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Abstract

This article uses the male cultural phenomenon that is The Beatles as a text through which to examine changing representations of men and masculinities at a particular historical moment, illustrating the ways in which the Beatles’ film *Help!* (1965) represents the re-imagining of what is meant to be an English man in the mid 1960s, containing, as it does, discourses which challenge notions of masculinity prevalent of the time. Discourses around hair, clothing, physical appearance and style are at work in the text. It also raises questions about ‘establishment’ values and the link between male identity and work which, up to that point, had been central to the male cinematic identity. The text also references ideas around upward mobility prevalent at the time of its production and argues that The Beatles provide a focus for debates around men and masculinity given their global popularity which was partly achieved through the medium of film.
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Introduction – The Beatles

The Beatles – John Lennon, Paul McCartney, George Harrison and Ringo Starr – were, arguably, the most photographed, listened to, high-profile men on the planet in the 1960s. Evans (1984:7) has described them as ‘the most important single element in British popular culture in the post-war years’, while Mäkelä (2004:237) states:

‘It is notable that as early as 1964 The Beatles had conspicuously expanded from being a music group to a highly mediated and circulated product … The Beatles’ early fame was underpinned not only by music, albeit it remained at the centre of their celebrity, but by appearances in different media forms and situations, as in comic television shows and films’.

Inglis (2000) has made an exploration of this cultural phenomenon in one of the few academic texts on The Beatles while elsewhere The Beatles’ as a global cultural phenomenon and their significance in terms of representations of masculinity in the period known as the sixties has been explored (King, 2013).

Here it is the intention to examine one of the ‘products’ mentioned by Mäkelä (2004), The Beatles’ second feature film Help! (1965), in relation to changing representations of men and masculinity this period. The filmic text provides an example of the way in which The Beatles, through the global commodification of their image, often ignored but equally as important as their music, helped to re-imagine what it meant to be an English man in the 1960s.
Masculinity and Cinema

In introducing a screening of Gone With The Wind (1939) for a series on TCM in 2004, broadcaster Stephen Fry described Clark Gable as Rhett Butler as ‘the epitome of masculinity’. The notion of masculinity as rugged, manly and associated with ‘traditional’ ideas about the male role has always had currency in the cinema. Spicer (1999) has examined representation of masculinity in British cinema since 1945, producing a range of varying masculinities; the gentleman, the action adventurer, the everyman, fools and rogues and rebel males to name but a few (Spicer, 1999). He argues that these types represent different social constructions of masculinity and that they embody beliefs about power, authority, nationality and class (Spicer, 1999). Male stars of the 1940s equated with Fry’s views on Clark Gable; macho heroic, daredevil swashbucklers or English gentlemen. The importance of the war film to British cinema in the 1950s brought to the fore the quiet yet heroic, stoic Englishman, epitomised by Kenneth More. However, the emergence of the portrayal of working class masculinity on the screen in the late 1950s (Segal, 1988; Spicer, 1999) brought the issue of class and upward mobility to the fore and it is within the context of the period that Marwick (1998) refers to as the long sixties (1958 – 1974) that this paper examines the role of The Beatles in re-imagining and reimagining the English man on the cinema screen.

Culturalist Approaches

Culturalist approaches to the examination of masculinity are marked by a shift from production to consumption and the concept of the commodification of masculinity (Edwards, 1997). These approaches take, as a starting point, the idea of consumption as traditionally associated with the feminine rather than the masculine:
‘The equation of fashion with the feminine, with the not masculine, with the effeminate, as well as with the homosexual, remains a chain of socially constructed and perpetuated links that are decidedly difficult to overcome.’

(Edwards, 1997:4)

This approach is, therefore, aligned with that of the social constructionists (Burr, 2003) but culturalist approaches also draw on other areas of the academy, drawing further ideas from fashion, art and design and media and cultural studies. The focus on image and representation is, therefore, vitally important (Edwards, 2006) and this links to ideas on ‘the gaze’ in relation to the male body (Mulvey, 1975; Cohan, 1993; Neale, 1993).

Several authors see the social changes of the 1980s, and the associated rise in production and consumption of men’s fashion, as a key period in which the objectification of the male body in film, TV and advertising becomes more visible and, therefore, see this period as key to the production of different conceptualisations of masculinities (Mort, 1996; Edwards, 1997; Nixon, 1997).

While the 1980s provides a focus and a starting point for many culturalist approaches, a number of authors provide a comprehensive history of the development of the male as consumer as context (Mort, 1996; Osgerby, 2001; Edwards, 2006). This includes work by Mort (1996) on the rising importance of advertising targeting men in the late 1950s and by Osgerby (2001) [drawing on work by Ehrenreich, 1983] which looks at the rise of Playboy magazine and the male consumer creating a new culturalist discourse around masculinity.
Much of this work is pertinent to the discussion of the representations of masculinities at work in The Beatles’ films (King, 2013). Both Mort (1996) and Edwards (1997) provide a history of the development of male fashion which pre-dates the 1950s and this is also relevant to the discussion of images of men in the 1960s. For example, it will be argued here that Simpson’s (2004) 1990s’ invention, the metrosexual, is pre-empted by The Beatles in Help! (1965), and that their style, appearance and artefact-filled homosocial living space, coupled with their ‘playboy’ lifestyle, makes them metrosexual before it had been invented.

