, Bond tells her that he was instead hoping to stay longer. While nevertheless a supporting character, the hand-holding and request to spend more time with her creates a much more intimate portrait of Bond’s feelings towards Lisl. This is further developed in her death scene. When Lisl runs away, Bond shouts after her to stop her, and calls her by her first name. However, after she is killed, Bond stands over her corpse with remorse and says goodbye, this time calling her “Countess”. This suggests that he is emotionally detaching himself from her in order to continue with his mission. The need to detach himself, along with his aforementioned behaviour, suggests that Bond had formed a real emotional attachment to her, and
did not view her as a one-time fling. As such, Lisl marks the first time that Bond is shown to have been emotionally intimate with a minor “Bond Girl”.

**“BOND GIRLS” AFTER FOR YOUR EYES ONLY**

Following *For Your Eyes Only*, the presence of fleshed-out female characters in the Bond franchise began to rise. This is not to say that women who fit the “Bond Girl” stereotype did not continue to appear. Characters such as Stacey Sutton (Tanya Roberts) of *A View to a Kill*, Pam Bouvier (Carey Lowell) and Lupe Lamora (Talisa Soto) of *Licence to Kill*, Christmas Jones (Denise Richards) of *The World Is Not Enough* (1999), Strawberry Fields (Gemma Arterton) of *Quantum of Solace* (2008), and Severine (Berenice Marlohe) of *Skyfall* (2012) are all examples of classic, formulaic “Bond Girls”.

However, different and more positive representations of “Bond Girls” have become more common. Berns discusses Magda (Kristina Wayborn) of *Octopussy*, calling her an “extraordinary” and “anomalous character” due to her ability to “circumvent the gender politics at work in the Bond franchise” (124). Beginning as an ally of the film’s villain, Kamal Khan (Louis Jordan), Magda instead chooses to be loyal to another woman, Octopussy (Maud Adams), and avoids any punishment from the villain. She is also resourceful and never requires saving from Bond. Kara Milovy (Maryam d’Abo) of *The Living Daylights* (1987) is likewise an important development for the franchise, as Dalton’s Bond is written to be extremely tender with her, with several scenes of passionate kissing and discussions about their emotional connection. Like Melina, intercourse between them is not implied until the credits roll. This lack of consummation with the lead “Bond Girl” until the end of the film, as previously mentioned, was a rarity. Before Melina it had happened twice; after Melina, it occurred twice more in the 1980s with Stacey Sutton and Kara Milovy, and with Wai Lin of *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997) and Christmas Jones in the 1990s; and then did not happen at all with Camille Montes (Olga Kurylenko) in *Quantum of Solace* or in *Skyfall* (which lacked a lead “Bond Girl”).

Chapman argues that “one aspect of *A View to a Kill* which does offer something new [...] is the prominence accorded to its female villainess, Zorin’s sidekick/lover May Day [Grace Jones]” (192). May Day is introduced at a horse race where she stands next to the villain Zorin (Christopher Walken) wearing a red gown and black cap that simultaneously appears as devilish and garish. Grace Jones, a Black model and singer known for her androgynous looks and muscular frame, brings a physicality to her role not seen in prior “Bond Girls”. Germaná
notes that “confident, strong, and sexual are suitable descriptors for May Day’s performance in *A View to a Kill*” (88); her looks and strength are highlighted in both positive and negative ways. May Day is the only person able to calm down Zorin’s frantic, steroidal prize racehorse, Pegasus. May Day is never seen again with the horses and there is no mention of her having any training regarding them. This association with the taming of the beast and her few lines of dialogue results in an associative animality which is “reinforced by [May Day’s] troubling lack of articulate language throughout the film, where her performance relies on her facial expressions or physical stunts. The absence of language underscores May Day’s untamed Otherness” (ibid., 90). Chapman notes that “Jones’s appearance emphasizes the physicality and sexuality of May Day: her lithe body and animalistic gesture [...] suggest the grace and aggression of a black panther” (192). This is highlighted at the climax of the film when she stalks Bond and Stacey through the tunnels of Silicon Valley, but it is showcased mainly through a scene with May Day and Zorin, in which she trains him in martial arts. Their training becomes a wrestling match as May Day pins Zorin to the dojo mat. He quickly flips her over, dominating her. May Day gnashes her teeth at Zorin and resists his attempts at kissing her but “succumbs” and begins to kiss him in return. Before the scene can progress, Zorin takes a phone call, which frustrates May Day. Whether she is frustrated because their foreplay was interrupted or because Zorin got the better of her is up for debate.

However, May Day remains part of the “succession of more assertive and challenging women” (ibid., 171) that occurred following *For Your Eyes Only*. May Day is the second Black “Bond Girl” and is the first to challenge Bond’s masculinity. When May Day finds Bond in her bed following his search of Zorin’s laboratory, she joins him but forbids him to take a dominant position. Instead, she turns him onto his back, “thus assuming the dominant position and placing Bond in an unaccustomed submissive role” (ibid., 192). Chapman notes how Jones was “privileged in the advertising campaign for the film: posters featured Bond and May Day standing back-to-back with the question ‘Has James Bond finally met his match?’” (ibid.). Indeed, May Day’s emasculation of Bond goes beyond sexual intercourse and into his abilities as an agent. After May Day kills his contact at the Eiffel Tower, Bond attempts to apprehend her, but is bested with a fishing rod, allowing her to make her escape by base jumping off the Tower. Indeed, a large part of this characterisation reflects the progressive nature of her abilities, but it does also reflect an aging Bond as played by Moore.

