

Dr. No & Dr. Strangelove: Cold War Anxiety in Film, 1962-1964

Alexander Patrick Langer
History

A bikini-clad Ursula Andress singing “Underneath the Mango Tree,” walking out of the Caribbean waters. A debonair spy in an immaculate tuxedo, stalking the overnight train to Montenegro for his cunning adversary. A brainwashed soldier, staring blankly at his target. A mad doctor in a wheelchair, standing up suddenly and screaming, “Mein Fuhrer! I can walk!” The Cold War films of the early 1960s have reached iconic status as part of American popular consciousness. Movies like *Dr. No* and *From Russia with Love*, the first two installments of the adventures of Mi6 Special Agent James Bond 007, and the classic Cold War thrillers *The Manchurian Candidate* and *Dr. Strangelove, or, How I learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* remain a vibrant part of the pop culture zeitgeist. The films were not made in a vacuum, however. Examining these films within their historical context reveals how they interacted with concurrent historical events and the reasons for their initial popularity. Embedded within the films is a wealth of information pertaining to how Americans perceived the nature of the Cold War. They illustrate how the public confronted and coped with the Cold War through shared popular culture.

The films listed above can be viewed in two categories, though overlap is inevitable. The first is the “spy” movie, which reduces the multi-layered tangle of international relations to the more navigable level of interpersonal relationships. The spy movie was a coping mechanism constructed for the unpredictability of the Cold War, wherein the actions of one person could single-handedly keep the country safe. The second type of film, which I will call the anti-spy movie, deconstructed the cultural fears that the spy movie comforted. Those movies confronted the anti-communist and “Red Scare” narrative fed to the American people throughout the 1950s and deconstructed it. The anti-spy movie examined the fear that Americans had just as much to mistrust from their own leadership as from a foreign communist state. They presented the antithesis of the spy movie, the acknowledgement that one person could not save the world, but on the contrary, one could end it. Those two opposites, examined together and in their historical

context, show the turmoil, confusion, anxiety, and complexity of the Cold War world that Americans lived with during the 1960s.

“The Name’s Bond. James Bond.”

In 1963, the American moviegoing public was introduced to the iconic spy James Bond. In contrast to the “Red Scare” movies of the 1950s, Bond faced new types of enemies: enemies not always Soviet, or even communist, but enemies who existed within the framework of the Cold War, and enemies who reflected real world issues.¹ *Ian Fleming’s James Bond 007 in: Dr. No* premiered in May 1963 in the United States, mere months after the Cuban Missile Crisis, making the movie’s plot lines reverberate with Americans. The Soviet space program had successfully launched the first satellite and the first man into orbit while the U.S. space program had lagged behind. President John F. Kennedy had challenged the American people to put a man on the moon by the end of the decade, yet their Army and NASA had suffered public embarrassment while the Soviet Union had successfully placed a man in orbit before them, shaking the confidence of the American people.² *Dr. No* offered both a tacit understanding of the fears America faced in the early spring of 1963 and an avenue of escape from those problems.

Dr. No at its heart is escapist fun; Bond is immediately presented as “confident, intelligent, lucky, serious, disarming, sexually attractive to women, nimble-witted and both physically and mentally prepared to meet any challenge presented to him.”³ He was seen as the type of man who could keep the Western world in command, “the very model of the tough, abrasive professionalism that was allegedly destined to lead [the west] into the modern, no illusions, no holds-barred post-imperialist age.”⁴ When audiences sat down to *Dr. No*, their hero embodied perfection in the postwar age: a man capable of nimbly navigating the confusing new conflict which Americans dealt with in the 1960s. The character of

¹ In *Dr. No* (1963), James Bond is sent to investigate the death of an Mi6 agent in Jamaica. There, he learns of strange stories concerning a nearby island, and, while investigating, meets Dr. No, an evil scientist who is using his position in the soft underbelly of the United States to steer Mercury Project rockets and missile tests at Cape Canaveral off-course. Bond and his famous Bond girl, Honey Ryder, succeed in destroying Dr. No’s secret base and saving the American space program.