**Representations of the Beatles: The Beatles on film**

“… the real value of the British pop film is the light it sheds on a culture in transition and transformation.”

(Medhurst, 1995: 61)

Here the intention is to briefly outline the way in which the Beatles’ films provide an opportunity to examine their representation and act as a way of exploring changing representations of men and masculinities in the 1960s. Hearn (1992) sees film as a relevant medium for the examination of men and masculinities, while Edwards (2008: 157) states:

‘movies have rarely received much serious study within the world of sociology and social science, or even sexual politics, while studies of masculinity still tend to see analysis of such popular cultural texts as films as rather small or trivial fry…’

Medhurst (1995), however, has argued the case for the pop film, in particular, as cultural artefact and as a way of examining social change stating “… the real value of the British pop film is the light it sheds on a culture in transition and transformation.” (Medhurst, 1995:61).
The 1960s was the heyday of the British pop film (Medhurst, 1995; Carr 1996) yet these artefacts have been mainly ignored by British film theorists and historians. Neaverson (1997) sees this as a result of their ‘low-culture’ status and their generic categorisation with no real attempt to distinguish between those which blatantly set out to make a fast buck from the singing sensation of the day and those which have a more interesting approach and pedigree.\(^2\)

The Beatles’ films, then, have to a large extent been disregarded because of their positioning within this genre and have certainly not been subject to the critical and cultural analysis of their recorded works. Neaverson (1997: 1) regards the films as ‘the most neglected aspect of The Beatles’ output’ and ‘a historical footnote’ and beyond his work The Beatles Movies (1997) and Roy Carr’s The Beatles at the Movies (1996) there are no texts that deal specifically with the films.

Lack of availability has also been an issue. Despite the Beatles Anthology TV series (1996) and subsequent DVD box set (2003), repackaged versions of the films have been slow to arrive. A Hard Day’s Night (1964) became available on DVD in 2003 while a remastered boxed set of Help! (1965) appeared in 2007. Magical Mystery Tour (1967) and Let it Be (1970) are still not available on DVD. Let it Be (1970) did not even receive a video release and has not been seen on TV since the 1970s.

However, the films are a key part of the Beatles’ legacy. Firstly, they provide texts in which to look at and study the to-be-looked-at-ness (Mulvey, 1975: 18) of the Beatles at various points throughout the 1960s. Neaverson (2000: 152) states ‘… their films were vital in communicating and showcasing the group’s ever-changing array of images, attitudes, ideas and musical styles’. The Beatles can be read as truly McLuhanite (McLuhan, 1964;
MacDonald, 2003) in that their fame coincided with an expansion of global media (Gripsrud, 2002) and the films are a central part of their ability to reach the global audience particularly in this historical period. Hoberman (2003) outlines the relationship between US politics, social change and a number of films produced in the 1960s, the films reflecting what he terms ‘the dream life’ (Hoberman, 2003) of the 1960s. In many ways it can be argued that the films of the Beatles can be read as a kind of dream-like version of the 1960s, a way of reflecting on the realities of social change mediated through a fantasy version of what the Beatles actually were. Much of Hoberman’s (2003) analysis centres on hegemony (Gramsci, 1971), the clashing of value-sets in general and on hegemonic masculinity (Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1995; Hearn, 2004) and masculinism (Brittan, 1989) at work in film texts and US politics of the 1960s.

The first two Beatles films, in particular, are central to the rise of Beatlemania as a global phenomenon (Neaverson, 1997; Stark, 2005). Their creative involvement and financing of the later films, combined with director Dick Lester’s range of ideas at work in A Hard Day’s Night (1964) and Help! (1965) reflect their status of ‘men of ideas’ (Inglis, 2000 : 1). These two films, in particular, Neaverson (1997 : 177) sees as ‘thoughtful, anarchic and joyous’ with an ‘anarchic freedom’ (Neaverson, 1997 : 119) in keeping with the social changes and ideas of the time. Their stylistic dissimilarity and experimental nature mirrors their approach to album marking in many ways and, yet, it is not recognised in the same way. Musical producer and arranger George Martin has often been quoted as saying they never wanted to do the same thing twice and were always looking for new ideas (The Beatles, 2000). Victor Spinetti, who starred in three of the four films, describes them as ‘eternal students’ (Neaverson, 1997 : 118) always wanting to learn more about their craft. Despite United Artists’ initial interest stemming from the ‘fast-buck, exploit them while it lasts and a sell a
million soundtrack albums’ approach, all the films avoid the formulaic approach and are
decidedly anti-Hollywood in their varying formats (Neaverson, 1997).
The films also bookend an interesting period in UK/US relations around film production with
large US film companies, like United Artists, keen to invest in the British film industry in the
early 1960s, while the end of the Beatles as a working group, at the close of the decade,
coincided with a decline in US investment. Neaverson (1997 : 2000) reads this as significant
in that the symbiotic relationship between the Beatles and the 1960s can be seen as the reason
that the UK was culturally ‘fashionable’ in this period. The Beatles’ films and those by other
groups involved in the ‘British invasion’ of the US around 1964/5 (Sandbrook, 2005) were
an important way of reaching an audience in the States beyond those who could get to live
shows.\footnote{\textsuperscript{4}}

