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Spies like us?
An analysis of six 1980s spy films and the images they presented about the Cold War.

- by Jason Bologna
"Let us not be deceived - we are today in the midst of a cold war. Our enemies are to be found abroad and at home. Let us never forget this: Our unrest is the heart of their success. The peace of the world is the hope and goal of our political system; it is the despair and defeat of those who stand against us" (Platt 48).

This passage was part of a speech delivered by Bernard M. Baruch before the South Carolina state legislature on April 16, 1947. The speech is significant because in using the term 'cold war,' Baruch became the first individual publicly to name the era which dominated the United States over the following four decades (Platt 48-9). Baruch's speech is also significant because he succeeded in identifying certain aspects of the national psyche. Words like deceived, unrest, peace, hope, and despair articulate some of the emotions Americans felt about the Cold War during the 43 years that followed his speech.


Each of these films presents images of U.S. superiority, yet, in no case is an American spy living in the United States the hero of the film. Rather, a group of 'outside agents' served as outlets for expressing American fantasies about the Cold War. Examining the symbolic meaning of these outside agents will ultimately show that the United States' perception of the Cold War during the 1980s was a curious mixture of both superiority and skepticism. This mixture is largely a product of four ingredients.
which make up each film: women, Russians, technology and spying. The United States' inability to reach some consensus about the proper roles of these ingredients ultimately resulted in the films' presentation of a skeptical superiority.

An understanding of this thesis will be enhanced by an analysis and comparison of the four ingredients that comprise each film. The issues to consider include:

1) The hero's relationships with women: Does he work to save them or does he work to deceive a female in order to protect himself?

2) The depiction of the Russians: Do we physically fight against them or do we symbolically fight for some ideal that we embrace and they reject?

3) The role of technology: Who uses it, how is it used, and is it a constructive or destructive force?

4) The spy game: How do experience, luck and individualism fit into the life of the spy?

These themes provide a basis to begin an analysis which will expand to incorporate journalistic appraisals of the films, a chronological overview of the decade, and additional writings about the patterns in and impact of motion pictures.

Two tasks remain before an analysis of these films and themes can begin. The first task is to establish a theoretical basis for looking at film.

**FILM THEORY**

Studying motion pictures is far different from studying literature because:

Novels are told by the author. We see and hear only what he wants us to hear. Films are, in a sense, told by their authors too, but we see and hear a great deal more than the director necessarily intends. It would be an absurd task for a novelist to try to describe a scene in as much detail as it
is conveyed in the cinema....Whatever the novelists describes is filtered through his language, his prejudices, and his point of view. With film we have a certain amount of freedom to choose, to select one detail rather than the other (Monaco 29).

The abundance of details makes the viewer's job more difficult because they are forced to make a series of decisions. These decisions can include everything from determining the meaning of the movie to understanding how the music contributes to the film's mood to recognizing recurring symbols, images, or lines. The decision-making process is complicated by the fact that the audience is comprised of a wide array of individuals. Obviously a twenty-two year old radical feminist, a retired stockbroker, and a middle-aged plumber will have different perspectives and expectations in watching a film.

Because these differences exist, it is imperative for me to establish my biases in critiquing films. On a personal level, I am a heterosexual male who is currently in college and believes in God and democracy. On a critical level, I believe that what we see on a movie screen can revise the way we see ourselves, our peers, and our society. With regard to these six Cold War films, I'd point to Stuart Kaminsky's assertion in *American Film Genres* that "people respond to what has meaning for them, though they might not know what they are responding to" (Kaminsky 227).

My response to the films being considered in this paper is slightly different from the "people" Kaminsky has addressed since I approached these films looking for specific details. This distinction suggests that the "typical person" will miss some (or many) of the aspects that I regard as important. While I'm not
suggesting that my interpretation is right and others' interpretations are wrong, I am proposing that just because someone doesn't initially see an aspect of the film doesn't mean that it does not exist or that it is not important.

One important factor to note about these six films is that they are not documentaries; rather, they are fictional accounts of Cold War events. This recognition of fantasy immediately raises questions about how someone can accurately interpret the national psyche of the United States with regard to the Cold War. Louis J. Halle's *The Cold War as History* addresses this topic when it declares that "the conceptual world, even if fictional, provides interpretations of the existential world that we must assume to be true in some degree" (Halle 412). Examples from this conceptual world could include, among others, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Twain's *Huck Finn* or Miller's *The Death of a Salesman*. Few would disagree that these fictional works spoke quite accurately about the realities of human existence.

Within the conceptual world of these films, there needs to be a distinction made between the Bond and the non-Bond films. This distinction should not suggest that one group of the films (non-Bond) is more worthy of analysis than the other grouping of films (Bond). Rather, the distinction merely identifies the fact that the Bond films are presented in a more outrageous manner than the non-Bond films. One needs to look no further than the Editorial page of a major newspaper to explain this distinction since political cartoons and political commentaries are used to critique events throughout the nation and world. Surely the methods of
criticism are different; yet, the power of that criticism is equal.

As I analyze each film, it is crucial to remember the theoretical groundwork that was established to explain my assumptions about studying motion pictures. One final task remains before starting the analysis, and that is to briefly review the characters and plot in each film.

**SYNOPSIS OF MOVIES**

*Octopussy* (1983) stars Roger Moore as James Bond who must prevent Kamal (Louis Jordan), the Afghan prince, and Orlov (Steven Berkoff), the Soviet General, from carrying out a scheme that will explode a nuclear bomb on a United States Air Force (USAF) base in Europe. Aside from killing thousands of innocent civilians, the explosion would lead to a removal of U.S. nuclear weapons from European nations which could open the door for a Soviet military attack organized by Orlov.

*Octopussy* (Maud Adams), in addition to organizing a circus, is an international jewel smuggler who forms a partnership with Kamal and Orlov in an elaborate plot to steal Russian treasures. The pair eventually trick Octopussy by placing a nuclear bomb, instead of the stolen jewels, in a trunk that accompanies her circus to a USAF base in Europe. Bond defuses the bomb, thereby saving thousands of lives, Octopussy's honor, and peace in the world. Bond and Octopussy then lead an invasion of Kamal's fortress that ends with the villain crashing his plane in a desperate attempt to escape.
Never Say Never Again (1983) features Sean Connery as James Bond and follows his battles with SPECTRE (Special Executive for Counterintelligence, Terrorism, Revenge, and Extortion). SPECTRE's leader, Ernst Stavro Blofeld (Max Von Sydow), has devised a scheme to steal two missiles with nuclear warheads from the United States Air Force. Blofeld tells NATO that the missiles will be detonated in two important locations unless NATO countries give him 25% of their annual oil purchases.

Bond, part of the 00 series (spies with a license to kill) that was retired in an attempt to save money, is reactivated to resolve the crisis. In battling SPECTRE agents Maximillian Largo (Klaus Maria Brandauer) and Fatima Blush (Barbara Carrera), Bond saves Largo's mistress Domino Petachi (Kim Basinger). Domino eventually falls in love with Bond as he foils Blofeld's scheme, eliminates Largo and Blush, and saves the world.

The Falcon and the Snowman (1985), set during Watergate and based on a true story, stars Timothy Hutton as Christopher Boyce. The film begins with Boyce leaving the seminary and returning home where he meets Dalton Lee (Sean Penn), his childhood friend. Boyce gets a job working at TRX, an enormous aerospace company, where he is exposed to CIA telegrams that reveal how the United States manipulates other countries' political and economic systems. Now disillusioned by "the extent of the lie, the extent of the deception", Boyce convinces Lee to join him in selling top secret intelligence to the Russians.

Lee soon establishes a working relationship with a member of the Russian embassy (Dave Suchet) in Mexico and things progress
smoothly until Lee's drug addiction becomes a problem. The film focuses on the deterioration of the relationship between Boyce, Lee, and the Russians until Boyce and Lee are finally captured, tried, and convicted of espionage.

A View to a Kill (1985) pits James Bond (Roger Moore) against the psychotic villain Max Zorin (Christopher Walken) who has developed a secret microchip that he will use to corner the international software market. The key to his takeover involves destroying Silicon Valley with an earthquake that he will trigger with a major explosion along the San Andreas fault line. In stopping Zorin's plot, Bond will save thousands of lives, billions of dollars, and the United States' technological superiority.

Bond begins his investigation at a horse race in England where he sights Zorin and his fearless assistant May Day (Grace Jones). Bond pursues the pair through France and the United States, where he meets Stacey Sutton (Tanya Roberts), a geologist and heiress who becomes a vital component in stopping Zorin's scheme. Zorin eventually betrays May Day, who in a fit of anger, extracts revenge on him by sacrificing her life to prevent the explosion which was to trigger the earthquake. Realizing his plot has failed, Zorin kidnaps Stacey in his zeppelin only to crash into the Golden Gate Bridge moments later. While stuck on the bridge, Bond outduels the villains, saves Stacey, and preserves peace and stability in the world.

The hero of No Way Out (1986) is Navy officer Tom Farrell (Kevin Costner) who has been hired to work in the Pentagon by Secretary of Defense David Brice (Gene Hackman). Farrell soon
discovering that the woman he is falling in love with, Susan Atwell (Sean Young), also happens to be Brice's mistress. That complication is intensified when Brice kills Atwell in a fit of jealousy and then goes to his trusted assistant Scott Pritchard (Will Patton) to confess his guilt before turning himself in to the authorities.

Pritchard attempts to save his boss by cleaning up the crime scene and concocting a story that a Soviet agent named Yuri was actually Susan Atwell's lover and killer. Farrell, who began the film as Atwell's lover, is now placed in charge of the investigation of her death. Farrell knows that Brice, his boss, was the man who had killed Atwell and that the investigation is a cover-up orchestrated by Pritchard.

However, Farrell was stuck because certain pieces of evidence pointed to him as the killer since he had spent so much time with Atwell. The film follows the investigation as Farrell races to prove Brice's guilt before it's discovered that he was Atwell's lover and therefore Yuri, the fall guy in the investigation. The investigation culminates in a series of ironies as Brice turns on Pritchard, the man who was trying to save him. This betrayal leads Pritchard to kill himself; thus, he is identified as Yuri. However, in a surprising twist, Farrell turns out to be the Soviet agent Yuri who was ordered to establish a relationship with Atwell because she was the Defense Secretary's mistress. Thus, the audience is tricked throughout the film as it identifies with Farrell who turns out to be a cunning Soviet agent.
The Hunt for Red October (1990) gives us two heroes, the Soviet submarine commander Marko Ramius (Sean Connery) and CIA analyst Jack Ryan (Alec Baldwin). Ramius pilots the Red October, a nuclear submarine which can travel without being heard by sonar. This feature gives the Soviet Union a major advantage in the arms race since it would have a first strike capability that the United States could not track. Ryan investigates photos taken of the Red October and deduces that the submarine can elude sonar while also proposing that Ramius is intent on defecting to the United States with the Red October! The (potential) defection of Ramius becomes the central feature of the film as Ryan races to prove his theory while the Soviet naval fleet races to stop Ramius.

Ramius and his trusted friend, Captain Vasily Borodin (Sam Neil), fabricate a nuclear accident that clears the Red October of all crew members with the exception of the group that is helping Ramius defect. Meanwhile, Ryan has recognized that U.S. Captain Bart Mancuso's (Scott Glen) submarine is following a path that Ramius would likely take in defecting; thus, he is flown to Mancuso's submarine where he uses Morse code to establish contact with Ramius. Ryan eventually joins Ramius in the Red October, and they proceed to elude a Soviet submarine as well as killing a KGB agent who had been stashed aboard the vessel. After sailing into the United States with Ramius and the Red October, Ryan flies home to his family in England.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH WOMEN

The hero's relationship with women can be divided into two groups: those who are protected and those who are deceived. The
women protected by the hero appear in each of the Bond films while
the women who are deceived tend to be "smaller" characters in the
non-Bond films. By looking at both groups, and at the one
individual who falls outside of either grouping, May Day, it will
become apparent that women were treated more as possessions than
as people.

Bond's role as a sexual savior is quickly established in
*Octopussy* as he and Octopussy make love soon after meeting one
another. Although these two shared the same bed, they failed to
share a similar lifestyle or set of personal beliefs. These
distinctions are initially established when Bond decides against
helping Octopussy's smuggling operation, a decision which prompts
Octopussy to chastise him with "You'll do it for queen and for
country but not for yourself!". Bond is thereby cast as an agent
who pursues other peoples' interests while Octopussy is cast as an
individual who eagerly pursues her own self-interest.