² Yuri Gagarin orbited the Earth once in Vostok 1 on April 12, 1961. The Americans would not orbit a man until John Glenn did it on January 20, 1962.

³ James Mulvihill, “The Golden Age of Bond: Creation of a Cold War Popular Hero (1962-1965) Part II,” *International Journal of Instructional Media* 28 (2001): 346.

⁴ Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott, *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero* (London: MacMillan Education, 1987), 239.

Bond allowed audiences to imagine themselves making the same dynamic decisions, and gave them comfort in his own assurance of superiority over his threats.

Dr. No is full of relevant concerns for the viewing public. The majority of the film takes place on or around the island of Jamaica, just south of the communist stronghold of Cuba, the island that had so recently captured American attention. For much of the 1950s, Americans had been preoccupied with the U.S. and U.S.S.R.'s struggle for primacy in Europe, and gave little thought to their "backyard," as Latin America was often called. After the Cuban Missile Crisis and nationalist revolutions that erupted in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Latin America could no longer be ignored. Now, the location of Dr. No's secret base near Jamaica "stirred the anxiety of Western viewers regarding the safety and security of America's Caribbean neighbors with Castro . . . only 90 miles off the coast of Florida."⁵ The threat of consistently fighting liberation movements influenced by the Soviet Union in America's soft underbelly was a horrifying thought for American audiences. For the first two decades of the Cold War, the communist threat was safely across an ocean. The combination of the Soviets launching their first Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM), nationalist movements undermining American hegemony in Latin America, and Americans perceiving that their nation was falling behind the U.S.S.R. in the technology race, contributed to the anxiety that the Cold War was coming dangerously close to American shores.

The primary threat of *Dr. No* is the fictional disruption of the contemporary Mercury Space Program, which, while the picture was in production, had not put a man in Earth orbit. Americans were worried about falling behind the Soviet Union, and "Dr. No tore at the bowels of Western Society as [he] played havoc with United States Missile tests," with his attempts to undermine America's space program.⁶ Furthermore, he was doing so from a hidden base, close to Cuba, in a place where the United States could not interfere without risking another standoff with the Soviet Union. By choosing to adapt *Dr. No* first, instead of another of Ian Fleming's books, the moviemakers "cleverly connect Bond's adventure to the real concerns of the American audience about the actual Cold War space race, perhaps making Bond's story seem more realistic."⁷ This grounded the escapist fun in a

⁵ Mulvihill, "The Golden Age of Bond," 343.

⁶ Thomas J. Price, "The Changing Image of the Soviets in the Bond Sage: From Bond-Villains to 'Acceptable Role Partners,'" *Journal of Popular Culture* 26 (1992): 28.

⁷ Mulvihill, "The Golden Age of Bond," 343. *Dr. No* is actually the seventh book chronologically of the Fleming books, but was chosen for adaptation first.

subconscious realism, which only served to demonstrate the fun and satisfaction of seeing Bond claim victory over the forces of evil.

These issues were tackled by a film that many critics saw as ‘popcorn entertainment,’ an entertaining but brainless excuse to visit the Caribbean for a few hours. “Nonsense, you say. Of course it’s nonsense—pure escapist bunk, with Bond . . . doing everything (and everybody) that an idle day-dreamer might like to do.”⁸ Because *Dr. No* is escapist entertainment, there was very little doubt that Bond would manage to defeat Dr. No, save the American space race, and sleep with Honey Ryder as a bonus. He was able to succeed in a fashion unburdened by reality, infiltrating an island near Cuba, single-handedly destroying a secret base, and escaping without international incident. He accomplished what the American government had not been able to do. He could police America’s soft underbelly and keep the West safe from threat—all while wearing a sneer, a suit, and his Walther PPK. *Dr. No* evoked relevant fears gnawing at the confidence of Americans while solving them in clear, unrealistic, and satisfying ways.

“Brave, but on the Whole Stupid.”