As texts they also transcend the period in which they were made. Given their popularity of
the Beatles with second and third generation audiences and their continued global fame, the
films still provide an opportunity for new audiences to look at the Beatles and given the
increasingly retro nature of the fashion and music industries their ‘look’ in all four of their
films can be read a strangely contemporary.\footnote{\textsuperscript{5}}

**The Beatles in Help! (1965)**

Production on the Beatles’ second film *Help!* (1965) started on 23\textsuperscript{rd} February 1965, produced
by Walter Shenson, with a ‘big’ budget of £400,000 and directed by Richard Lester. Since
making The Beatles’ first feature film, *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), Lester had been
successful at the prestigious Cannes Film Festival with *The Knack* (1965), a London- based
swinging Sixties comedy starring Rita Tushingham and a young Michael Crawford. Lester
brought in Charles Wood, who had written the screenplay for *The Knack* (1965), having
already commissioned a screenplay from Mark Behm who had worked on *Charade* (1964), a popular comedy thriller featuring Hollywood royalty Cary Grant and Audrey Hepburn. The addition of a highly experienced team of comic British actors, including Victor Spinetti, Eleanor Bron and Leo McKern, who also brought with them the gravitas of theatre, added to the impression that this was no run-of-the-mill British pop movie (Carr, 1996) but rather a suitable vehicle for the Beatles as they made the transition from mop-top pop stars to ‘men of ideas’ (Inglis, 2000:1) surrounded by creative and experienced professionals.

Neaverson (1997) argues that *Help!* (1965) is a film starring the Beatles as opposed to a film about the Beatles, a position contested retrospectively by the Beatles themselves who claimed to have felt like extras in their own film (The Beatles, 2000). McKinney (2003: 72) describes *Help!* (1965) as ‘a comic strip of what the Beatles’ real lives were becoming’. Their position as ‘a moving bulls eye for a band of religious zealots’ (McKinney, 2003: 72), for example, predicts the ‘bigger than Jesus’ religious furore of 1966, in which John Lennon’s statement that The Beatles were bigger than Jesus caused a violent backlash in the United States (Stark, 2005). *Help!* (1965) is essentially about the attempts of a rogue Eastern religious cult to retrieve a sacrificial ring sent to Ringo by a fan (‘an Eastern bird’). Here, fear, and general threats of violence (McKinney, 2003), jostle with discourses of escape and upward mobility. There is some continuity with the first film, *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), in this sense. The hordes of girls pursuing the Beatles in the first film are replaced by a representation of ‘the shadow of the female over the Beatles’ (McKinney, 2003:78) in the form of the Goddess Kali, to whom Ringo is to be sacrificed. There is a suggestion of violence as a result of adoration and obsession (McKinney, 2003) which would play out in the reality of the 1966 tours and Lennon’s death in 1980. Thus, the predatory female of the Northern kitchen sink
drama (Segal, 1988) becomes an exotic goddess, yet still provides a ‘disturbing undercurrent’ (McKinney, 2003: 83) to the Technicolor escapism that is Help! (1965).

A Technicolor International Travelogue

The increased budget for Help! (1965) meant that the film would be shot in colour. However, rather than hark back to the early 1960s’ Brit-pop musical the Technicolor Help! (1965) pre-empts other key 1960s’ texts such as Batman and The Avengers (Topping, 1998; Chapman, 2000) and the use of colour is important in terms of the representation of emerging versions and alternative discourses of masculinity at this point in the 1960s. As an ‘elaborate fantasy film’ (Neaverson, 1997:34) it is part of a shift in British film making, a North-South shift, away from the new wave Northern drama of the early 1960s (Stafford, 2001). This shift also reflects changes in the representation of men in the cinema in this period, from men at work, trapped by work and responsibility in the grim North, to men at play in the swinging South (Spicer, 1999; Stafford, 2001).