This dichotomy between Octopussy and Bond is further
developed by the ways in which they live. Octopussy resides on a
remote island that is inhabited only by women while Bond has no
home and spends the majority of his time traveling through a world
that is comprised of both genders and dominated by one: men.
Finally, Bond is distinguished from Octopussy in that he is
dominated by a man, his boss, M.

The relationship between Bond and M is curious as M "has a
global view of events, hence his superiority over the 'hero' who
depends upon him and who sets out on his various missions in
conditions of inferiority to the omniscient chief" (Bennet 73-4).
Despite his superiority, M usually cannot help Bond, a fact made apparent when he tells James "Remember Bond, you are on your own". Although he's on his own, Bond maintains a distinct sense of what he's fighting for. For Bond, the detonation of a nuclear device at the air force base is threatening because it will disrupt world peace and destroy Octopussy's honor.

In preventing the explosion and preserving Octopussy's honor, Bond has fostered an ideologically-loaded resolution. Bond's values of loyalty, daring, and idealism are reaffirmed in saving Octopussy while her self-interest is discredited. However, while this trait is discredited, Octopussy is not. By assisting Bond in the raid on Kamal, Octopussy moves from being the villain's accomplice to the villain's adversary. Bond was the impetus for that movement and thus is recognized, by Octopussy and the audience, as a savior.

Another character in *Octopussy* who sees Bond as a savior is Miss Penelope Small Bone, the new assistant secretary. When Bond gives Miss Small Bone a bouquet of flowers, she is star struck and gapes at James. Her fascination with Bond fits within the trend for James to be "constantly shot in the films under the admiring gaze of women, from the adoring gaze of Monneypenny...to the girls of the credits sequence...to every passing receptionist and nurse, quite apart from his conquest of the villains girls" (Bennet 223). Bond is admired because he is good-looking, strong, noble, exciting and important. Audiences responded favorably to these qualities in leading men of other genre films during the era such as Sylvester Stallone in *Rocky* (1976, 1979, 1982, 1985, 1990), Mel
Gibson in *Mad Max* (1980, 1981, 1985) and Bruce Willis in *Die Hard* (1988, 1990). This response is critical to the Bond film's success since:

The Bond films appear to conform closely to "the look" incorporated in the forms of Hollywood feature films, in which the viewer can be expected to identify with the hero who is active in the narrative, who makes things happen and solves problems, and to share with the hero the desire and accompanying "looks" at women whose image is passive, there to be desired both for the hero and the audience (Bennet 211).

Stacey Sutton's character in *A View to a Kill* is intended to be desired by the audience. A strikingly beautiful blond, Stacey has a degree in geology, works for the government, lives in an exquisite house by herself and is the heiress to her father's fortunes. Despite her attractiveness, intelligence, independence and wealth, Stacey is rightfully deemed "incompetent" (Durovicova 405) by one critic since she's always getting caught in dangerous situations that Bond must save her from.

Bond assumes the role of Stacey's savior during three different scenes in the movie. He saves her from an assault by Zorin's henchman, from a burning building, and finally from a zeppelin which is caught on the Golden Gate Bridge. While it is important to note what her saved her from, it's more important understand the significance of where Bond saves Stacey. The three scenes described above occurred in Stacey's home, her workplace, and at the most recognizable landmark in her hometown, San Francisco. Thus, despite Stacey's attributes, she is almost completely dependent upon Bond to protect her in every area of her life. Stacey's dependence empowers Bond in the same way
Octopussy’s dependence had since neither woman could succeed, let alone survive, without the constant assistance of James Bond.

Domino Petachi, Maximillian Largo’s mistress in Never Say Never Again, fits within the same trend as Stacey and Octopussy in that she needs Bond to save her. One critic attacked Domino, claiming that she “is hesitant, child-like, traipsing around in leg warmers and tights - she lacks the independence viewers have come to admire in Bond women” (Van Orman 256). While Van Orman critiqued Domino’s youthfulness, athleticism and reliance, Bond affirmed those qualities by pursuing her as a potential lover. After winning $267,000 from Largo, Bond proposes to settle the debt by getting one dance with Domino. During that dance, Bond tells Domino that her brother Jack will not return since he has been killed by SPECTRE.

Bond’s honesty with Domino immediately contrasts him from Largo who he had been telling Domino that Jack would be returning in a few days. In addition, Bond’s willingness to exchange $267,000 for one dance with Domino illustrates how desirable she is in his eyes. Thus, Bond’s honesty with and interest in Domino tells the audience that she is not simply a “bad” girl because she’s Largo’s mistress; rather, she is a character whose youthful innocence jeopardizes her safety and compels Bond to save her.

It’s noteworthy that Bond saves Domino from two treacherous men (Largo and Ernst Stavro Blofeld) much like he saved Octopussy from two scheming men (Orlov and Kamal), and that in saving Domino and Octopussy, Bond helped them both cross the line from being potential adversaries to becoming allies and lovers. What’s more,
neither Octopussy nor Domino initially knew that they needed Bond to save them since Octopussy had no idea about the nuclear bomb and Domino had no reason to believe that her brother wasn't alive. Thus, Bond is glorified in that he appears to be omniscient while Octopussy and Domino, despite their attributes, are relatively clueless.

In moving from a comparison of the movies to a closer analysis of one, it is useful to consider one critic's contention that "If Never Say Never Again is to be taken as a model, Bond may be used to reward 'supportive women' and to punish and kill those whose sexualism and aggression is seen as threatening" (Bennet 283). This assertion revolves largely around the relationship between Bond and SPECTRE agent Fatima Blush. While Bond slept with Fatima immediately, he waited a long time before kissing Domino. This distinction suggests that Fatima is an 'easy' woman, and thereby the more sexual of the two female characters. Fatima's aggression is clearly developed during the conspiracy as she beats up, drugs, kisses and totally dominates Jack Petachi, the Air Force pilot who is used to gain access to the missiles.

Fatima's presence on the screen was compelling enough to lead one film critic to comment "swathed in leathers and furs, unswathed in bikinis, the imperiously beautiful Carrera (Fatima) beats up chaps, tosses venomous snakes around like Givenchy scarfs, and kills people with the joyous exuberance of Mother Nature on an angel-dust high" (Kroll 93). Fatima is initially linked with Bond after she notices him in the back of a boat while she is water skiing past him. Impressed with what she sees,
Fatima joins Bond on the boat and suggests that they go scuba diving together. Bond agrees to the invitation, makes love to Fatima on their way to the dive site, and then eludes two of her attempts to kill him. These scenes set up a final confrontation between Fatima and Bond that culminates with a powerful symbolic statement about women's sexuality and aggression.

Bond, who has pursued Fatima into an abandoned warehouse after she killed a secret agent, is held at gun point by Blush and told "You're quite a man Mr. James Bond, but I am a superior woman. Guess where you get the first one?" Confronted with a life-and-death situation, Bond uses his experience to frustrate Fatima and his technology to kill her. Implying that Fatima hates men, Bond guesses that she will shoot him in the groin. Fatima is irate with this response because it establishes Bond as the sexually dominant being who Fatima must destroy to protect her own sexuality. Fatima believed that she had already conquered Bond sexually in sleeping with him; thus, she demands that James write a confession which reads "The greatest rapture afforded in my life was aboard a boat in Nassau with Fatima Blush." Bond uses Fatima's sexual hubris against her by removing his pen, symbolic of his penis, that he uses to shoot a missile into Fatima that explodes inside her. With Fatima lying in a bloody heap, Bond's solution emerges as a creative yet wretched response to a woman's challenge of his sexual dominance.

In Fatima's eyes, Bond held no potential as a savior because he was sexually inferior to her. On a more basic level, Bond was not a savior in Fatima's eyes because he killed her. The mixture
of a basic and deeper level of understanding is essential to comprehending Never Say Never Again's construction of womanhood. The film relies on simple stereotypes to create Domino (the Madonna) and Fatima (the Whore), yet, in presenting two women who hold different views about the hero's role as a savior, the film goes beyond the non-Bond films which present only one female view. Thus, the Bond films' presentation of womanhood are, in many ways, deeper than their non-Bond counterparts. That depth will be further understood if we turn our attention to May Day who appeared as Bond's nemesis in A View to a Kill.

Bond's relationship with May Day subverts the traditional male-female relationship in a Bond film. Usually, "in winning 'the girl' from the services of the villain and, in the process, into his own bed, Bond 'repositions' her both sexually and ideologically" (Bennet 74). Bond cannot 'reposition' May Day because he is inferior to her in bed and his ideological arguments (fighting for freedom, being loyal to one's country, etc.) cannot crack her fierce independence. Thus, May Day is not a character whom Bond can save because he has nothing to offer her.

The extent of May Day's disregard for Bond's role as savior is emphasized when she realizes that Zorin has left her to die in the coal mine. She joins Bond, not because she believes in his cause, but rather because she craves some form of revenge over Zorin. We know that revenge is her motivation when she insists on guiding the bomb out of the mine shaft and refuses to listen to Bond's pleas that she jump from the platform and save her life.
As May Day dies, so too does Bond's stature as a savior since he cannot dissuade an exotic and talented woman from killing herself.

May Day's final act also sets up a curious dilemma as "Bond's skill and improvisation prove, in the end, to be insufficient. The day is saved not by an English male hero but by an American black woman as May Day, putting her extraordinary strength in Bond's service" (Bennet 291). May Day's actions are compounded by her name, which, taken literally, means a distress signal. The signal in *A View to a Kill* is directed towards white males who must acknowledge that their power, embodied by Bond, has begun to wane. The symbolism of May Day's name makes the symbolism of her death even more compelling as her dying "to put it bluntly, expresses the pious hope that both the women's movement and black liberation movement might take themselves off somewhere into the California desert and blow themselves up" (Bennet 294).

The level of interpretation that surrounds May Day's death is more difficult to achieve in the non-Bond films because the female characters are so poorly developed. Lana, Christopher Boyce's girlfriend in *The Falcon and the Snowman*, is one example of that poor development. Film critic Pauline Kael felt Lana's "only role is to let us know Boyce is not homosexual" (Kael 109), and there is some credence to Kael's assertion. Lana lacks not only the symbolic development of May Day and Fatima but also the detailed personal background of a character like Stacey Sutton. After initially meeting Boyce, Lana exists as character rather than developing as one. Thus, in studying her significance, it's
useful to look at Lana in relation to Boyce rather than studying her as an independent entity.

While Boyce is more than willing to sleep with Lana, he consistently deceives her throughout the film. After trying and failing to cook dinner, Boyce storms around the apartment prompting Lana to exclaim "What's wrong?" and "What's happening? Tell me, please tell me!". Boyce, of course, cannot tell Lana that he is emotionally distraught over the process of spying. His dishonesty contrasts Bond's honesty with Domino and Fatima and therefore eliminates Boyce from being a potential savior of Lana.

This inability to talk with others highlights the loneliness of spies who are forced to live in worlds unto themselves. When spies emerge from their worlds, they either fail to talk or feel compelled to lie as Boyce did when he tells Lana "I don't love you anymore and I want your things outta here by tonight." Lana's role therefore goes beyond establishing Boyce's heterosexuality as she exposes the confusion and frustration that marks another relationship that Christopher Boyce is involved with.

Confusion and frustration are also important components of Tom's relationship with Susan Atwell in No Way Out. What's more, the emotions of confusion and frustration seem to be gendered as Lana and Susan are confused by their romantic relationship while Boyce and Tom are frustrated by theirs. Tom's frustration stems, in large part, from the initial success of his first meeting with Susan. The film begins at a large party where Tom notices Susan staring at him and comments "you're pretty impressed with me."
Susan admits that she is impressed with Farrell, and the two quickly leave in a limousine where they have passionate sex.

One critic took exception to the introduction of love-making so early in the film, claiming that "in a civilized movie, the pair would be allowed some conversation of interest, perhaps even wit" (Simon 59). However, Simon fails to recognize that in spy thrillers such as No Way Out, sex "is always marked by aggressiveness" (Palmer 29), and there exists a "sense that in sex, as in violence, the hero is always alone" (Palmer 33). The component of aggressiveness is obvious in just watching the scene while the loneliness is developed by the failure of Tom and Susan to exchange names until after they're done having sex. This failure to establish identities suggests that Tom isn't making love with Susan, rather, he's making love to a beautiful woman.