While *Dr. No* centered its fears around the American space race and their “soft underbelly,” *From Russia with Love*, the second film adaptation of James Bond, returns the concerns to continental Europe, specifically Turkey.⁹ Turkey had often served as a symbolic bridge between West & East, and in the Cold War, the status of Turkey was a consistent hot-button issue. The placement of American nuclear missiles in Turkey was the catalyst for Soviet placement of missiles in Cuba, and a secret agreement to the end of the Cuban Missile Crisis was the removal of American missiles from Turkey.¹⁰ Furthermore, Moscow viewed Turkey’s links to the West with apprehension and consistently warned that if it came to war, Turkey

⁸ Bosley Crowther, “The Screen: *Dr. No*, Mystery Spoof,” *The New York Times*, May 30, 1963, accessed October 1, 2013 through the Historic New York Times Database Online.

⁹ In *From Russia with Love* (1964), Bond is sent to Istanbul to assist in the defection of a beautiful cypher clerk, Tatiana Romanova, who insists on only defecting, and bringing along a lektor, to James Bond in person. Unbeknownst to Bond, he is being manipulated by the evil SPECTRE, who want to create conflict between the West and the Soviet Union, steal the cypher for themselves, and kill Bond in revenge for his victory against Dr. No. Bond succeeds in escaping Istanbul and several assassination attempts with his life, Tatiana’s love, and the important lektor.

¹⁰ Jim Hershberg, “Anatomy of a Controversy: Antoly F. Dobrynin’s Meeting with Robert F. Kennedy, Saturday, 27 October 1962,” *The Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 5 (1995), accessed October 23, 2013 from the National Security Archive at The George Washington University, http://www2.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/cuba_mis_cri/moment.htm

would be the first nation attacked.¹¹ When Americans saw that Istanbul and the volatile Balkans were the primary settings of *From Russia with Love*, the implications for the balance of power were clear. The movie was set in one of the strategic lynchpins of the Cold War. Just like in *Dr. No*, Bond had to operate in ways that Americans, due to their agreements to remove strategic assets from Turkey, could not do without another international incident.

The presence of SPECTRE as the primary antagonist served to further expand the threats and echo the changing tone of the Cold War. In the novel, the primary antagonist is SMERSH, a branch of the KGB that serves as a direct Soviet antagonist to Bond. For the movie, the villains had to be changed to reflect the changes in political climate. Since the end of the Cuban Missile Crisis, both Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev stated desires for coexistence, and because of that, “the Russians could no longer be the heavies.”¹² Instead, the screenwriters took a hard look at the fragility of the global system and turned to a villain that sought to “exploit the fragility of relations between the East and West.”¹³ The stated goals of SPECTRE in the film were to foment misunderstandings and suspicion among the superpowers, which super villain Ernst Stravro Blofeld called “brave, but on the whole stupid.”¹⁴ Blofeld desired to escalate the war for personal gain, using the two superpowers to weaken each other so that he could achieve favorable results, but the logical end of schemes like his might have resulted in “the very type of global conflagration the viewing audience would most fear.”¹⁵ The fragility of the global system and the ability of smaller and non-aligned actors to affect change and create discord was on the forefront of the minds of Americans when they finally saw the film. Five months before, Lee Harvey Oswald had assassinated President John F. Kennedy in Dallas. American memory of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the assassination of a President by a Soviet sympathizer, and the conspiracy theories already forming around it all highlighted how fragile the standoff was, and how many chances there were for escalation and calamity.

Into that cauldron of possibilities stepped Bond, more attractive and effective than the viewers last saw him. In *From Russia with Love*, Bond

¹¹ *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 14:5; quoted in Kenneth L. Hill, *Cold War Chronology: Soviet-American Relations, 1945-1991* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1998), 126.

¹² Steven Jay Rubin, *The James Bond Movies: A Behind the Scenes History* (Norwalk, CT: Arlington House, 1981), 25.

¹³ Bennett and Woollacott, *Bond and Beyond*, 33.