This shift from reality to fantasy is reflected in the Beatles’ first appearance in Help! (1965). Following the opening sequence, in which they do not appear, they are seen in black and white, wearing black roll neck sweaters, dark trousers and Beatle boots in what looks like an outtake from A Hard Day’s Night (1964) but is, in fact, a cine film of the group performing the song Help! (1965), watched by cult leader Chang and his followers, with the ring, central to the plot, visible on Ringo Starr’s finger. The next time they appear they are in colour. Like Dorothy in The Wizard of Oz (1939) they have travelled from the black and white ‘reality’ of Kansas (read Liverpool) to the Technicolor fantasy world of Oz (read pot-fuelled swinging London, 1965), with the implication that other men could make this journey too. Help! (1965) is itself a representation of this shift. The Beatles are seen at play in an
international travelogue, no longer ground down by the gruelling touring schedule represented in *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), the ordinary replaced by the extraordinary, a reflection of their ‘real’ lives, having moved from Liverpool to London in late 1964.

Neaverson (1997) describes how British cinema moved from North to South in this period with the resultant colour films being ‘increasingly London based, light-hearted and ‘international’ in both style and subject matter.’ (Neaverson, 1997:34-5). In this sense *Help!* (1965) can be read as a cultural text of its time with the Beatles, as men, at the centre of an emerging consumerist and upwardly mobile lifestyle, a key discourse throughout the film. It is a Technicolor travelogue, exotic, in retrospect vaguely racist (Ingham, 2003), with a hint of adventure movie, the Bond cycle and something of a *Carry On* Britishness about it. However, it is also peppered with drug references for the emerging ‘in’ crowd. Above all, it is international, with settings in ‘swinging’ London, Austria and the Bahamas, mixing James Bond with the upward mobility thesis of the 1960s (Sandbrook, 2005).

The mood, settings and international style of *Help!* (1965), borrowed from the Bond cycle, is crucial in establishing a discourse of masculinity which is resistant to the hegemonic (Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1995; Hearn, 2004). Foulkes (1996a) sees the Bond films as introducing the audience to the possibility of long distance travel and exotic locations years before it became a reality for ordinary men (Sandbrook, 2005). He goes on to describe the Bond cycle of films as part of the post war affluent, feel-good atmosphere of the early 1960s, with Bond as a member of ‘the international set’ (Foulkes, 1996a: 62) *Help!* (1965) draws on this in establishing the Beatles as part of the international set, with art mirroring life to a certain extent. Their extraordinariness and the exotic freedoms it brings is a key theme of *Help!* (1965). Their ‘freedom’ is established in the film by their lifestyle and their portrayal
as part of ‘the jet set’, with the ability to leave behind the mundane for the exotic at a moment’s notice.

The portrayal of Bond in the early Sean Connery films draws very much on traditional ‘Hollywood’ masculinity in his dealings with women and villains. Fiske (1992) asserts that the male Hollywood hero embodies patriarchal capitalism. Connery’s Bond is a good example of this. Bond’s contested portrayal of masculinity continues to present material for debate. The release of Quantum of Solance in 2008 prompted an article by Rohrer (2008), in the BBC News Magazine, reviewing the evidence. This included Paul Johnson’s review of Fleming’s Dr No novel in 1958 entitled ‘Sex, Snobbery and Sadism’, interpreting Bond’s masculinism (Brittan, 1989) as something loathsome, Kingsley Amis’ assertion that Bond’s relationship to ‘foreign’ villains is about Britain’s cultural hegemony (Gramsci, 1971) at a time of developing world power, and Professor James Chapman’s view that the films remain ideologically unsound as racist, heterosexist, xenophobic texts (Rohrer, 2008). Early 1960s’ Bond, while certainly containing these elements, has also been interpreted as representing something else for men and the representation of masculinities. McInerney (1996), for example, writing from a US perspective, argues that his persona also represented a new kind of stylish masculinity and that his sophistication, urbanity and Europeanism were seen as positive (rather than sexually suspect) attributes. He sees Bond as a new kind of role model ‘a cultured man who knew how to navigate a wine list … and how to seduce women’ (McInerney, 1996:36).

Connery’s working class roots (he had been a truck driver like Elvis [Sullivan, 1996]) meant that his portrayal of Bond reflected something of the upward-mobility thesis of the times (and a contrast to the more traditional gentlemen-hero of the Fleming novels). Like John, Paul,
George and Ringo, Connery as Bond reflected the mood of times and his visual appearance – single breasted suits – ‘the modern man’s preferred choice’ (Foulkes, 1996b:96) or modern casual attire, his elegant Aston Martin DB5 (McCartney and Harrison both owned one by the mid 1960s) and the many exotic mis-en-scenes of the Bond films represented male aspiration (Sandbrook, 2000). While the Beatles did not invent swinging 1960s’ cinema, *Help!* (1965) sees them planted firmly centre stage and thus enables a reading of changing representation of masculinity, at this point, through them.