Tom Farrell's loneliness in and frustration with sex is developed in other scenes as well. Stationed in an exotic port, he fails to reach Susan from a pay phone in a strip bar which leads him to tear the phone off the wall. This act highlights not only his physical power, but also his psychological frustration as he cannot connect with Susan. On top of not connecting with her, the scene in the strip bar shows that Tom doesn't care to connect with any other woman as naked dancers surround him and he does not look at or talk with any of them.

At this point, sex for Tom is sex with Susan. Yet, in his sexual relationship with Susan, Tom is forced to play second fiddle to Secretary of Defense Brice. When Tom and Susan return from their weekend getaway, Brice shows up on Atwell's doorstep
and Farrell is forced to leave out the backdoor. Every one of Tom's efforts to establish a romantic relationship with Susan ultimately fails; thus, he is left as a frustrated outsider. The inability of Tom to successfully lure the villain's mistress to his side contrasts him from Bond who had "won" Domino from Largo. This failure to win the girl is compounded by his inability to save the girl as Brice kills Susan because of her relationship with Tom; thus, despite his good looks and nobility, Tom Farrell is a complete failure in his role as a woman's savior.

While Tom fails in his role as a savior, Jack Ryan denies his savior role in *The Hunt for Red October*. Described by one critic as "a relatively ordinary man thrown into extraordinary circumstances" (Mancini 168), Ryan is unique among the spy heroes in that he is married. Although the film's last scene shows Ryan returning home in an airplane with a teddy bear for his five-year-old daughter Sally, the audience should be careful about thinking of him as a woman's savior.

That's because recklessness, not responsibility, is what characterizes Ryan's actions. Upon seeing a picture of a Soviet submarine and knowing a few details about its commander, Ryan offers a guess about what it all means and then consistently risks his life to prove his theory. While this makes him a hero for the United States, it does not make him a hero for his wife and daughter because he was so willing to give up his family life to prove a point. Thus, while Ryan's family distinguishes him from Bond, Farrell, and Boyce, he is ultimately linked to these
characters because he is willing to risk his life in the battle against the enemy.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ENEMY

The depiction of the Russians in these six films followed three different routes. In \textit{Octopussy} and \textit{The Hunt for Red October} the Russians were the enemy the hero fought while in \textit{Never Say Never Again} and \textit{A View to a Kill}, the Russians were the opponent in an ideological sense as the hero fought for ideals that the U.S. embraced and the U.S.S.R. rejected. Finally, \textit{The Falcon and the Snowman} and \textit{No Way Out} raised a series of questions about who the United States was fighting and what it was fighting for. By analyzing and comparing the different ways Russians were treated in these films, we can gain a better understanding about how the "enemy" was constructed, critiqued and conquered.

The first major scene involving the Russians in \textit{Octopussy} (1983) occurs at a military intelligence meeting where General Orlov reveals his attack plan only to be rebuked by other Soviet leaders who are presented as thoughtful and competent individuals. The message from this initial scene is clear: not all Russians are bad. Despite this message, the movie still manages to implicate the Soviet Union as the enemy of the United States. That implication is a product of Orlov's last scene where a Soviet officer has shot him. While Orlov agrees with the officer's charge that he is a "common thief", he points out that his actions will make him a hero in the Soviet Union. The message from this final scene is clear as well: the Soviet Union is evil because it idolizes ruthless men who threaten world peace. Thus, the film's
political message is that the United States must remain wary of the Soviet Union's constant potential as a ruthless adversary.

The image of the ruthless Russian, embodied by Orlov, was not new to Americans at this point in the decade. Ronald Reagan, in his first major press conference as president, revealed how he knew "of no leader of the Soviet Union since the Revolution" who did not pursue the goal of "world domination...The only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat" (Warner 23). These scathing words implicate all Soviets leaders as tyrants, yet, in Octopussy we see that Reagan's message has been refined. The Soviet leaders who chastise Orlov's initial attack plan and call for a greater emphasis on domestic problems clearly have goals that supersede any notions about world domination. Film critic David Ansen comments:

The Bond movies have often been seen as a pop indicator of current cold war fashions, and this year's model gives off a curiously mixed message. Where once the villains were simply the nasty Russians, the filmmakers go out of their way to single out a single renegade Soviet officer as the cause of all the trouble, absolving the Soviet government of all responsibility. At the same time, the movie's plot twists to confirm right-wing fears that disarmament would be a form of suicide; it suggests the Russians would attack us if they thought they could get away with it (Ansen 77).

The film's "mixed message" is compounded by the final scene where the Soviet official denies any knowledge of Orlov's scheme to detonate a nuclear bomb and launch a military attack. This denial suggests that Ansen's exoneration of the Soviet government and identification of only one Soviet villain was inappropriate; rather, there are at least two Soviet villains since the official's dishonesty casts him as a scheming adversary of the
United States. Bond emerges as the consummate hero because he preserved peace in stopping Orlov's plot and protected the truth by letting us know the Soviet official was lying.

Confrontations between the Soviet and American governments about the truth were a common occurrence surrounding the release of *Octopussy*. One glaring example occurred in September of 1983 as the Soviet Union shot down an unarmed commercial airliner killing 269 passengers, 69 of whom were Americans (Doerner 10). The Soviet government alleged that the airplane, which had flown off course, was on a top secret spy mission. U.S. President Ronald Reagan responded to that allegation and to the tragedy by declaring:

> While events in Afghanistan and elsewhere had left few illusions about the willingness of the Soviet Union to advance its interests through violence an intimidation, all of us had hoped that certain irreducible standards of civilized behavior nonetheless obtained. But this event shocks the sensibilities of people everywhere...What can we think of a regime that so broadly trumpets its vision of peace and global disarmament and yet so callously and quickly commits a terrorist act to sacrifice the lives of innocent human beings (Doerner 10).

When Bond finally confronts Orlov, he delivers a passionate speech that addresses many of the same issues that Reagan had raised. Bond asks Orlov, "Doesn't it matter that thousands of innocent victims will die in the accident", to which Orlov responds, "It's better than letting old men in Moscow bargain away our advantages in disarmament talks". This answer casts Orlov as a militaristic and deceitful individual who cares little for human life while Bond, the defender of democracy, is cast as a peaceful and honest individual who's concerned with the sanctity of human life. Although Bond's speech made these ideological distinctions
blatantly obvious, it disgusted critics like Pauline Kael who noted "It's as if a teacher had been entertaining us with crazy stories and then reprimanded us for laughing" (Kael 93).

While Kael finds Bond's speech frustrating, in some ways the speech makes the story more realistic. "Stories have to be believable - not in the sense that they are accurate or even possible, but in the manner they reflect a popular mood or image held within society" (Price 20). The reflection here is between two leaders of the Western world, Reagan and Bond, who responded emotionally to Soviet aggression. That type of reaction is important not only to a presidency, but also to the genre of spy thrillers as the "Hero's actions are justified by the fact that he responds to aggression to maintain the status quo" (Palmer 20). Bond has maintained the status quo by defeating Orlov; yet, he has also done something more because:

In frustrating the villain's conspiracy, Bond effects an ideologically loaded imaginary resolution of the real historical contradictions of the period, a resolution in which all the values associated with Bond, and, thereby, the West - notably freedom and individualism - gain ascendancy over those associated with the villain... (Bennet 25).

Individualism is one trait the characterizes Marko Ramius, the Soviet submarine commander in The Hunt For Red October (1990). Unlike Orlov, Ramius is given a personal background (wife had died the previous year, successful career, etc.) and a special point is made about the fact that he is not Russian; rather, he is Lithuanian. This distinction would mean more to American audiences at the end of the 1980s as the nationalist movements of Soviet republics were beginning to gather serious momentum and publicity.
Ramius' nationality is only the first component that distinguishes him from other Russian characters. When beginning the mission, Ramius delivers an impassioned speech to his crew that concludes with the lines "The world will tremble at the sound of our silence. We sail into history". His eloquence is sharply contrasted by the reticence of rival Soviet naval officers like Yuri Pedorin, head of the Soviet Northern fleet and Tupolev, a talented submarine commander. By distinguishing Ramius' personality from his peers, the film succeeds in placing him outside the confines of the "normal" Russian officer and thereby makes him unique.

In addition to distinguishing Ramius' nationality and personality, the film uses another technique to establish his individuality. When Ramius and the KGB agent meet aboard the Red October to review the plans of the mission, they are pictured on opposite sides of the screen. This configuration establishes a distance between the men while also providing "a clever visual shortcut to Ramius' personality: This is a near outsider who has been forced to the boundaries of conventional Soviet military thinking" (Mancini 168).

Opposite Ramius stands the KGB agent, a man so devoted to Communist ideology that he reminds Ramius the Red October does not belong to him; rather, "the vessel belongs to the people of the Soviet Union". The KGB agent's ideology makes him a threat to Ramius while his intrusion of Ramius' privacy (reads his diary without permission) places the defection in great jeopardy. Ramius responds to these threats by breaking the KGB agent's neck.
with his bare hands, thereby exhibiting a degree of physical power that distinguishes him from Bond, Tom Farrell, and Christopher Boyce.

Ramius' violent act also fits within the belief that "because the Cold War was an ideological battle, there were no geographical limits and victory was attained only when the other side was destroyed" (Halle 157). The "other side" had changed for Ramius by the time he was chosen to command the Red October as the United States had moved from being a known adversary to a potential ally. As commander of the Red October, the KGB now represented the "other side" because it sought to protect the submarine's unchecked first-strike nuclear capability. For Ramius, ideology had given way to idealism in the sense that he wanted to maintain world peace rather than establish Soviet dominance. Upon meeting Jack Ryan and Bart Mancuso, the U.S. submarine commander, Ramius displays the triumph of idealism over ideology by turning the Soviet Union's prized possession, the Red October, over to the United States.

Sean Connery played the character of Ramius to mostly favorable reviews from film critics, one of whom noted "Connery, the actor to whom everyone most eagerly surrenders disbelief, quickly renders the movie's central implausibility plausible" (Schickel 70). The implausibility that Schickel referred to was the defection with the Red October, yet, that may not have been the most extravagant aspect of the film. Rather, the timing of the film made its story seem outdated to the point where another critic commented "the fantasy that the Soviets might be planning a
first strike nuclear assault on the United States doesn’t tap into our current fears* (Ansen 63).

Ansen’s contention was grounded on a number of events leading up to 1990 that significantly eased Cold War tensions, perhaps the greatest of which was the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. One analyst described that event as follows:

For 28 years it had stood as the symbol of the division in Europe and the world, of Communist suppression, of the xenophobia of a regime that had to lock its people in lest they be tempted by another, freer life - the Berlin Wall, that hideous 28 mile long scar through the heart of a once proud European capital, not to mention the soul of Europe (Church 25).

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and disintegration of the U.S.S.R., the perception among American audiences was that the Soviet Union was no longer the threat it had once been. The film acknowledges this perception during the opening scene as it places the story before Mikhail Gorbachev came to power. This placement recreates a more confrontational period of U.S. - Soviet relations as well as keeping the movie closer to Tom Clancy’s book The Hunt for Red October.

However, this chronological placement also changes the tone of the movie as it becomes more like the comic book Bond films which ask us to suspend our disbelief for the sake of a good story. The Hunt for Red October is a good story and it is useful to study because it critiques a number of Russians while exalting another. Ramius' courage and tenacity is glorified in a similar fashion to Tom Farrell in No Way Out while Tupelov's fanaticism is critiqued much like Orlov's in Octopussy. However, in trying to present an earnest account of the superpowers' ideological battles
and military maneuverings, the film arrived a few years too late, since by 1990 the "Cold War thriller has become a historical genre" (Ansen 63).

While it was difficult to fight directly against the Soviets in 1990, it was far easier to fight them in an ideological sense during the middle of the 1980s. *Never Say Never Again* is one film that takes this approach. Bond begins the movie by doing something unusual - failing. In a practice rescue mission, Bond eludes numerous armed guards and traps only to be stabbed by the hostage he was supposed to have saved. This failure leads M to question whether Bond has lost his sharpness as a spy. The potential deterioration of Bond's skills serves as a metaphor for the dulling of British and American power, and the film becomes an allegory that represents a reaffirmation of Western strength after a period of turmoil.