¹⁴ *From Russia with Love*, producers, Albert Broccoli and Harry Saltzman, director, Terrence Young, (United Artists, 1963, Digital Video Disc), 0.12.20.

¹⁵ Mulvihill, “The Golden Age of Bond,” 342.

succeeded in defeating a conspiracy aimed at igniting new conflict, capturing a Soviet encryption device, turning a woman's fake defection into a real one with the sheer power of his charm (and capitalist luxury), and ending the film with the West having scored a strategic victory over the Soviets without directly competing with them. Bond again served as the perfect agent of Western power, defeating Red Grant, the imposing specimen sent to kill him, and seducing Tatiana Romanova to the point that she acted quickly to kill a fellow comrade, Rosa Klebb. James Mulvihill wrote, "Romanova represents a hopeful example of what can happen when a Soviet individual interacts with...the forces of good."¹⁶ Through his interactions with the grim specter of SPECTRE and the alluring Soviet Tatiana Romanova, Bond represented the fears and hopes of an American public in the beginning of the thawing Cold War. He faced criminal conspiracies and forces aimed at destabilizing a *détente* established after a narrow avoidance of a global nuclear war, but also managed to seduce a model Soviet communist to the side of the West, and Western values and politics. He was an explicit reminder that the Western world was on the side of angels. In Bond's world, every Soviet wanted the goods and the freedom that Bond represented. He was an assurance that given the choice, the communists would come willingly to the West, and that, despite the horror and instability the movie-goers had faced, they would win, if only they acted like Bond. As one 1963 article from the *Times of London* stated, "He has the courage, and the physical equipment, to do without thinking what most of us feel we might be doing."¹⁷ He provided a guide to salvation for a worried and paralyzed public.

"Raymond Shaw is the Kindest, Bravest, Warmest, most Wonderful Human Being I've Ever Known in My Life."

When moviegoers went to watch *The Manchurian Candidate*, they had no guarantees there would be a world when the movie ended. *The Manchurian Candidate* was released on October 24, 1962, the same day Soviet Premier Khrushchev wrote a letter to President Kennedy stating the American blockade was "an act of aggression propelling human kind into the abyss of a world nuclear-missile war."¹⁸ *The Manchurian Candidate* echoed many of the fears found in *From Russia with Love*, namely, the fear that the conflict itself was the problem. In

¹⁶ Mulvihill, "The Golden Age of Bond," 349.

¹⁷ "Four Just Men Rolled into One," *The Times* (London), October 10, 1963, accessed October 23, 2013

¹⁸ "Khrushchev Letter to President Kennedy (Moscow October 24, 1962," Library of Congress. Retrieved October 23, 2013.

From Russia with Love, non-state actors used the conflict between the East and West to sow dissent and gain profit, but the outlook in *The Manchurian Candidate* was even bleaker. The film's plot shows a far-right McCarthy stand-in nearly becoming the President thanks to his Soviet agent wife and her programmed assassin son.¹⁹ It is only thanks to the heroism of the hero Benedict Marco and his recollections of the brainwashing he and Raymond Shaw received that the communist plot was thwarted through an assassination and on-camera suicide at the party convention.²⁰ *The Manchurian Candidate* offered a chilling glimpse at the danger of the two sides of the conflict, and how both were equally capable of manipulation by unscrupulous powers.

As *The Manchurian Candidate* premiered, Americans were witnessing the climax of nearly two decades of vitriolic rhetoric from both sides of the Cold War. There was a genuine fear that political ideology and hard-line tactics would lead to nuclear holocaust. *The Manchurian Candidate* offered little solace to the movie-going public. Instead, it critiqued the system that put the world on the brink of destruction. In *The Manchurian Candidate*, "any modest distinctions between the Communists and the anti-Communists...disappear."²¹ Both the communists and the hard-right politicians were portrayed as stupid, lazy, and using ideology as an excuse to gain power. In doing this, the *Manchurian Candidate* was attacking the politics of the 1950s. McCarthyism and the John Birch Society had been a powerful force of ideology in the American political landscape. The ideological dichotomy these people and societies espoused was the target of *The Manchurian Candidate*. It sought to redirect the gaze of the American public to the dangers of both ideologies by using an over-the-top comparison of the dogmas on the American right and those on the communist left.