**Escape**

If their first film, *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), showed moments of men ‘breaking out’ from the trappings of the indoor, work and screaming females, *Help!* (1965) can be read as a discourse of escape on a number of levels. Both the Bond and Michael Caine’s Harry Palmer films had presented male heroes who were fiercely heterosexual, children of Hefner’s 1950s’ vision of men reclaiming the indoors and their identity (Ehrenreich, 1983). The Beatles are presented in the same way here. The film, as a travelogue and a celebration of upward mobility, can be read as a fiction fantasy prompted by the Beatles’ own need to break out and escape from Beatlemania for a more sustained period. *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964) ends with the group being whisked off to yet another midnight matinee performance by minders Norm and Shake. *Help!* (1965) provided the opportunity for men at work to become men at play and to take advantage of their fame. McCartney (1989:47) recalls:

‘I remember one of the first conversations was, hey can’t we go somewhere sunny? … The Bahamas? Sure we could write a scene in where you go to the Bahamas. And skiing. We’d like to go skiing! It was like ordering up your holidays.’
This idea of men at play provides a sharp contrast to the idea of the male cinematic hero as defined by work/achievement, a role acted out by The Beatles themselves in their first film (King, 2013).

**Indoor Boys**

The ordinary yet extraordinary nature of the Beatles as men is established in a memorable early scene where they arrive in a limousine in a terraced street and walk up to the doors of four adjoining terraced houses (with red, green, blue and orange front doors). They are observed from across the road by two older women who discuss whether or not to wave: ‘they expect it, don’t they’ and then comment on their fame and extraordinary nature, a reference to Beatlemania and their household name status.

‘Lovely lads, and so natural. I mean, adoration hasn’t gone to their heads one jot, has it? You know what I mean … success? … still the same as they were before … not spoilt one bit, just ordinary lads.’

As they step through four separate front doors they enter one large communal room. The interior of the house represents a shift from the black and white reality of 1964 to the Technicolor hyper-reality of 1965 and the upward mobility of the Beatles, but also reflects, as does the film itself, a different potential lifestyle opening up for men in the mid-1960s and, consequently, can be read as a discourse around resistant masculinities. The house is filled with contemporary designer furniture – arc lamps, an Arne Jacobson egg chair, a Robin Day sofa (Jackson, 1994) – with a well stocked book case (from which Lennon takes [and kisses] his own book *A Spaniard in the Works* [Lennon, 1964]), an action which emphasises Inglis’ (2000:1) ‘men of ideas’ concept. It is also a fantasy world. Expectations created by the outside are subverted by the inside view. They are Hefner’s playboys (Ehrenreich, 1983)
reclaiming the indoors. As well as the upwardly-mobile designer furniture, the house also contains a number of surreal and displaced objects. A Wurlitzer organ, a number of vending machines along one wall and a set of American comics, all reflect the increasing influence of Americana on the UK (Hoggart, 1957).

Co-ordinated different coloured front doors, telephones and pyjamas for each Beatle indicates movement from the uniform dress of their Beatlemania period in *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), to a greater sense of individuality within the group. The colours on the walls are vibrant blues, purples and greens. They are men interested in their surroundings, creating a non-traditional male environment. But only men live there, in an environment that would not look out of place in a 21st century copy of *Elle Decoration*. While there is no real romantic plot, the presence of heroine Eleanor Bron and her meaningful looks to Paul McCartney and George Harrison, coupled with Lennon’s reported off-screen fascination with her (Carr, 1996), establishes their heterosexual credentials. The setting represents the idea of freedom, Ehrenreich’s (1983) male revolt. They are independent men living together. They have moved out of the family home, but not to get married, something that was to become increasingly common for men throughout the decade. The juxtaposition of contemporary furnishing and Americana creates an exotic location.

Their upward mobility as men is contextualised by their upward mobility as Beatles. As in their other films the Beatles represent a resistant version of masculinity (King, 2013). They are not like other men portrayed in the film. Their youth and vitality is juxtaposed with the world weariness of the older men they encounter; the police inspector, the jeweller, the scientist, a marching band and Royal Guardsmen at the Palace. These all provide a representation of a traditional masculine discourse, old order, ‘the establishment’ and the
Beatles’ encounters with them allow for a subversive dialogue with satirical digs at their masculinism (Brittan, 1989), against which we can read the Beatles’ version of resistant masculinity (Whitehead, 2002). The setting of the emerging swinging London (Melly, 1970) of 1965 acts as a focus for their ‘inside yet outside the establishment’ status. Iconic representations of the upper class are interspersed throughout the film. They are pursued by a Harrod’s van, seen in Asprey the jewellers and visit Scotland Yard. All the classic London landmarks appear in the film and, eventually they seek sanctuary in Buckingham Palace (actually filmed at Cliveden, setting for the Profumo scandal), a nod back to their success at the Royal Variety Performance in 1963 and a pre-cursor to their actual trip to the Palace later that year to receive their MBEs. This also represents the ultimate in upward mobility. The four ‘working class’ heroes, the most famous men in Britain, seemingly offered hospitality by the Monarch.