The choice of a hostage mission in which Bond failed was an astute way to begin the film because his actions mirrored the failure of the United States' rescue mission which was designed to free American hostages from Iran in 1980. An article in *Time* magazine described that rescue as follows:

The supersecret mission failed miserably. It ended in the desert staging site, some 250 miles short of its target in the capital. And for the world's most technologically sophisticated nation, the reason for aborting the rescue mission was particularly painful: three of the eight helicopters assigned to the mission developed electric or hydraulic malfunctions that rendered them useless (Time 12).

The failure of technology was accompanied by a loss of national confidence. Bond's failure, which occurred on a movie screen three years later, was designed to reawaken many of the
same doubts and frustrations that the United States felt about the crisis in Iran. An essay that described the culmination of the hostage crisis commented that:

Yet, the fact is the United States lost a great deal because of the hostage crisis. It lost eight men, and that was the worst. It also showed itself and the rest of the world that its defense and foreign policy could be confounded by a street gang. It demonstrated that it was willing to work a deal with kidnappers; that its military and covert forces were faulty and impotent; that its political intelligence was porous. Beyond that, it lost clarity on its foreign policy when clarity was needed most (Rosenblatt 53).

Bond's actions throughout Never Say Never Again help to reverse some of these dilemmas; he fights against terrorists, he uses military technology with skill and precision, and he exhibits a clear vision about the political importance of his spying. Simply put, Bond acts differently from the United States when placed in a crisis situation. His noble and successful actions provide an outlet for U.S. audiences to resolve their frustrations about America's military incompetence and political impotence in the hostage crisis. By resolving these frustrations in Never Say Never Again, Bond achieves a greater symbolic victory than he had in Octopussy. That's because instead of maintaining the status quo by preventing an explosion, Bond changes the status quo in the favor of the United States, NATO and democracy.

A major challenge to Bond's dominance comes from Maximilian Largo, a villain who possesses "a believably insidious dimension" (Van Orman 256) according to one critic. While Largo is an insidious terrorist, he is also a philanthropist whose favorite charity is orphan children. The dichotomy between good and bad qualities illustrates the film's intention to portray Largo as a
character with depth. This portrayal makes Largo a more compelling villain than Orlov who was fashioned by simple stereotypes and genuinely unbelievable.

A major component of Largo’s personality involves his relationship with his mistress, Domino Petachi. After seeing Bond kiss Domino, Largo flies into a rage and destroys a mirror and stereo with an ax in addition to dropping a picture of himself and Domino, an act symbolizing the fracture of their relationship. This response illustrates that Largo can be emotionally crushed while also revealing his violent nature. That violence is further developed as he leaves Bond to die in a dungeon and Domino to be bought and raped by a group of gun-toting rebels on horseback. A violent response to a failure in one’s romantic life was nothing new for Americans in 1983 as the image of John Hinckley lingered on. Hinckley, distraught over the fact that actress Jodie Foster wouldn’t meet with him, shot U.S. President Ronald Reagan in April of 1981 to gain her attention and favor. One critic commented that:

The interesting thing is that people can actually do this; can take a terrifying act, chaotic act and eventually make some sense of it...When the President was shot, Americans prayed very hard, not for the life of an abstraction, but for a man, one who as leader of the democracy carries something of everyone in that mortal chest (Rosenblatt 21).

When Hinckley was found not guilty by reason of insanity in May of the following year, many Americans had trouble making sense of the verdict. The insanity of Hinckley was paralleled by Largo who admits to Domino that he is “crazy”. And, in a similar fashion, Bond is linked to Reagan in that he is a leading defender of democracy. Thus, Bond’s efforts to stop Largo will, in some
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ways, foster a symbolic victory for the peace and order that were so lacking in Hinckley's assassination attempt.

While Bond was fighting for these ideals, he was fighting against the power hungry SPECTRE. In destroying SPECTRE "Bond would be striking a blow for true democracy - not the wishy-washy, half-hearted ideals that, of late, seemed to permeate the West" (Price 31). The triumph of democracy establishes an implicit competition between the West and Russia since Bond is trying to preserve what the Communist want destroyed. Thus, while Never Say Never Again fails to pit Bond against a KGB agent, it does succeed in presenting a series of resolutions which bolster the West and thereby batter the Soviet Union.

A View to a Kill adopts the same approach as Bond battles Max Zorin, a villain who stands six feet tall and has blue eyes, blond hair, and a perfect complexion. With no apparent flaw, Zorin seems an unlikely adversary, yet "as is customary for the Bond megavillain, Zorin's monstrously perfect features make it clear that he is essentially nonhuman, a creation representing not simply an opposing political system but a threat to mankind" (Duricova 404). The threat that Zorin poses is developed along two fronts: his association with the KGB and the fact that he is a product of a scientific experiment.

After Zorin discovers that Bond is not James Saint-John Smythe, a rich sportsman interested in purchasing horses, but rather a secret agent, he moves quickly to kill him. Zorin precedes his (attempted) assassination of Bond with the remark that "If you're the best they have, they'll try to cover up your
embarrassing incompetence”. The “they” represents the British Secret Service whose best agent, Bond, is now being mocked by a KGB spy. The damage this scene would inflict upon to the notion of Western superiority is modified by Zorin’s declaration a few minutes later that “I no longer consider myself an agent of the KGB”. Thus, we are presented with a villain who doesn’t fit neatly within the East-West dichotomy that Orlov embodied in *Octopussy*.

In making his statement about the KGB, Zorin “reveals his independence and disobedience which undermines the usual basis of opposition between Bond and the villain” (Bennet 289). In addition to his independence and disobedience, Zorin’s scheme illustrates his willingness to improvise which brings him into direct competition with Bond, the master of improvisation. This competition comes to a head when Zorin, poised once again to kill Bond, tells him that “Intuitive improvisation is the secret of genius”. Bond reveals his genius by escaping Zorin’s assassination attempt for a second time. During the first attempt, Bond avoided drowning in a car by sucking the air out of its tires until Zorin had left the area while in the second attempt, Bond crawls out of an elevator engulfed in fire and lowers a fire hose to Stacey Sutton to save her just before the elevator crashes to the floor. These acts establish Bond’s superiority over Zorin since he proves to be the more resourceful individual in crisis situations.

Superiority was the ultimate goal of Zorin’s creation as he was born in Russia as part of an experiment with women and
steroids that attempted to create a "master race" of children. The Soviet Union had smuggled the German scientist who started these experiments during World War II into their country just before the war was to end. This smuggling implicates the Soviet Union as an inhuman place while Zorin "in both physique and character - embodies the myth of Aryan supremacy" (Bennet 293). Thus, Bond is fighting one person who reflects the two greatest villains democracy has faced in the past century: a Nazi poster boy and a KGB-trained agent.

The experiment that produced Zorin had a number of implications, the first being that it produced babies who were psychotic. Although Zorin exhibits this quality throughout the film, the most glaring example occurs in the mine shaft where the explosion is to be triggered. Knowing that there cannot be any witnesses to his villainous act, Zorin removes a machine gun and begins shooting all of his workers with a look of exuberance. After he's done killing dozens of men, he looks at his watch and remarks, with delight, that he's still on schedule. Zorin's nauseating killing spree immediately distinguishes him as a more reprehensible villain than Orlov, Fatima, Largo or any other adversary Bond faced in the 1980s.

The audience clearly wants Bond to eliminate Zorin since the "vileness of the opponent justifies his destruction through the use of evil by the forces of the good" (Price 18). Also established in this scene is a message about how disastrous uncontrolled science can be. In many ways, Zorin is a piece of technology because he has been consciously created and monitored...
for a specific purpose - to be a peerless KGB spy. Thus, while A View to a Kill upholds the importance of technology, the film also highlights the problems which can result when technology is placed in the "wrong" hands, namely the Soviets.

A second aspect to consider about the experiment that produced Zorin is the way it links him to Bond. The film fits within a major requirement of any thriller, that being the "hero and villain are outsiders" (Palmer 24). Zorin is an outsider because he has no country or family outside of the scientist who created him and follows him to this day. On a deeper level, Zorin is an outsider because he is a freak of science; he cannot have a human peer because he is, for all intents and purposes, not human. Bond too is an outsider. Sean Connery noted "He has no mother. He has no father. He doesn't come from anywhere and he hadn't been anywhere when he became 007. He was born - kerplump - thirty three years old" (Bennet 161). With no background and no youth, Bond is a human aberration and therefore can have no peer. Therefore, Bond and Zorin, in being peerless, are a perfect match for one another.

By matching these two agents, the film implicitly matches the backgrounds that produced them: Communism and democracy. As Bond constantly outduels Zorin, he establishes a series of ideological victories for Western nations over the Eastern bloc. These conquests are coupled by the technological advantage that the West enjoys over the Soviet Union. Bond is initially assigned to the investigation to recover a new microchip which:

Is vital to the defense of the West with its immunity to 'magnetic pulse damage' that would otherwise render all
computers inoperable in the event of a nuclear attack. In this respect, the film locates itself firmly in the era of America's superiority over Russia (Bennet 288).

The West's technological advantage is enhanced by the superiority of Bond to his Soviet counterparts in the investigation of Zorin. Bond eludes the grizzly death that befalls one Soviet spy who is dropped down an air shaft where a high-powered propeller chops him to pieces. In another instance, Bond sleeps with Soviet agent Pola Ivanova after she had made an audio tape of Zorin discussing his plot. Bond, who realizes that Ivanova is going to slip away after they had made love, deceives her by substituting the real tape for a recording of Chinese harp music which reinforces the ineptitude of Soviet agents and thereby the Soviet Union.

Adding to the ineptitude that surround the Soviet investigation is the intrigue of why they even bothered to follow Zorin in the first place since his plot involved the destruction of American property. This question is answered when a KGB official presents Bond with the Order of Lenin at the end of the film, marking the first time a non-Soviet citizen has been given the award. While this presentation disgraces the importance of the medal, the KGB officer's conversation with M provides important details about the predicament of the U.S.S.R.

Responding to M's declaration that "We would have expected you to be happy with the destruction of Silicon Valley", the KGB officer replies "On the contrary, where would Russian technology be without it?" The implication is that Russia, lacking the creativity to make technological advances on its own, must hope to
continue stealing American secrets lest it fall behind in the arms race. This dependence on U.S. technology suggests that "America need no longer take the Soviet Union seriously" (Bennet 290) as a threat to its security.

The United States' sense of superiority was a product of a series of important events in both nations. While Soviet leaders Leonid Brezhnev, Yuri Andropov and Konstantin Chernenko died in 1982, 1984, and 1985 respectively, Ronald Reagan was reelected by landslide margin in the 1984 presidential election. The stability in U.S. leadership was coupled by a sense of national pride about the domination of the 1984 Olympic Games while the Soviet Union, which had boycotted those games, was beginning to realize the extent of its problems in Afghanistan. With the countries headed in seemingly different directions, A View to a Kill espouses a greater sense of U.S. superiority than Octopussy had only a few years before. This change fits within the notion that:

The figure of Bond had not always stood for the same values or represented a constant position in relation to the ideological concerns we have enumerated...it has been the very malleability of Bond...his ability to be changed and adapted with the times, that has constituted the basis of continuing - but, at the same time, always modified popularity...this is not suggest that Bond can mean anything to anybody but, rather, that his coherence as a figure consists in the way in which he has functioned as a shifting focal point for the articulation of historically specific ideological concerns (Bennet 20-1).

Adding insult to injury for the Soviet Union is the fact that Zorin, the KGB's best hope, has renounced his affiliation with the organization. Zorin's departure makes the Soviets' decision to grab the German scientist after World War II a moot point as he gives them no strategic advantage. What's more, this scientist
hurts the Soviet Union because he presents an outlet to attack their morality.

The fact that the United States employed Klaus Barbie, a Gestapo agent dubbed the 'butcher of Lyons', as a spy after the war and then helped him escape while covering up the whole affair (World Almanac '84 893) is interesting for historians but irrelevant to the audience. What matters is that Bond fights against a host of villains in fighting for the preservation of Silicon Valley. His last confrontation is with the Soviet/German scientist which suggests that he, not Zorin or May Day, represents the greatest threat to U.S. ideology.