While May Day is positioned as a *femme fatale* through these actions (as well as her ability to deadlift a Soviet agent that insults Zorin, and casually drop-
ping a businessman out of an airship), she switches sides at the end of the film. When Zorin betrays her and floods the tunnels while she is chasing Bond, Bond and May Day begin to work together. Her humanity is shown when she mourns her friend Jenny (Alison Doody), who is found floating in the underground flood waters. She then assists Bond in derigging the explosives Zorin had planted in a mine shaft. After putting a bomb on a mine cart on which a handle must be held in order for it to move, May Day chooses to sacrifice herself so that Bond can live to kill Zorin. Germaná elaborates that:

While May Day’s performance bears the traces of patriarchal and colonial history – and the racial discourse attached to it – it also simultaneously speaks of the violent rebellion against it [...] though her death could be easily read as paradigmatic of the wide dismissal of Black female characters in the Bond cultural productions, her choice to die is also an act of revenge against all of her ‘masters’, and therefore, liberating. (91)

Chapman claims that “in killing May Day this way, the film denies Bond the opportunity of proving his masculinity against her in a straight fight – and, moreover, denies the audience the confrontation it had seemed to offer” (193). However, the film is progressive in this way, as Bond (despite losing several allies), does not desire this confrontation. He willingly accepts May Day’s help to complete the mission, as his motivation is not revenge, but rather saving Silicon Valley. He then tries to stop her from killing herself, showing Moore’s Bond’s dedication to saving those who aid him in his last outing as 007. May Day’s final act is to rebel against the man who had dominated her and saves Silicon Valley in the process, granting her an independence often denied to “Bond Girls” and her Black “Bond Girl” predecessor, Rosie Carver. May Day thus stands out as a complicated portrayal of Black strength and sexuality within the Bond canon, albeit with some positive character differentia that mark her as one of the more noteworthy “Bond Girls”, not just in Roger Moore’s era but in the entire franchise.

Other anomalies to the formula include Paris Carver (Teri Hatcher) of *Tomorrow Never Dies*. Although Paris is married to villain Elliot Carver (Johnathan Pryce), she is established as having had a relationship with Bond years before and sleeps with him again during the course of the film. While Paris is a sacrificial lamb, Brosnan’s Bond is portrayed as having genuinely cared for her in both their more-intimate-than-usual love scene and in his mourning for her death – evoking memories of Lisl from *For Your Eyes Only* in the process. Meanwhile,
Elektra King (Sophie Marceau) of *The World is Not Enough* became the first female antagonist and is shown to have manipulated the film’s secondary villain Renard (Robert Carlyle) into doing her bidding. Camille Montes of *Quantum of Solace*, like Domino and Melina, is a woman seeking revenge for the death of her family and is the only lead “Bond Girl” to remain platonic with Bond.

Finally, Vesper and Madeleine, both “Bond Girls” of the Craig era, capture Bond’s heart in a way that only Tracy had before. Bond’s love for Vesper in *Casino Royale* leads him to attempt to leave MI6; her subsequent betrayal of him destroys his trust in women and affects his relationships in future films. Not until he meets Madeleine Swann does he allow himself to fall in love again; this leads Madeleine to become the first “Bond Girl” to lead two films – *Spectre* and *No Time to Die* – and results in a child between them. Both strong, independent, and fully-developed characters, Vesper and Madeleine were clearly written with the character of Tracy in mind. With Madeleine as the most recent “Bond Girl”, she represents the culmination of changes that began with Domino and Tracy and were truly put into action with *For Your Eyes Only*.

**CONCLUSION**

Neuendorf et al. comment that “prominent female roles are pivotal to the storyline and overall tone of the films. Every Bond film has multiple female characters who variously tempt, distract, and assist James in his latest mission” (747). While the first two decades of the Bond franchise feature extremely formulaic and highly sexist portrayals of women, the first film of the 1980s, *For Your Eyes Only*, changed this by presenting not one but four detailed and nuanced portrayals of the female characters in Bond’s life. While this analysis is specifically about how the structural components of the franchise changed with *For Your Eyes Only*, Berns does offer an explanation for this shift: “the representation of Bond women in the early 1980s is influenced by the radical feminist movement of the second wave” (119), which focused on critiquing patriarchal society, and subsequently translated to a lessening of male domination in certain texts.

While the series was not completely bereft of well-developed female characters, as seen in *Thunderball* and *On Her Majesty’s Secret Service*, it was not until *For Your Eyes Only* that these characters became more commonplace. Subsequent films depicted more and more strong female characters, culminating in the characters of Vesper Lynd and Madeleine Swann in the recent Daniel Craig films. Regardless of the particular reason for the shift, it can be traced back to this 1981 Bond film. While many have noted that “the Bond series has become entrenched in Western popular culture with the films’ diegetic form so highly predictable
and dependable that it has proved useful in studies of moving image audience response” (Neuendorf et al., 748), For Your Eyes Only proved that the formula was not absolute. Not only could a Bond film exist that portrayed women as something other than adjunct to Bond, but these narratively critical female characters could enjoy more intimate relationships with Bond regardless of whether they were the lead “Bond Girl” or not; could maintain a platonic relationship with Bond; and could maintain their significance in later films. As such, For Your Eyes Only is responsible for the continuing trend of female characters that rejected the stereotypical women of the Connery and early Moore eras, and is an integral film within the franchise for its evolution and representation of female characters.
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