**Outdoor Boys**

The use of the indoor/outdoor juxtaposition (Petersen, 1998) is featured in *Help!* (1965). The outdoor scenes in the film (skiing in Austria, beaches in the Bahamas) represent breaking out and having fun. In their first film, *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), they achieved this by running about in a field. In *Help!* (1965) it is as if the world were their playground, McLuhan’s (1964) global village made (un)real in Lester’s fantasy travelogue. Lester uses the performance scenes in the film to build on the work he pioneered in the first feature with outdoor settings and their ‘breaking out’ implications replacing the confined indoor spaces of *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964). This is important in terms of representation. While the outdoors has provided the backdrop of the most masculine of film genres, the Western (Branston and Stafford, 1996), the Western’s rugged landscape for rugged men scenario is subverted by the Beatles’ feminized and narcissistic appearance (Cohan, 1993; Neale, 1993). In a scene where
the group are supposedly recording on Salisbury Plain, protected by the army from Ringo’s pursuing hordes, the group wear a ‘feminized’ version of military chic which can be read as subversive (Hebdidge, 1978). The resistant masculinities on display serve to undermine the phallic military tank symbolism. The whole idea of recording outdoors is surreal in itself, the military presence makes it more so and the scene pre-empts the Monty Python team’s juxtaposition of indoor objects in outdoor settings by several years. Harrison and Starr wear military jackets in the style of those that they would all wear for their appearance at New York’s Shea Stadium later that year (The Beatles, 2000). Starr also wears a huge military tam-o-shanter which gives his outfit a further air of camp.

A later scene showing the group skiing in the Alps sees McCartney sporting a zip up fur jacket, definitely of the unisex variety, while Harrison wears a top hat and cape and Starr and Lennon wear nautical caps. Again, these outfits challenge the traditional masculinism (Brittan, 1989) of the suit and tie and reflect changing options for men at the time. Their choice of halves of lager and lime as opposed to the traditional ‘male’ pint in another scene set in a London pub further adds to their upwardly-mobile, ‘feminized’ credentials.

**Men of Ideas**

Dick Lester’s direction provides some continuity with their previous film. Slapstick humour and silent-movie jump-cut comedy combine with the surreal – day-glo graphics, which sporadically appear, an indoor gardener cutting the indoor ‘grass’ with a set of wind-up false teeth, and an ‘intermission’ sequence, with the Beatles in an outdoor rural setting. In this sense the film looks backwards to Lester’s Goons connection but also forward to mid 1960s’ pop art TV (Chapman, 2000; Ingham 2003). Its influence and links with other TV
and film series of the time is also significant. Lennon is quoted as realizing in retrospect that Lester was ‘a bit ahead of his time with the Batman thing’ (Carr, 1996:64). Ingham (2003) sees its pop art style as highly influential on future US TV shows. The Beatles’ proximity as men of ideas (Inglis, 2000:1) to Lester as man of ideas is an important element in their 1960s’ journey. The style over substance approach apparent in Help! (1965) has also seen it linked to the cult TV series The Avengers (Topping, 1998), particularly the 1965-1967 Diana Rigg/Patrick MacNee phase, ‘when it abandoned any pretence of realism or seriousness and moved decisively in the direction of fantasy and tongue-in-cheek humour’ (Chapman, 2000:38). In his work on The Avengers, Chapman (2000) characterizes it as a key text of the 1960s, a window on what Marwick (1998) has termed the ‘high sixties’, and sees it as a hybrid of internationalisation (in terms of finance and production) and quintessential Englishness. The pastiche, intertextuality and post-modernism Chapman (2000) identifies in The Avengers, ‘the foregrounding of style over narrative and the very knowing and deliberate playing with generic conventions’ (Chapman, 2000:64), is also at work in Lester’s Help! (1965). Goldman (1988:219) sees the change of environment from Liverpool to London as significant.

‘Lennon was employing the new medium of the pop song like a serious artist, using it as a lens through which to scrutinize quietly and accurately the character of the strange new life he was experiencing in London’

The Beatles as Pre-Metrosexual

Mark Simpson’s late 20th century ‘discovery’ ‘the metrosexual’ has, it can be argued, its roots firmly in the mid 1960s and the Beatles in Help! (1965) can be read as metrosexual or, perhaps, pre-metrosexual. Simpson (2004:51) describes the typical metrosexual as
‘a young man with money to spend, living in or within easy reach of the metropolis
… they might be officially gay, straight or bisexual but this is utterly immaterial.’

Pre-dating Simpson’s (2004:51) ‘über metro poster boy’ David Beckham by almost 40 years,
the Beatles in Help! (1965) can be read as a representation of the development of further
feminisation (Cohan, 1993; Bruzzi, 1997) in men’s visual appearance, characterized by
increased hair length and a more dandified dress sense.