The threat is twofold as the genetic creation of a perfect being runs contrary to the American notion, detailed in the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal". Adding to that threat is the fact that these perfect beings have no freewill as they are being created for a specific purpose; in effect, they are products more than people. Because of the lack of freewill and inherent inequality that the scientist strove to develop, it was more than appropriate that Bond confront and destroy him last. In upholding the freewill of individuals as well as the inherent equality of all human beings, Bond is maintaining United States' ideals that in turn weaken the stature of the U.S.S.R.

While A View to a Kill affirms the fight to maintain these ideals, The Falcon and the Snowman critiques the United States by questioning whom it is fighting and what is fighting for. The
opening sequence of the film begins the questioning by flashing a series of images before the viewer. These images include:

1) Cheerleaders 13) Plane dropping bombs
2) Astronaut on moon 14) A falcon
3) Woman dancing 15) John Lennon
4) Man smoking pot 16) Robert Kennedy
5) A rocket 17) A spaceship
6) Helicopter in Vietnam 18) Richard Nixon
7) A falcon 19) A falcon
8) Lyndon B. Johnson 20) Man beaten in street
9) Vietnam 21) Watergate
10) Dallas Cowboy cheerleaders 22) A falcon
11) Martin Luther King 23) A church which Boyce
12) Cheerleaders for Nixon is leaving - the movie begins.

These images, all particular to the United States, are linked by their association with violence, sex, and decay. Amidst these difficulties stands the falcon, an "image of freedom in a world of sex, violence and power. It gives Boyce hope and symbolizes his personality" (Erskine 166). Boyce's optimism is challenged by his job where he reads the top secret CIA memos that detail the dishonesty of the organization.

By exposing the duplicity of the CIA, the film establishes it, and not the Soviets, as the major threat to be confronted. The constant presence of the CIA agent who follows Boyce's partner, Dalton Lee, throughout Mexico reinforces that threat for the viewer by showing how pervasive the agency has become. The *Falcon and the Snowman* 's portrayal of the CIA was matched by the agency's growing impact on American life in the 1980s. In November of 1981, President Reagan signed an executive order that broadened the authority of intelligence agencies in the U.S. to collect information from Americans at home and abroad. Included in this order was a provision that the CIA, for the first time,
was authorized to conduct covert operations in the United States (World Almanac '83 920).

A few years later, the American public learned a good deal about CIA covert operations abroad as the agency admitted to mining Nicaraguan harbors, an act which damaged at least eight vessels. (World Almanac '85 905) Later that same year, a mysterious CIA manual became a noteworthy topic as it was given to rebels opposing leftist regimes in Central America. The manual contained a section about how to neutralize certain government officials through a variety of guerrilla tactics (World Almanac '86 891). Many took the term "neutralize" to mean assassinate, and this created an uproar since the CIA had not been granted the power to assassinate anyone.

Amidst these developments, John Schlesinger directed his film which staged a pointed attack on the CIA and other aspects of American culture. While once critic felt Schlesinger was "successful at portraying American society, particularly the power structure, as repressive, corrupt, and degenerative" (Erskine 167), another critic felt "He's busy making a countercultural statement and a work of art when if he had just told the story straight it might have really done those things - it might have meant something" (Kael 109). Both assessments are valid as Schlesinger successfully tears apart the "power structure" throughout the film; yet, in tearing the "power structure" apart, he often takes such a heavy-handed approach that the film becomes less of a story and more of a sermon.
The final scene where Boyce is interviewed after he's been captured is a case in point. When Boyce castigates the CIA for preying on weaker governments and attacks the U.S. government for developing and using nuclear weapons, the viewer is placed in a fix. Having depended on symbols and imagery throughout the film, Schlesinger has now moved to a different approach. This approach has Boyce telling the audience, for all intents and purposes, what to be afraid of. In being so direct, Schlesinger weakens the symbols and imagery he had used to raise questions about the integrity of United States and the nobility of its battles.

Integrity, or a lack thereof, is a major feature of No Way Out. David Brice, the Secretary of Defense, is one character who embodies a lack of personal integrity. While Brice's assistant Pritchard tells us that he is "an extremely bright man", we notice that Brice is unfaithful to his wife, two-faced with Senators, an alcoholic, and according to his mistress, a "pig". This laundry list of flaws is consistent with the notion that "after Watergate and Vietnam, our willingness to trust the feds seems to have wilted very badly" (Strada 254).

Brice puts all his trust in Pritchard, yet, when he recognizes that Pritchard's plan might not work, he turns on him by telling Farrell "my friendship has clouded my judgment. Help me, I'll do anything. Help me". The emotional insecurity of Brice raised serious questions about the trust we place in solitary individuals to defend our nation's security. These questions fit within Michael Rogin's observations in Kiss Me Deadly: Communism, Motherhood, and Cold War Movies. He states:
Cold War films have sharply distinguished subversives from countersubversives... The free man's dependence on the state, at the center of Cold War ideology, goes back to the origins of America: American countersubversion has always defended the individual by mobilizing American nationalism... The New Deal, the war, and the Cold War have all given the state an unprecedented presence in American life. The boundary separating the free man's state from its subversive was always in danger of collapsing in an implosion that would destroy the free man (Rogin 3-5).

The implosion in this case would involve Brice's sexual escapades which have allowed Farrell, the 'subversive' element, to gain greater power within a state that was designed to protect Americans. Brice's assistant Pritchard could also be considered a 'subversive' element since he wields a great deal of power within the state largely because of Brice's personal weaknesses.

While Pritchard and Farrell are linked as 'subversive' elements, they are distinguished in a variety of ways. When "Hail to the Chief" is played at the party that begins the film, Farrell, the military man, stands at attention as the president enters while Pritchard, the government employee, walks off to attend to other matters. Another area where the men take opposite approaches is in their sexual lives as Pritchard is a homosexual while Farrell is the consummate heterosexual. Described by one critic as the "movie's villain... the yes-man, tireless aide, a ruthless homosexual" (Kael 99), Pritchard represents a number of negative qualities in the eyes of the audience. His homosexuality makes him sexually deviant, he lacks individuality since he spends the majority of his time cleaning up after Brice, and he fails to show the proper respect for individuals as well known as the president or as anonymous as Nina Bika.
Pritchard's interrogation of Bika, who is black, is especially appalling as he threatens to revoke her visa and deport her to Johannesburg. While Bika doesn't know who Pritchard is, she does understand that he can destroy her life in an instant. Moreover, the audience understands that Pritchard can terminate Bika's life when he assigns two agents from Special Forces to assassinate her. This degree of unchecked power within the government was also seen during the Iran-Contra hearings that surrounded No Way Out's release. Those hearings raised serious questions about the integrity of government officials who sought to hide their knowledge from the American public. Pritchard's demand that no television cameras cover the departure of Pentagon employees establishes the same desire to conceal a scandal in the film as was seen in the Iran-Contra hearings.

Pritchard's scandal, which is designed to save his boss, incorporates a number of important thematic factors. One involves the ease of using Yuri as a scapegoat in the investigation since, in the Cold War, it became "easy to frame the battle in ideological terms as the wicked (they) and good (we) are the two species inhabiting the earth" (Halle 157). In No Way Out the "wicked" had come to the West in the form of Yuri. As a Soviet agent, Yuri is distinguished from Christopher Boyce in that he received vigorous KGB training as a youth and worked his way into the U.S. power structure while Boyce received no training and became a KGB agent after he'd already established himself within the power structure.
It's interesting to note that while the wicked Yuri was among us, no one could identify him. Pritchard played upon this fear of the unknown with startling success as the Pentagon became a madhouse when Yuri was being stalked by the two witnesses who saw him (Farrell) and Atwell together. The film presents a mixed message about this investigation. On one hand, it implicates Pritchard for devising the plot to obstruct justice while also condemning the government officials who were so willing to believe Pritchard's story. On the other hand, the film supports Pritchard because his story was almost on the money as Yuri (Farrell) was Atwell's lover as well as being a Soviet mole in the Pentagon.

THE USES AND ABUSES OF TECHNOLOGY

While technology is often difficult to understand, it is easy to categorize in these films as the Bond pictures affirm it while the non-Bond critique its uses and abuses. The opening scene of Octopussy highlights how technology is affirmed in a Bond picture as James escapes from the Cuban military in a makeshift airplane which then he uses to guide a missile into a aircraft hanger thereby destroying dozens of Cuban fighter planes and helicopters. The evasion of the missile and destruction of Cuban military aircraft establishes a set of symbolic victories where Western technology outdoes Communist technology while the personal skills of Bond, the defender of democracy, overwhelm the forces of communism. Thus, with only four minutes of Octopussy having elapsed, technology is affirmed as a vehicle to express Western superiority.
That superiority was sustained by the nuclear weapons the United States kept on army bases throughout Europe. Orlov's belief that a removal of U.S. nuclear weapons from Europe would open the door for a Russian attack was shared by many American citizens who pointed to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan as an example of unchecked Communist aggression. That invasion, which ousted Afghan President Hafieullah Amin and installed former Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Babrak Karmal, led one critic to note "The most dangerous development in world opinion is the growing belief that the U.S. is weak, that it has lost the will to act" (Morrow 32). In Octopussy, a proliferation of nuclear weapons surrounding Soviet borders was a clear indication of the United States strength, and with that strength, the need to act was significantly reduced. Therefore, because technology allowed us to decide when and where we needed to act, it was an essential asset for the United States to utilize.

Bond's use of technology was also apparent throughout Never Say Never Again. His competition with Maximillian Largo in Domination is the single most important scene with regard to technology. Domination, a video game whose purpose is to dominate the world, was created by Largo and is designed to deliver a powerful electric shock to the loser. Largo had never lost at Domination and quickly defeats Bond in front of a large crowd. Bond, resilient as always, picks himself up off the floor (the electric shock had knocked him there) and challenges Largo to play for the entire world. Largo agrees to play, yet when he realizes that he is going to lose to Bond, he quits.
Bond emerges from this scene as a winner in a number of important ways. First, he reveals himself as the true master of technology. He also establishes himself as a fearless competitor as he refuses to quit after initially losing to Largo. This competitive fire, cherished by American audiences of all ages, was extinguished in 1980 by the United States' decision to boycott the Summer Olympics in Moscow. That move which prompted one observer to note:

There has always been an explicit association of sports with the old success dream: every up-and-coming athlete a potential Horatio Alger hero. In some ways, the modern history of the United States is a huge, complex, athletic event; industries, immigrants, and ideologies are continuously vying with one another for clear cut victories. For capitalists, it is a special strain to be out of the competition (Rosenblatt 28).

In playing Domination, Bond indicates that we are back in the game. In winning Domination, Bond is establishing that "we", which means the West, capitalism, and democracy, are still the best in the game. Messages like these, while reassuring to the viewer in and of themselves, were made more popular by the manner in which they were presented on the screen. The components of the popularity included "their developed and highly distinctive use of technological gadgetry; to their sheer visual spectacle, particularly the destruction of expensive sets and scenery; or to the opportunity they afford for escapism into a universe governed by the laws of fantasy" (Bennet 16).

While the Bond films are filled with elements of fantasy, they are also consistently reminding the viewer that technology is only as good as its user. This message is centered on the U.S. military whose incompetence poses a major threat to the world. Air
Force pilot Jack Petachi highlights that incompetence as his heroin addiction and psychological frailty allows SPECTRE to steal the United States' missiles. Petachi's incompetence is magnified by the USAF generals who punctuate a description of the missiles test flight with the phrase "we hope".

Instead of controlling this technology, the generals are presented as clowns who are reduced to "hoping" that things go right. The message about what can happen when things don't go right is suggested in the scene where the missiles fly over a group of young children playing on the beach. While the kids are oblivious to what's going on, the audience recognizes that their lives are jeopardized by the incompetence of the U.S. military. This incompetence mirrors Octopussy where the Air Force security guards chased Bond around the base as he was trying to save their lives by defusing the nuclear bomb. Therefore, while these Bond films have affirmed technology, they've affirmed it with a caveat: use technology wisely or don't use it at all.

Bond's shrewd use of technology is once again highlighted in A View to a Kill. Q, the technical wizard of the British Secret Service, gives Bond a series of gadgets that include a ring and sunglasses that can both take pictures, a copying device that picks up writing from the previous page, and a audio tape of him snoring. This last item, the audio tape, seems rather simple; yet, it's vital because it tricks the villains into thinking Bond is in bed which allows him to sneak out and investigate Zorin's operation. Bond's improvisation with technology, seen in Never Say Never Again when he uses the pen/missile to kill Fatima Blush,
is consistently stressed in *A View to a Kill* as one area that sets him apart from the villains. Bond's creativity in utilizing seemingly useless gadgets also distinguishes him from the U.S. Air Force generals who were unable to control the technology that dominated their jobs.