The equation of right-wing politicians with Soviet agents was thought to be satire by film critics. The exaggeration of the communist plot had "just enough

¹⁹ In *The Manchurian Candidate*, a squad of U.S. soldiers is captured and brainwashed by the North Koreans into believing one of their members, Raymond Shaw, had saved them all. They returned to the U.S. praising him as a hero. His stepfather was nominated for Vice President while Shaw was programmed by the North Koreans as an assassin. His mother was his controller, and planned to have him kill the Presidential nominee at the convention, giving her husband the Presidency. It took Benedict Marco breaking free of the brainwashing to foil the plot.

²⁰ George Axelrod and John Frankenheimer, producers, John Frankenheimer, director, *The Manchurian Candidate*, (United Artists, 1962) Digital Video Disc.

²¹ Jonathan Kirshner, "Subverting the Cold War in the 1960s: *Dr. Strangelove*, *The Manchurian Candidate*, and *Planet of the Apes*." *Journal of Film and History*, 31 (2001): 41.

imitation of reality to make it uncomfortable.”²² Bosley Crowther, the reviewer for *The New York Times*, was unsure of how to handle the film’s insistence to not satirize its point. The film explicitly compared the outrageousness of the right-wing politics of the United States to insane communist plots, challenging the viewers’ preconceived ideologies and assumptions. The film placed the blame for the continued escalation of rhetoric and conflict on adherents of both sides of the political spectrum and argued that the conflict, not either ideology, was the real evil. Neither side of the conflict could win, because neither side had the moral high ground. Both sides were vicious in their attacks on the other, and both sides were to blame for the current crisis the world was faced with. John Frankenheimer, the director of *The Manchurian Candidate*, stated “I wanted to do a picture about how ludicrous McCarthy-style far-right politics are and how dangerous the far-left is also, how they were really the same thing, and the idiocy of it all.”²³ This message left viewers discomfited about the current political reality and their place within its structure.

The Manchurian Candidate offered a blazing critique of the system of Cold War rhetoric and conflict-oriented thinking that pervaded both the far right and the far left. Eventually, mainstream opinion would indict the ideological constraints and zero-sum system of interaction in the Cold War as ultimately destructive to both sides, but *The Manchurian Candidate* said that at a time when “people could still get in trouble for saying the wrong thing.”²⁴ It “ridiculed both [sides] and trivialized their conflict, asserting that the differences between them were meaningless.”²⁵ *The Manchurian Candidate* was on the front edge of this view, but its withdrawal from circulation after the Kennedy assassination kept it from having sustained influence on the American imagination. That role would be fulfilled by a little black comedy about nuclear annihilation.

“Gentlemen! You Can’t Fight in Here. This is the War Room!”

Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb was released in January of 1964, and like *Dr. No* before it, the film centered on the

²² Bosley Crowther, “Twisting Truth: New Sinatra Film Slips out of Bounds,” *The New York Times*, November 4, 1962.

²³ Gerald Pratley, *The Films of John Frankenheimer*, (Cranbury, NJ: Lehigh University Press, 1998), 40.

²⁴ Kirshner, “Subverting the Cold War in the 1960s,” 40.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

danger of the nuclear race's potential climax.²⁶ Unlike *Dr. No*, the film was not concerned with the United States falling behind in the missile gap or the space race, or with concerns that communists were poised to strike at the "soft underbelly" of the United States. Instead, *Dr. Strangelove* was principally concerned with "the Cold War itself, and the moral equivalence, and folly, of both sides."²⁷ It, like *The Manchurian Candidate*, saw the Cold War as an ultimately destructive conflict where there were no winners.