By 1965, the phrase unisex was in circulation via the mass media. Entrepreneurs like Mary
Quant and, more significantly for men, John Stephens, had invented the boutique as opposed
to the clothes shop (Marwick, 1998; Sandbrook, 2006), and ‘Carnaby Street’ became a
globally recognised ‘brand’ in itself, representing these new developments. The boutique
provided both young men and women with a multi-coloured, pop-soundtrack filled
environment in which to buy the latest fashions. The clothes worn by the Beatles in Help!
(1965) reflect this change for men, a development of the mod style of the early 1960s
(Hewitt, 2001) and a more ‘feminized’ look in many ways. The suits worn with coloured roll
neck sweaters, the introduction of coloured shirts, materials such as corduroy and denim and
the addition of capes and hats can all be seen as examples of early metrosexuality. Simpson
(2004) argues that while metrosexuality can be read as emasculation, or an opposition to
masculinism (Brittan, 1989) it can, at the same time, be read as liberating through its aesthetic
pleasures, and the Beatles’ visual appearance in Help! (1965) can be seen as a representation
of Stacey’s (1992) possibilities of pleasure, inherent in certain forms of masculinity.
This feminized (Cohan, 1993; Neale, 1993) pre-metrosexual look is on show throughout *Help!* (1965), particularly where Lester stops the action in order to gaze (Mulvey, 1975; Cohan, 1993; Neale, 1993) at the Beatles’ performance. *Help!* (1965) provides the opportunity for the audience to gaze at the Beatles at a number of points in the film. One early scene in the film shows the Beatles in the recording studio, a diegetic performance with non-diegetic moments, a good example of Lester’s experimental style. Beautifully lit (Ingham, 2003:197) and shot in soft focus with a blue filter, the addition of Ringo Starr’s cigarette smoke gives the whole scene an indoor jazz club feel and in-scene drug jokes (‘boys are you buzzing?’) reminding the audience that it is ‘swinging’ 1965. It is an invitation, via close up shots of heads, hands, hair, mouths and guitars, to look at the Beatles in their coloured shirts and polo neck casuals. This provides another example of the Beatles’ resistance to hegemonic masculinity (Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1995; Hearn, 2004). McKinney (2003:75) regards them in this scene as ‘posed merely for their magnificence as objects’, an example of Mulvey’s (1975:18) ‘to be looked at-ness’. However, it is through this position as objects to be looked at that their resistance to the traditional male film hero, with its connotations of masculinism (Brittan, 1989) and patriarchal capitalism (Fiske, 1992) is established. The other men in the scene - the studio engineers in the control room, attired in shirts and ties and dark rimmed 1950s’ style glasses - appear to belong to a different era, and to reflect Brittan (1989) and Fiske’s (1992) conceptualisation of traditional masculinity. Again the juxtaposition within the scene is crucial to an understanding of this state of affairs, and, indeed, to the way in which The Beatles re-imagined the English man at this point in the mid 1960s.

**Conclusion**
The exotic Technicolor travelogue that is *Help!* (1965), containing, as it does, discourses around upward mobility for the Beatles, and, by implication, other young mid-1960s men caught up in the classless society discourse prevalent at the time (Marwick, 1998; Sandbrook, 2006), is, then, a text which draws together a number of academic and popular ideas at work in UK society by the mid 1960s (Sandbrook, 2006; *forthcoming, 2012*). These discourses are constructed particularly through the mis-en-scene of the film, through its indoor pre-metrosexual (Simpson, 2004), pre-loft-living accommodation that the Beatles occupy early in the film, but, mainly, through the indoor/outdoor juxtapositioning (Petersen, 1998) which equates the outdoors with escape. This discourse is also at work in The Beatles’ first film, *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964), but appears to go into overdrive in *Help!* (1965), representing a reflection, to some extent, of the pace at which the Beatles’ own lives and global success had escalated between 1964 and 1965 (Norman, 1981; Stark, 2005).

*Help!* (1965) offers a second opportunity to look at and study the ‘to-be-looked-at-ness’ (Mulvey, 1975:18) of the Beatles on the big screen, and the more feminized (Cohan, 1993) visual appearance described here is significant in terms of changing representations of masculinity in this period. In *Help!* (1965) they are metrosexual (Simpson, 2004) before it had been invented (a post-modern idea if ever there was one). The camp codes and narcissism at work in *A Hard Day’s Night* (1964) are still in evidence (Neale, 1993; Shillinglaw, 1999) and the subtle differences in forms of appearance and attitudes which challenge the masculinism (Brittan, 1989) that surrounds them are on show in *Help!* (1965). It is a swinging sixties text (Stafford, 2001; Sandbrook, 2006) yet the Beatles are out on their own as the only ‘swinging’ characters in the film.
Its ‘swinging’ credentials are cemented by its intertextual relationship with other texts, such as the Bond films and *The Avengers* which also played with traditional discourses around class and gender (Chapman, 2000), an emergent transatlantic visual style and Lennon and McCartney’s appearance together, in the same year, in a photograph which seemed to blur the homosexual/homosocial boundaries, as part of David Bailey’s *Box of Pinups* (1965), a collection of photographs which supposedly ‘reflected the values of swinging London’ (Sandbrook, 2006:255).