Although Bond’s use of technology sets him apart from the air force and the villains, it does not set him apart from other cinematic heroes of the 1980s. Stars like Sylvester Stallone [*Rocky IV* (1984) & *First Blood Part II* (1985)], Arnold Schwarzenegger [*Terminator* (1984) & *Commando* (1985)], and Mel Gibson [*Mad Max Beyond Thunderdome* (1985)] were featured in action-packed blockbusters laden with technology and testosterone. The middle-aged Roger Moore couldn’t hope to match the physical prowess of these three individuals, a fact noted by one critic who noted that “In his seventh movie as James Bond, Moore is looking less like a chap with a license to kill than a gent with an application to retire” (Kroll 74).

While Moore couldn’t match the physicality of a Stallone or Schwarzenegger, the director couldn’t afford to let technology dominate the movie because it would cheapen Bond as a character. Thus, the Bond series faced a dilemma that revolved around the fact that:

As long as he (Bond) can count on encountering his enemies in falling elevators, or burning ships, Bond is all right. In a world of data banks, video screens, and artificial intelligence, Bond will either have to “upgrade” to be a full-time sci-fi hero or else withdraw to the sidelines, watching it all, amused, over a dry martini (Durovicova 405).

One advantage that *A View to a Kill* had over the five films mentioned above was the explosion that was to destroy Silicone
Valley. While the other films were filled with action, in no case was the star defending a tangible piece of American property. In saving Silicon Valley, Bond was preserving an area that was essential to America's technological advantage and to the nation's concept of superiority. What's more, Bond was saving the area at a time when America audiences knew what it meant for technology to be destroyed. This knowledge was a product of the explosion of the space shuttle Challenger in February of 1986, a moment which gripped the nation with horror and sorrow. An article in *Time* magazine commented:

Over and over, the bright extinction played on the television screen, almost ghoulishly repeated until it had sunk into the collective memory...It inflicted upon Americans the purest pain they had felt in years...The mission seemed symbolically immaculate, the farthest reach of a perfectly American ambition to cross frontiers. And it simply vanished (Morrow 23).

When the space shuttle vanished, many of the mission's ideals (crossing frontiers, etc.) became clouded as well. If Silicon Valley was to vanish in Zorin's earthquake, some of the ideals associated with it (diligence, creativity, opportunity, etc.) would also become tarnished. Thus, as Bond acts to preserve this region of the country, he is sustaining the nation's sense of superiority as well as the nation's sense of self.

*The Falcon and the Snowman'*s Christopher Boyce finds himself in a nation that has come to place an enormous amount of faith in machines. Upon meeting with his boss at TRX, Boyce is told that the company's satellites significantly reduce the work of human spies since we can see Brezhnev's mistress, missiles, or dog peeing while relaxing in front of a terminal in the United States.
Yet, while our machines allow us to see things abroad, they don't always give us an accurate view of our situation at home. This problem is depicted by Christopher's boss who "gave Boyce, at the age of 21, a quick service check after a couple weeks of work and then reassigned him to the Black Vault at $140/week" (Corliss 90). The film's message is simple: machines have made us sloppy.

One way that we are sloppy is that our leaders fail to consider the basic emotional needs of human beings. Boyce's boss tells him that he cannot talk about his job with his girlfriend, family, or co-workers. This restriction would make the job unbearable for Boyce since he was spending the majority of his life in a place that he couldn't admit existed. The scene where Christopher and his co-workers relax at a strip bar and discuss their jobs over a few beers suggests the emotional need we all have to talk about our activities.

Another way machines have made us sloppy involves the way we disregard for the basic financial needs of individuals. Machines are usually purchased for a lot of money, yet, after they're bought, you do not need to pay them a salary. Humans, on the other hand, are in constant need of money which means that they can't be purchased and put to work like a machine. Boyce's income, or lack thereof, was consistent with the pay that other individuals in the military received. In 1980, an army recruit made $448.80 a week while the federal minimum wage for a 40 hour work week was $520.80 and an air force pilot earned only $27,800 while a co-pilot for a major airline received $48,000 (Time 24). The economic tight-rope that these individuals had to walk
undoubtedly made the prospect of selling secrets for cash a path some would consider. Events surrounding the release of *The Falcon* and the *Snowman* revealed that many individuals had already walked that path.

In October of 1984, Richard Miller became the first FBI agent ever charged with espionage. A 20 year veteran of the bureau, Miller was in financial need when he met Svellana and Nikolay Ogorodnikova whom he offered to sell classified FBI documents for a grand total of $65,000 (World Almanac '85 919). Months later, retired Navy warrant secretary John Walker, his son John, a seaman aboard the aircraft carrier Nimitz, and John’s brother Arthur, a Navy lieutenant commander and instructor in antisubmarine warfare, were arrested for divulging the capabilities of United States aircraft and missiles to the Soviet Union (World Almanac '86 909). And, at the end of 1985, Ronald Pelton, a former employee of the National Security Agency, was charged with selling secrets to the Soviet Union (World Almanac '87 887).

The shock of these discoveries prompted a number of responses, one of which was already occurring in films as the "suggestion that 'we' and 'they' and the 'system' are all potential sources of threat to the values of civility, justice, and peace, with the recent emphasis on indigenous American threats" (Strada 268). The indigenous threat in *The Falcon and the Snowman* was clearly the CIA, yet, it’s vital to recognize how the "system" is also a factor. For Christopher Boyce, the "system" represents an American method that relies upon machinery more than morals. This machinery, which is a derivative of
technology, is critiqued as a vehicle that has undermined the individual.

This subversion casts the individual aside and leaves them looking for a vehicle to reestablish a sense of justice. The vehicle many have chosen, or are likely to choose, is communism, the "invasive, invisible, deceptive, and enslaving conspiracy" (Rogin 9). Thus, The Falcon and the Snowman casts technology in a different light than the Bond films as it suggests that a dependence on technology will tear society apart rather than weaving it together.

No Way Out also focuses on the problems that result when individuals rely completely upon technology. The character Sam is presented as the movie's technological wizard as he moves quickly from computer to computer accumulating and interpreting various pieces of information. He is expected to help find Susan Atwell's killer by using his technical knowledge to interpret evidence gathered from Susan's home and body. However, the information that Sam gets from his computer will not tell him who Susan's killer really was because Pritchard has manipulated the evidence. The photo negative that's being developed by the computer tells the audience that because we know that Tom Farrell's face will appear, and we know that Tom Farrell did not kill Susan Atwell.

That reality doesn't matter to the computer because its only job is to decipher the evidence that it is given. Because the computer cannot recognize that it has been manipulated, a greater burden falls on Sam to consider the integrity of the evidence he
is using. Sam fails in this regard, and from his failure we see the film's critique of an excessive reliance upon technology.

However, while Sam is the character who is tied most strongly to technology, he is also the only character who is presented as a genuinely honest person at the end of the film. Sam is the film's solitary family man and he willingly serves as Tom Farrell's confidant throughout the investigation. After a number of conversations, and acting under the impression that Tom is under too much stress, Sam talks with Pritchard about Farrell and is shot in the chest for his efforts. Thus, while technology is critiqued in No Way Out for being unreliable, it is not critiqued for corrupting the morals of its users like it had been in The Falcon and the Snowman.

The Hunt for Red October critiques technology in a different way from any of the previous films as the Russians are presented as the technologically superior nation. Their superiority lies in the creation of the Red October's caterpillar drive which prevents sonar from picking up the submarine's movements. Thus, the Red October can sit miles off the coast of the United States, armed with nuclear missiles, and never be detected. This ability means the Red October has but one purpose: to start a war.

By placing the nuclear threat directly on the United States, The Hunt for Red October is linked to Never Say Never Again where SPECTRE stole the U.S. nuclear missiles and threatened to use them on a major city. However, the movies are distinguished in that SPECTRE stole the missiles as collateral in an attempt to extort money while the Soviet Union developed the Red October to destroy
the United States. This potential destruction makes the competition between the U.S. and Soviet forces more intense than it had been in any other film since peace is so clearly jeopardized. Technology is critiqued in this regard because it serves only one purpose, to destroy mankind.

Despite being inundated with technology, the film actually upholds the power of man over the power of machines. When U.S. Captain Bart Mancuso's submarine stumbles upon the sounds coming from the Red October, he is forced to decide between a $40 million computer's assessment of the noise and the hypothesis of a dedicated seaman named Jonesie. When Captain Mancuso selects Jonesie's guess, he affirms the power of the human intellect that was so lacking with Sam in *No Way Out*.

Events preceding the film's release suggested that despite the technological innovations of military equipment, it was still the performance of human beings that mattered the most. In May of 1981, a Marine combat helicopter crashed aboard the deck of the U.S aircraft carrier Nimitz killing 14 men, destroying 3 fighter planes and damaging 16 other aircraft (*World Almanac '82* 935). A few years later another U.S. aircraft carrier, the Kittyhawk, was involved in an accident in the Sea of Japan as a Soviet submarine ran into it (*World Almanac '85* 903). And finally, in 1989 a Soviet submarine caught fire off the coast of Norway and sank as 42 crewmen were killed (*World Almanac '90* 53). These examples suggest that the precision of technology often is not the key to success; rather, it's the individual's skillful use of technology that makes the difference.
The Hunt For Red October addresses this topic in the scene where Soviet commander Tupolev tracks down Ramius and fires a torpedo at him. Despite the numerous technological advances of the Red October, it cannot elude this torpedo. Ramius, who realizes the submarine's predicament, orders the Red October to turn into the torpedo's path and sail towards it. The torpedo, which Tupelov had yet to arm because he thought Ramius try to escape, crashes harmlessly into the hull of the Red October. Ramius' response reinforces the notion espoused in the Bond films that improvisation with technology is often the key to success.

**HOW TO PLAY THE SPY GAME**

While the spy heroes are faced with a different series of challenges in each of the films, they are united by the elements of luck, experience and individualism. By using these qualities as a basis to compare the spies, it will become apparent how they used different means to achieve the same end: success.

Claiming that each of the spies succeeded immediately brings up *The Falcon and the Snowman* since both Christopher Boyce and Dalton Lee were captured and imprisoned at the end of the film. This unlucky conclusion distinguishes the pair from the success of the other spies, yet, in an important way Christopher Boyce stands as the most successful spy in these six films. His success stems from both his ideological motivation and his insight into the nature of the spy game.

Described by one critic as a "bruised idealist" (Ansen 75) and another as a "renegade idealist" and "bruised capitalist" (Corliss 90), Boyce is a curious mixture of idealism and anguish.
Timothy Hutton prepared for the part by meeting the real Christopher Boyce, talking with him over the phone, and reading numerous press clippings about him (Erskine 167). The result is that Boyce is presented as a character with a great deal of emotional depth, and while his actions clearly reveal his psychic struggle, other aspects of his psyche are harder to read.

John Schlesinger, the film's director, uses the falcon as the dominant symbol to explain Boyce's psyche and named the movie after this comparison (Boyce being the Falcon and the cocaine addict Lee being the Snowman) which indicates how vital the falcon is to understanding the story. That understanding can be taken a step further by incorporating the stuffed owl, a gift from a co-worker to Boyce, into the analysis.

The falcon is a cunning and swift predator, yet, it is a creature that depends almost entirely on its master. In comparison, the owl does not depend on anyone as it can exist by itself in nature. These components, dependence and independence, are compounded by the importance of eyes to both beasts. The falcon's eyes are covered before flight which suggests that it enters the world with few, if any, conceptions about what it will see. Its goal during flight is to find and kill its prey, yet, during that flight it will undoubtedly notice aspects of its surrounding that it never knew existed.

The owl, on the other hand, sits and watches its surroundings which make it an all-knowing creature. When the owl attacks, it lacks the speed, skill or beauty of the falcon; but, it still succeeds in killing its prey because it knows what's around it and
what it is capable of accomplishing. Boyce fits into the comparison in that he did not know what was around him (discovery of CIA manipulating foreign governments) and that he is a dependent creature (Lee must help him with spying).