The attitudes of the authority figures were caricatures of similar sentiments expressed, without irony, by US officials around the time of the movie's release. General Buck Turgidson, the top Air Force official briefing the President in *Dr. Strangelove*, acknowledged that if the US were to commence with a first strike it would "get its hair mussed," which was his way of calmly condemning ten to twenty million Americans to nuclear death.²⁸ While undoubtedly an exaggeration meant to prove the absurdity of 'winning' a nuclear war, the sentiment "hit uncomfortably close to home for some elements of the Air Force at the time."²⁹ At the end of the film, as the doomsday device was being activated, politicians in the War Room lamented America's perceived gap in the mine-shaft race, mocking common fears about the Americans falling behind the Russians in the so-called "missile gap" and satirizing the fear of nuclear missiles that underlies *Dr. No*. That particular comment was a reference to a campaign tactic used by John F. Kennedy, accusing President Eisenhower, and by proxy Vice President Nixon, of falling behind in the missile race. When Kennedy became President, defense spending skyrocketed, even though the new Defense Secretary Robert McNamara found that no such gap existed.³⁰ *Dr. Strangelove* was mocking the fears that underpinned earlier movies while acknowledging the real fears of nuclear destruction, but destruction based upon equal incompetence from both sides of the conflict rather than the one.

²⁶ *Dr. Strangelove* centers around an unhinged SAC general who believes he's uncovered a plot by the Soviets to poison American water, and orders a first strike. In the War Room in DC, the President's advisors are circling through codes to call off the attack, and are informed that the Soviet Union has created a doomsday device that automatically triggers when a nuclear device hits the U.S.S.R. The film ends with the lone bomber not recalled dropping a bomb on the Soviet Union, ensuring global nuclear annihilation, and an American plan to retreat to the mineshafts to wait out the coming nuclear winter.

²⁷ Kirshner, "Subverting the Cold War," 41.

²⁸ Stanley Kubrick, producer and director, *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*, (Columbia Pictures, 1964) Digital Video Disc.

²⁹ Kirshner, "Subverting the Cold War," 42.

³⁰ "Defense: The Missile Gap Flap," *Time*, February 17, 1961: 12-13.

Deconstructing the film's themes illustrates striking similarities between the Soviet and American leadership. "Turgidson may attempt to clumsily plant a camera on the Russian Ambassador, but it does not matter because the Russian has one of his own,"³¹ observes Jonathan Kirshner. Stanley Kubrick's denunciation of the American school of thought did nothing to laud the Russians. In the film, the American general staff learned that the Russians had a "doomsday device" only after there were nuclear bombs headed towards Russia. The Russian Premier had kept the existence of the device a secret (thus defeating the entire point of Mutually Assured Destruction) because he liked surprises. However, the Russians were not denounced for creating a doomsday device. Instead, the Americans "wish[ed] they had one."³² Repeatedly Kubrick reminded viewers that very little substantive difference existed between the two sides. Both were irrational and insane in their own ways. Kubrick "ha[d] managed to explode the right-wing position without making a single left-wing affirmation."³³ Using satire, he made it clear that neither side of the Cold War debate had it right. Before the movie came out, it was referred to as a topical farce, and not expected to have the cultural impact it did. Instead of a farce, theatergoers were subjected to a scathing takedown of the stupidity and childish competition at the core of the Cold War. Kubrick, an Englishman writing and directing in England, was able to examine the competition from a slight distance, and used humor to highlight how dangerous a game the Americans and Soviets were playing.

When Americans went to see *Dr. Strangelove*, they had spent the last several years finding new threats to be terrified of. The opening up of the Cold War in America's backyard, the threat of missiles in the Caribbean, and the fear of their government's inability to stop them from being killed were all on American minds when they sat down to watch Kubrick's work. *Dr. Strangelove* assures them that there was only one overarching fear they need worry about: fear that their leaders and the Soviet leaders were insane, incompetent fools who would destroy the world "over political differences that will seem as meaningless to people a hundred years from now as the theological conflicts of the middle ages seem to us today."³⁴ In this way, *Dr. Strangelove* signaled a call to move past the "Us vs Them" mentality that had held the country in its grip since the end of the second World War and steer toward a relationship less conducive to bringing about the apocalypse.