Francis Wyndham’s introduction to the collection stated:

‘Together, these 36 photographs make a statement not only about the man who took them, but also about London life in 1965. Many of the people have gone all out for the immediate rewards of success; quick fame, quick money, quick sex – a brave thing to do’

(Sandbrook, 2006:255)

*Help!* (1965), then, is a text which captures the Beatles as the men of the hour. The discourses around masculinity at work in *Help!* (1965) are reflective not only of a number of sociological and cultural debates of the time, but also reflect the real beginnings of a resistance to the discourses of masculinism (Brittan, 1989) and hegemonic masculinity (Carrigan et al., 1985; Connell, 1995; Hearn, 2004) which had been the norm in 1950s’ British cinema and were still at work in many mid-1960s’ texts (Spicer, 1999). In this sense The Beatles in *Help!* (1965) can be read as centre-stage in 1960s’ Britain, projecting this image across the world using the emerging global media in this period. In addition, the appearance of the Beatles’ song writing partners in a collection of photographs categorized as
'pinups' is, of itself, a reimagining of the concept of the Englishman and a signpost to the further feminization of the English male on the screen in the years that followed.

Notes
Inglis (2000) provides an authoritative summing up of their career:

‘On one level the story of the Beatles is deceptively easy to relate, not least because it has been retold, reproduced and reinvented on so many occasions. John Lennon met Paul McCartney in Woolton 6th July 1957, and shortly afterwards invited him to join his group (then known as The Quarrymen). In 1958 McCartney introduced Lennon to George Harrison: these three remained the nucleus of the group amid numerous variations in personnel (of which the most important was Stuart Sutcliffe’s membership from January 1960 to June 1961), changes of name (Johnny and the Moondogs, The Silver Beatles, The Beatles), and a performing history largely confined to Merseyside (with occasional spells in Hamburg) for the next five years. At the beginning of 1962 they agreed to place their management in the hands of Brian Epstein, a local businessman. In August of that year, several weeks after the group had accepted a provisional recording contact with E.M.I.’s Parlophone label, drummer Pete Best was replaced by Ringo Starr. In October 1962, Love Me Do, their first official single, was released and was a minor chart entry; and in February 1963, Please Please Me became their first British Number One. In January 1964, I Want to Hold Your Hand was their first US Number One, and for the rest of the decade the Beatles dominated popular music around the world. They toured extensively until August 1966, when they elected to abandon live performances in favour of studio work. Epstein died in August 1967, and in 1968 the Beatles established their own management and recording company, named Apple. In April 1970, after increasing involvement in individual projects, the group effectively disbanded.’

(Inglis, 2000:xv)

See also Davies (1968); Norman (1981); Stark (2005) for a full history.

Just for Fun (1963) would be an example of the former, having no real plot and it is merely a way of showing a number of early 1960s’ acts one after another. Catch us if you can (1965), director John Boorman’s debut film, starring the Dave Clark Five, would be an example of the latter.

Ferry Across the Mersey (1964) starring Gerry and the Pacemakers, and Hold On! (1966) starring Herman’s Hermits are two such examples.

After they stopped touring in 1966 the Beatles’ promotional films (forerunners to the pop video) for new singles fulfilled the same function.

The TV documentary The Beatles Anthology (2003) [first broadcast on TV in 1996] combined with Manchester group Oasis’ well publicised Beatle-worship saw an upsurge in Beatle interest, both music and style-wise, in the mid 1990s, while the idea of Britpop and the Labour Government’s ‘cool Britannia’ concept attempted to recreate, somewhat unsuccessfully, the creativity of mid 1960s Britain in the same period.


The James Bond cycle of films produced by United Artists and based on the novels of Ian Fleming, began with Dr No (1962) followed by From Russia with Love (1963) and Goldfinger (1964) with Sean Connery in the role of Bond. The Harry Palmer films starring Michael Caine began with the Ipcress File (1964) followed by Funeral in Berlin (1965) and Billion Dollar Brain (1967). Palmer is generally seen as a more down to earth spy played with Caine’s characteristic deadpan humour, the antithesis of Bond’s glamour.

See Ehrenreich (1983) for a full account of her ideas on the male revolt as a precursor to second wave feminism.


The Goons, Spike Milligan, Peter Sellers, Harry Secome and Michael Bentine were a popular surreal comedy grouping with a radio show in the late 1950s. The Beatles’ producer George Martin had worked with them on a number of recordings and Richard Lester had worked with them on The Running, Jumping and Standing Still (1959) film. All went on to success in a variety of fields. Sellers became friendly with the Beatles later in the 1960s and co-starred with Ringo Starr in the film The Magic Christian (1969).
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