By destroying the stuffed owl at the end of the film, Boyce is symbolically expressing his frustration with being constantly watched by others. The conventional owl proves to be more deadly than the noble falcon, and Boyce tries to resolve this crisis by killing the owl and freeing his falcon. However, the viewer knows that Boyce cannot kill the owl because it is already dead. This realization foreshadows Boyce's failure as a spy while also suggesting that the idealism of falconry is "inappropriate in contemporary America" (Erskine 168). That suggestion would seemingly lead the country to embrace the conventional owl, but *The Falcon and the Snowman* denounces the partnership by presenting the audience with a stuffed owl. This infertile and inactive owl embodies the potential fate of our nation if we continue to embrace conventional wisdom over a sense of idealism.

The film also presents the audience with a detailed background of Christopher Boyce's life. These details link the film to *The Hunt For Red October* which quickly established Jack Ryan as the consummate family man. Yet, while Ryan enjoyed a peaceful family life, Boyce was stuck in an antagonistic relationship with his father who at one point asks him "Do you resent me as much as you want me to believe?" While the audience is never given a definitive reason why Boyce has problems with his father, we can make some educated guesses. The father's job at
the FBI and devotion to the bible clearly contrasts Christopher’s mounting disillusionment with U.S. intelligence agencies and frustration with religion; therefore, these characters personal beliefs are clearly at odds with one another. In the breakdown of this relationship, the underlying premise is that as Christopher has gained more experience with government and religion, he has developed a greater sense of frustration. This pattern of experience leading to frustration continues during Christopher Boyce’s relationship with the Soviet spy.

Despite being a novice in the spy game, Boyce immediately reveals his intellect by instructing his partner, Dalton Lee, not to give Boyce’s name to the Soviet contact since Lee would then become expendable. Coded messages and secret cameras soon enter Boyce’s life and he proves himself adept at using the technology to his advantage. The skillful use of technology links Boyce to Bond as does the cool he displays when the National Security Agency (NSA) arrives to inspect the office. While Bond was confronted by the exotic Fatima Blush and her gun in Never Say Never Again, Boyce’s nemesis is the NSA official who appears in a tie and asks him tough questions. These confrontations illustrate how different the film’s presentation of the spy game truly were. Boyce’s experiences as a spy, while less fantastic than the Bond films, are probably more believable and nerve-racking for the audience.

Boyce’s experience as a spy also lead him into a heated discussion with his Soviet counterpart. This discussion, which parallels the conversation between Tom Farrell and his Soviet
superior at the end of No Way Out, contained the following passage:

Soviet: We are not unalike...I know what it (spying) does to a person. I know how hard it is. I know what you are feeling.

Boyce: I am not a professional at this like you. This is not a career for me. I never expected it to go this long. I'm not like you. You don't know how I feel. I have a life apart from all of this - unlike you.

Soviet: You owe us!

Boyce: Owe you?

Soviet: Whether you realize it or not, you are a professional. The money sent you over. You cannot leave here. It is not over, it is just beginning.

The Soviet official's assertions prove to be totally accurate. Boyce cannot go back to who he was because once he entered the spy game, he closed the door on ever having a normal life again. We see the inability to live a normal life repeatedly in his relationship with Lana. Instead of gaining a degree of independence from his spying, Boyce is left a lonely individual who is trapped by his decision.

The Soviets, who "present an external and internal threat as they looked to unleash the extremist we could all be" (Biskind 136), are the ones who are trapping Boyce. Their presence initially allowed Boyce to act on his frustrations, yet, their continued presence poses an external threat to Christopher's safety and an internal threat to his conscience. By the film's end, Boyce delivers a monologue which suggests that he is beginning to understand some aspects of his dilemma. He states to Lee that:

I'm tired too. So tired I can barely stand it. I'm going to be looking over my shoulder the rest of my life. There is
never going to be any reconciliation. They are just as paranoid as we are. I can’t imagine why I thought they would be any different. Well, fuck them. I am going to get something out of this nightmare.

Boyce is captured soon after he makes this statement. His life as a spy proved to be more of a dream than a nightmare for Schlesinger who could use Boyce’s experiences to illustrate “the free man’s displacement by the technological state” (Rogin 9). Boyce’s individualism brought him into direct competition with the state as he sought a moral truth while the state sought an absolute supremacy. While Boyce’s individualism also gave Schlesinger the opportunity to attack the United States for letting its technological fascination turn into a technological fanaticism.

Despite being the consummate individual, Boyce was forced to rely on childhood friend Dalton Lee, played by Sean Penn, to be his partner in espionage. One critic compared the pair by noting that “Hutton underplays his role and remains a mystery while Penn overplays his and is manic” (Simon 57). Lee’s first scene immediately establishes him as a character who is surrounded by death and sexual decay as he climbs out of a prostitute’s bed in Mexico and proceeds to look out the window as a funeral passes by.

These factors led another critic to note that “Penn is the protagonist of American vulgarity which indicates the level of national disillusionment” (Ansen 75). The disillusionment, which Boyce revealed in his initial scene when he leaves the church, is consistently developed by Lee who is bemused by the hypocrisy he sees in the military. In one scene early in the movie, a patrolmen at the Mexican border allows Lee’s partner in drug
smuggling to pass without a check simply because he proved that he had served in Vietnam. Lee, who is not a member of this military fraternity, is thereby left as an outsider.

Lee's status as an outsider is further established by this scene in the sense that he is outside U.S. borders and trying to get back in. The border police make his reentry more difficult as they pull him over to check his car after a computer details Lee's drug record when his license plate number is checked. This search suggests that Lee will constantly be confronted and confounded by his past mistakes. Therefore, Lee's entry into the spy game represents a chance for him to escape his past and foster a new identity.

Lee's identity as a spy is a product of his actions which are both comical and illogical. When waiting at the Soviet embassy in Mexico, Lee checks for bugs (listening devices) by saying "testing 1,2,3" into various lampshades throughout the room. While this scene amuses the viewer, we are also wary of the scene where Lee is kidnapped and left in a remote playground after giving the Russians some important information. The film's message is that the spy game is serious business and Lee must begin to act accordingly.

However, when he offers a drug deal to the Soviets, takes pictures of a girl at a party with the secret camera, and brags about his spying to strangers, we realize that the spy game is more of a joke than a job for Lee. The experience he gains as a spy is useless because he lacks independence from a crucial factor: drugs. Lee's heroin addiction destroys his ability to
think rationally and leads him to be arrested and tortured by Mexican police before he is turned over to the United States as a traitor. Instead of emerging from his history of drug problems and establishing a new identity, Lee is torn down by his past and loses his identity as he becomes a number in a federal penitentiary.

It's crucial to note that, despite being traitors, Boyce and Lee are the heroes of the movie. This presentation fits within the developing "concept of a foe that was as much an internal betrayer as an external threat" (Sayre 11). Therefore, The Falcon and the Snowman serves as a poignant reminder that in the battle for democracy and justice, our greatest opponents can often be ourselves and the society we live in.

No Way Out's Tom Farrell is closely linked to Christopher Boyce and Dalton Lee in a number of important ways. Farrell is an outsider, he is an agent for the Soviet Union, he exposes some of the flaws within our society and ourselves. Most importantly, Tom Farrell, like Boyce and Lee before him, is the hero of the film. By comparing the characters along these lines and then contrasting their levels of experience, we'll gain a clearer picture of how the spy game is constructed in each film.

Farrell's role as outsider is not confined just to his romantic life with Susan since he is also an outsider in the investigation of her death. When Farrell is first given a picture of Susan and told that she is dead, he is so shocked that he asks to use Brice's bathroom where he suffers an emotional breakdown. As Farrell crawls around the bathroom floor in a stupor, we
realize that he's stranded in a corrupt environment much like Christopher Boyce was in his job at TRX. Thus, Farrell's breakdown is not only a reaction to Susan's death, but also to the dreadful situation he has been placed in. In fighting against the treachery of Brice and Pritchard, Farrell is taking the only available step to fight for his own survival. Farrell's independence in these battles fits within the notion that "individual vigilantism (not teamwork) is the only option for modern-day heroes" (Strada 268).

This individual vigilantism, which Stallone, Schwarzenegger, and Gibson portrayed in films mentioned earlier in the paper, is further developed in Farrell's character throughout the film. In one particularly important instance, Farrell singlehandedly outwits two Special Forces agents who have been sent to kill Nina Bika, a friend of Susan Atwell. By outrunning, outfighting and outsmarting these two agents, Farrell is presented as twice the man that they are. The series of battles which pit Farrell against two foes (Brice & Pritchard, Special Forces Agents 1 & 2) are also going on in his head as he struggles to decide whether it's more important to solve the case or to maintain his cover as a Soviet spy.

The last scene, which revealed Farrell's identity as a Soviet spy, was accosted by many film critics, one of whom noted "the movie's final scene is an afterthought" (Cono 261). Another film critic felt "the ending sacrifices sympathy for Costner's character, and the movie, by giving him a second superfluous identity. This decision is more of a mystery than the movie itself" (Schickel 62). The fact that these critics feel the
ending is an "afterthought" and a "mystery" is somewhat surprising because the ending of any film must tie its plot and themes together. Even after the investigation is completed in No Way Out, there are two scenes that needed to be resolved if the film was to have any sense of thematic unity.

The first scene shows Farrell talking with two men in a suburban Washington home as the film is just beginning. These unidentified men, who turn out to be Farrell's Soviet contacts, never appear during the rest of the film. This scene would have absolutely no explanation if the film was to end right after the investigation was "solved". A second scene that demands some sort of explanation occurs during the middle of Farrell's investigation when he rushes off to a pay phone and places a mysterious call. His conversation "Hello, you know who this is. I have to talk with you, but I can't leave here now. I'm on a damn pay phone. I know it's probably not safe. I'll come when I can" gives some pretty good clues about his identity, yet we, as an audience, don't pay attention to those clues.

That lack of attention is a product of the audience wanting Farrell to succeed so badly that it stops looking at the facts objectively. Termed a "boy-next-door who has grown up" (Cono 260), Farrell embodies the individualism, sexuality and confidence that we worship in our spy heroes. However, in worshipping those qualities, we often forget that individualism, sexuality, and confidence are human qualities before they are American qualities. The film shows us that this type of oversight allows Russian spies
like Farrell to gain our confidence because our nation is so quick to discard flaws in the individuals it finds heroic.

A quick glimpse of events in the 1980s shows how prevalent this trend was within America. Individuals like Oliver North, Pete Rose, Mike Tyson, and John Belushi stand out because they were guilty of some serious infractions that scores of people overlooked simply because they were thought to be heroes. No Way Out critiques the dangers of such a pattern since, according to a West German analyst in 1980, "it's safe to assume that there's not a place in the world where the KGB does not have its men" (Time 39).

With the knowledge that Farrell was a KGB agent, we need to reconsider the sincerity of his feelings for Susan. In Farrell's conversation with his superior officer, it is revealed that he began his relationship with Susan solely because she was linked to the U.S. Defense Secretary. This information shows that Farrell deceived Susan about his intentions and also potentially deceived the audience about his emotions. Yet, determining how much he deceived us is impossible because while we can probably agree that Tom grew to love Susan, we can never know the extent of his love.

The uncertainty surrounding the extent Farrell’s love links him to Christopher Boyce whose relationship with Lana posed similar problems for the audience. One critic noted that the ambiguity of Farrell's love life gave No Way Out a "moral complexity which distances it from the black-white depictions of James Bond films" (Cono 259).
While Farrell's feelings remain a mystery, our impressions of him are quickly modified. He no longer represents a set of "American" values, rather, he represents the complexities of a life in espionage which forces the individual to live in a number of different worlds at once. In the Soviet world, Farrell is now a hero. Farrell denies his heroism which, aside from recalling a similar scene in *Octopussy* between General Orlov and his superior officer, illustrates how bewildered Farrell is by his predicament.

That sense of bewilderment was seen in real life spies like Vitaly Yurchenko who defected to the U.S. in 1985 with vital intelligence secrets only to redefect later that same year. A U.S. Senator summed the whole affair up by commenting that espionage was akin to stepping "into a line of infinite mirrors where it is impossible to detect reality from reflection" (Kelly 41).