³¹ Kirshner, "Subverting the Cold War," 42.

³² *Dr. Strangelove*.

³³ Robert Brustein, "Out of This World," *New York Review of Books*, 1 (1964): 4.

³⁴ Norman Kagan, *The Cinema of Stanley Kubrick*, (New York: Continuum, 1989), 111.

The early 1960s in America brought about a rapid paradigm shift in the understanding of the Cold War and its presentation in popular film. Whereas throughout the 1950s demagoguery, witch hunts, and red-baiting were the modus operandi, and popular culture reflected that anxiety, Americans in the 1960s were confronted with new questions concerning the political climate. Movies such as *Dr. No* and *From Russia with Love* explored new fronts of the Cold War, simultaneously addressing the unease Americans felt while providing them with a safe catharsis. Concurrently, movies like *The Manchurian Candidate* and *Dr. Strangelove* challenged the ideology of the Cold War, comparing far-right conservative politics to the communists. All films forced Americans to rethink the nature of the Cold War and their role within it. They challenged the notion that Americans were a people immune to dangerous ideology and forced people to consider that the conflict was the problem. These four movies, which premiered in the United States within two years of each other, each found new questions to ask of the Cold War. They helped Americans deal with their unease and fears while driving them to reexamine the construction of the conflict they were trapped in.

Bibliography

- Axelrod, George and John Frankenheimer, producers. John Frankenheimer, director. *The Manchurian Candidate*. United Artists, 1962.
- Bennett, Tony and Janet Woollacott. *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero*. London: MacMillan Education, 1987.
- Broccoli, Albert, and Harry Saltzman, producers. Terrence Young, director. *Dr. No*. United Artists, 1962.
- Broccoli, Albert, and Harry Saltzman, producers. Terrence Young, director. *From Russia with Love*. United Artists, 1963.
- Brustein, Robert. "Out of This World." *New York Review of Books*. 1964.
- Crowther, Bosley. "Twisting Truth: New Sinatra Film Slips out of Bounds," *The New York Times*. November 4, 1962.
- Crowther, Bosley. "The Screen: Dr. No, Mystery Spoof." *The New York Times*, May 30, 1963.
- _____. "Defense: The Missile Gap Flap." *Time Magazine*. February 17, 1961.
- _____. "Four Just Men Rolled into One." *The Times (London)*. October 10, 1963.
- Hershberg, Jim. "Anatomy of a Controversy: Antoly F. Dobrynin's Meeting with Robert F. Kennedy, Saturday, 27 October 1962." *The Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 5 (1995).
- Hill, Kenneth L. *Cold War Chronology: Soviet-American Relations, 1945-1991*. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1998.
- Kagan, Norman. *The Cinema of Stanley Kubrick*. New York: Continuum, 1989.
- Kirshner, Jonathan. "Subverting the Cold War in the 1960s: Dr. Strangelove, The Manchurian Candidate, and Planet of the Apes." *Journal of Film and History* 31 (2001).

Kubrick, Stanley, producer and director. *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*. Columbia Pictures, 1964.

_____. "Khrushchev Letter to President Kennedy, Moscow October 24, 1962." Library of Congress.

Mulvihill, James. "The Golden Age of Bond: Creation of a Cold War Popular Hero (1962-1965) Part II." *International Journal of Instructional Media* 28 (2001).

Pratley, Gerald. *The Films of John Frankenheimer*. Cranbury, NJ: Lehigh University Press, 1998.

Price, Thomas J. "The Changing Image of the Soviets in the Bond Sage: From Bond-Villains to 'Acceptable Role Partners.'" *Journal of Popular Culture* 26 (1992).

Rubin, Steven Jay. *The James Bond Movies: A Behind the Scenes History*. Norwalk, CT: Arlington House, 1981.