Tom Farrell is stuck in a set of mirrors as well, only these are the type of mirrors you find at the circus which distort your image. Tom is intelligent enough to see exactly what is going on around him as he quickly identifies Pritchard's manipulation of justice, Brice's insecurity, and the purpose of the Special Agents. However, while Farrell can focus on what's going on around him, he cannot focus on what's going on inside him because the mirrors of espionage keep distorting his emotional reactions.

This distortion links Farrell to Christopher Boyce since both men were so emotionally distraught by the process of spying that they turned and walked away from it all. However, in walking away, these two are also distinguished because Boyce was leaving...
something he chose to do while Farrell was leaving something he was trained to do. Thus, *The Falcon and the Snowman* and *No Way Out* affirm the importance of experience to a spy as the veteran Farrell walks away after succeeding in his mission while the novice Pritchard tries to walk away and is captured.

*The Hunt for Red October* reverses that trend as it uses Jack Ryan to illustrate how experience is irrelevant to the success of a spy. Ryan’s declaration at the end of the film that “I’m not an agent, I just write books for the CIA”, links him to Christopher Boyce in that both characters are rookies in the spy game who consistently deny their status as spies. Ryan is also linked to Ramius by one critic who felt “In a way, Ryan is the Soviet officers double. A CIA intelligence analyst, he too is an apparatchik who retained the capacity to think for himself. And he too is a man who embarks on a lonely and perilous course” (Schickel 70-1). It’s somewhat surprising that Ryan is so easily linked to other characters since individuality is one of his dominant traits.

That quality is exhibited during Ryan’s journey through a “lonely and perilous course” which included:

1) His home 8) An aircraft carrier
2) An airplane 9) Another helicopter
3) A government office 10) U.S. Submarine *Dallas*
4) A military factory 11) Small submarine
5) A library cellar 12) The *Red October*
6) Joint Chiefs of Staff meeting 13) An airplane going home
7) A helicopter

This journey is significant because it fits within the notion that “Cold War films present themselves as defending the private life from Communism” (Rogin 9). The fact that Ryan had to cover
each of every one of these areas suggests how extensive an effort was needed to check the forces of Communism. In checking those forces, Ryan emerges as the defender of democracy, a role which links him to Bond and distinguishes him from Boyce and Farrell.

Although he's distinguished from Farrell, Ryan shares three distinct qualities with him: toughness, luck, and the status as an outsider. Ryan’s toughness is illustrated by his actions and suggested by his personal history. Upon boarding the U.S. aircraft carrier, Ryan fails to impress an officer with his theory about the Red October’s defection. The officer's apathy is quickly reversed by his commander’s story about Ryan’s graduation from the U.S. Marine Academy. After being shot down in a helicopter while serving in Vietnam, Ryan completed his final year as a student in the hospital as he lay in traction. The message from this brief history is quite simple: Jack Ryan is tougher than he looks.

That toughness is exhibited during the Joint Chiefs of Staff meeting when, after a General chastises Jack for his theory regarding the Red October’s defection, Ryan proclaims “I’ve met Ramius sir, have you?” Ryan’s answer indicates that The Hunt for Red October places tenacity over experience in the spy game. One critic commented on the film’s development of this and other character traits by noting:

The screenwriter’s apply personality traits like Post-It notes: Ryan gets a teddy bear to show us he’s a loyal family man; Sam Neil as Ramius’ loyal second in command muses constantly about living in Montana when he gets to America. These supposed “human touches” only reinforce the film’s total absence of character (Ansen 63).

Ansen’s criticism could just as easily have been applied to any of the Bond films since their presentation of character traits
is equally blatant. One trait that links the dominant characters in these films, Bond and Ryan, is the importance of luck in their lives. Ryan convinces U.S. Captain Bart Mancuso that he knows Ramius by telling him about Ramius' "Crazy Ivan" to starboard side after the half hour of every hour. While Ryan knew that a "Crazy Ivan" was a sudden submarine turn that was intended to check whether anything was following it, he had no idea about what side Ramius would turn to. Thus, he guessed, and like any good spy hero, he guessed correctly.

While Ryan is lucky enough to guess correctly, he's unlucky in the sense that he is an outsider in America. This status is consistent with the notion that in spy thrillers, the "hero shares the general moral perspective of the community he serves, yet, he is forced to spend the majority of his time outside of it in defense of that community" (Palmer 25). Every film is linked by Palmer's observation since Bond and Ryan defend America while living outside it whereas Farrell and Boyce spy on America while living within it.

James Bond's defense of America is curious because he is not American; rather, he is British. Nevertheless, Bond can "be conceived as, if not an American agent, as an agent who is at the service of American interests" (Bennet 209). Bond's service is multifaceted in the sense that his actions exist on at least two levels. On a basic level, Bond's efforts to defuse a nuclear bomb in Octopussy preserves U.S. stability and strength; yet, on a deeper level, Bond's efforts in every film exhibit the qualities
that Americans coveted in the individuals who represented the nation.

Individualism is one such quality. Bond’s individuality is revealed in *Octopussy* during two early scenes, the first of which occurs at an auction. Bond attends the auction to trace a Faberge egg that is a vital lead in the case, and he quickly proceeds to steal the real egg, substitute a false one, and drive the bid to a ridiculous level. These maneuverings eventually force the villain’s accomplice, who had been ordered to buy the egg at any cost, to reveal himself to Bond as he matches the exorbitant bids. While the scene exposes the villain, it also reveals that Bond is a crafty individual who can interpret and manipulate every situation to his advantage.

This interpretation and manipulation is revealed again at an exotic hotel where Bond encounters Kamal and discovers that he is using loaded dice to cheat at backgammon. Bond challenges and defeats Kamal by using the villain’s loaded dice against him which suggests that Bond is not only a crafty individual, but also a confident one who can rely upon his own skills to succeed in any situation.

This self-reliance was a product of the experience that Bond had gained in his adventures as a spy. In *Never Say Never Again*, Bond acknowledges that his skills have deteriorated and proceeds to enter a health spa get physically fit. While there, he is confronted by an anonymous villain who is twice his size and quite intent on beating him into a pulp. After a fierce and destructive battle, Bond defeats the villain with the help of his urine
sample. When Bond discovers exactly what he has used, he offers a sheepish grin to the audience which suggests that while Bond has probably seen and done it all, he is still genuinely amused by the means he uses to achieve the ends of victory.

Thus, Bond possesses the finest mixture of individualism, luck, and experience in the spy game. While it's easy to say that Bond is a more fictional character than Farrell, Boyce, or Ryan and therefore is easier to mold into the "perfect" spy, it is perhaps more accurate to look at the fact that Bond has appeared in numerous movies while the other characters have appeared in only one apiece. By appearing in a number of different films, Bond is an easier figure for scholars to analyze because there's a greater wealth of information that can be interpreted. In comparing and contrasting how the Bond films have changed from year to year, it's apparent that:

If Bond has functioned as a "sign of the times", it has been a moving sign of the times, as a figure capable of taking up and articulating quite different and even contradictory cultural and ideological values, sometimes turning its back on the meanings and cultural possibilities it had earlier embodied to enunciate new ones (Bennet 19).

While Bond serves as a "sign of the times", so too do these six films. Yet, determining what the "sign" means is often challenging because time is such a difficult concept to rationalize since it cannot be isolated. What happened in the United States during the 1980s was, in some ways, the product of a series of events that occurred in 1970s, 1960s, and 1950s and so on. This paper is weakened by the fact that it failed to incorporate other decades of Cold War film into the analysis of 1980s spy films.
Compounding that problem is the fact that:

Every work in history is a product of two elements, the historian's mind and the masses of facts that it transforms from chaos into whatever order appeals to it as best representing reality. There are, then, as many Cold Wars as there are individuals, and none of them the "true" Cold War (Halle 435).

Since there can be no "true" Cold War, it might appear that studying the topic is absolutely useless. To put it simply, Why bother if you can't get it right? The answer lies in the fact that Halle, who had acknowledged that no history could be the "true" one, continued to write books and articles after he made his admission. While Halle knew that he could not reach the ultimate truth, he did believe that his efforts were worthwhile in the sense that he could come closer to comprehending aspects of the truth.

Studying these six films ultimately has the same relationship with the truth. It's impossible, and inappropriate, to say that No Way Out is the single film that explains what the Cold War was all about. Yet, it is entirely appropriate and accurate to say that No Way Out and the five other films being considered offer some important insights about what the Cold War might have meant. What's more, by looking at a single decade of films it's easier to establish a deeper level of analysis than assessing a series of films over a forty-year period. The 1980s are typical because they saw a rise and fall of Cold War tensions; yet, the decade is unique in that it saw the end of the Cold War as well. This culmination makes the decade the most compelling period to study since it offers films during a rise in tensions (Octopussy & Never Say Never Again), a fall in tensions (No Way Out, A View to a
Kill, The Falcon and the Snowman), and a supposed ending of tensions (The Hunt for Red October).

While it's useful to compare the films with the superpower's political relationships in mind, it is also useful to look at the films in relation to a particular film genre. Cold War films have frequently used spy thrillers, comedies, sci-fi films, and Westerns to express their messages. While individual films within each genre can hold a great deal of meaning, it's probable that:

No individual film is as likely to affect underlying attitudes as is a series of films with similar subtexts, and relies for this concession on genre analysis as the organizational motif... For the social observer, however, genre movies provide the repetitive patterns suggestive of a link to mass consciousness (Strada 249).

The decision to choose the genre of spy thrillers was relatively simple because it offered an immediate distinction between the Bond series and non-Bond films. The films' different means of presenting images about the Cold War, compared earlier in the paper to a political commentary and a political cartoon, suggests that viewers were willing to look at the Cold War through a variety of lenses. It is the viewers' looking that eventually leads to the "mass consciousness," and from that consciousness the question that frames this paper arises: Are the spies like us?

Yes they are. They are because as individuals we too struggle to make sense of a proper role for women, Russians, technology, and the spy game. The heroes of these films consistently present a wide array of messages about these themes; thus, it's logical to conclude that the 1980s were marked by a series of questions instead of a string of answers. That trend has continued into
1994 as our society is faced with a series of nagging questions about these four themes.

The continuing friction in male-female relations was addressed in the February 14th issue of Time magazine whose cover read 'Men: are they really that bad?'. An eight-page article that accompanied the cover suggested that our society is not even close to resolving the battle between the sexes. This current struggle clearly recalls the sexual conflicts that were so apparent in all of the spy thrillers during the 1980s.

With regards to the Russians and the spy game, the capture of U.S. intelligence officer Rick Ames and his wife Rosana in March suggests that while the Cold War has ended, tensions between the superpowers still do exist. Therefore, the criticism that The Hunt for Red October fell outside of current political realities seems unjustified while the questions that The Falcon and the Snowman and No Way Out raised about our nation's integrity still demand an answer.

And finally, the role of technology remains a hot topic on political, military, and medical levels. President Clinton's decisions about how to downsize the military are riddled with questions about the importance machines versus men while Doctor Kevorkian's suicide machine continues to raise a series of moral questions throughout our society. Thus, Christopher Boyce's struggles with technology and society in The Falcon and the Snowman appear to be less and less of an isolated incident and more and more of a common occurrence.
Perhaps the most important level to consider in any of these issues is the personal one. If we, as a nation, are continuing to struggle with the same problems that the spy heroes dealt with a few years earlier, we must conclude that they are like us. Yet, while the spies are like us, we cannot justify making them one of us. This pattern is obvious in the sense that in no case is an American agent living in the United States the hero of a film.

The reason we cannot make these agents "one of us" is that while we both struggled with the same four themes, the agents were able to overcome fears about the Cold War that still plagued the audience. Had those agent lived within the United States and protected American interests on a major level (i.e. defusing a bomb), the least we could expect from ourselves is to deal with our minor anxieties about the Cold War (i.e. do we trust our neighbors?). History shows us that the majority of Americans were unable to do this. The unrest that Bernard Baruch's speech addressed never dissipated because we were constantly afraid of the Russians' potential as well as the flaws within ourselves.

Thus, we took our heroes and made them outsiders. We made them outsiders because it distanced us from the reality of what they had done. They had fought the Cold War on a psychic level and won while we chose to fight the Cold War in movie theaters. In fighting the war here, we hoped to escape dealing with the issue on a psychic level; yet, we fooled ourselves. By pushing the spy heroes outside our country we made ourselves implicitly superior, but because the films' superiority was implicit, they actually revealed how skeptical we were about our own superiority.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


