# PART III
# Gender: Modernity and Tradition

# 8 The Fashioning of Julie Christie and the Mythologizing of "Swinging London": Changing Images in Sixties Britain

Pamela Church Gibson

No account of the relationship between fashion, film, and urban space in this most scrutinized of all decades could possibly leave out a consideration of actress Julie Christie, whose stardom was created by her two-minute stroll, skip, and canter through a nameless northern city in the film *Billy Liar* (John Schlesinger, 1963). This sequence dominated contemporary reviews of the film and endeared her instantly to audiences everywhere. Men, of course, were attracted by her youth and good looks: an Oxford University student poll instantly proclaimed her "The Most Beautiful Woman in the World." But she was equally popular with young women, perhaps in part for being what Kenneth Tynan described as "blazingly nice"—and most certainly for her mode of self-presentation.[1] The particular visual components of her style—the simple bob, wide smile, muted makeup, and short skirts—when combined with her seeming independence, made for an immediate appeal to younger women, then without a contemporary screen icon of their own.

Since she exemplified the emerging look of a decade when London was, however briefly, the most important of fashion capitals, she was instantly interviewed and photographed for magazines that ranged widely across demographics of class, age, and income. She was enthusiastically profiled in both the new teenage publications like *Honey* and *Petticoat* and the "colour supplements" that were fast becoming a staple of broadsheet journalism. Her appeal as fashion icon extended to the august tastemakers at *Vogue*, and she appeared in its pages on both sides of the Atlantic.

She moved seamlessly from publicity shots and film reviews to fashion spreads, unusual for actresses at that time, and she was photographed for several years after *Billy Liar* by the leading names in fashion. Early in her career, she was picked up by mainstream American journalists, fascinated as they were by

the new and increasingly sexy "look" of young London girls.[2] *Time* magazine profiled Christie some weeks before the infamous issue in which "swinging London" was celebrated and dissected; so too did writers for *Life*. The release of John Schlesinger's *Darling* in 1965 would see her on the cover of the conservative US magazine *Parade*, which, in that same week (July 11) carried a message to America's youth from J. Edgar Hoover. When *Doctor Zhivago*, one of the top-grossing films of all time, was released in December that year, *Newsweek* devoted four pages to a consideration of the film, while its cover featured Christie, christened the "new darling of the movies." She appeared on magazine covers across Europe and behind the Iron Curtain, while specialized fashion publications would continue to use her until her final flight from Hollywood to a self-imposed solitude on her Welsh farm in 1974. Only recently, she granted an interview to a journalist writing for the incredibly chic *AnOther Magazine*. Interest in this star does not diminish.

However, here we will focus on the years when she was first in the spotlight and on the two films that created so much interest and attention. The fascination of the general public with Christie at the time was a result of the particular part she plays in *Billy Liar* and her subsequent, sharply contrasting role as the manipulative heroine of *Darling* two years later. Somehow, these two very different characters served to complement one another in the popular imagination, for in these two films, she seemed to epitomize in very different ways the much discussed new modernity of Britain, to embody perceived contemporary changes in sexual behavior, and lastly, to be an integral component in the new mythologizing of the metropolis. Significantly, these two roles also entwined her on- and off-screen appearance with the new youthful fashions that were taking over; she became seen as a key player in the cast of "swinging London." In fact, her image was construed as being so completely contemporary that her later forays into period drama generated some criticism for her apparent lack of fit with the historical periods portrayed.[3] She was also an interesting early variant within the problematic configuring of the 60s "dolly bird."[4] From the start, Christie, unlike the fashion models of the time who were usually featured in the pages of print devoted to the "dolly," had a forceful off-screen persona and a highly publicized nomadic lifestyle, telling the eager interviewers of her student days when, as she said, "I just dossed down in the flats of my friends."[5] When *Life* magazine later featured the actress on April 29, 1966, the caption beneath a sizeable photograph read "Julie Christie in motion, which she ever is," as she was shown running along a London street swinging a straw basket and sporting a gingham headscarf like those then on sale in the new London boutiques. In addition to her perceived independence and this desire to be on the move, she had strong, serious political views that set her apart. While still an aspiring starlet, she had posed handcuffed to black actor Cy Grant in order to publicize Human Rights Day in 1962. Lastly,

she had an impeccable middle-class background, which the media dissected straightaway. This not only inflected her first two roles but also served to highlight the tensions around class and gender both in contemporary cinema and in the salacious consumption of the new "dolly bird" image, even of the "dolly bird" herself.[6] All this extradiegetic information that saw Christie featured so prominently across the media after the release of *Billy Liar* affected the reception of her performance in *Darling*, making its selfish heroine infinitely more appealing.

The "swinging London" to which she was seen as integral would later be coolly dissected by documentary filmmaker Peter Whitehead. *Tonite Let's All make Love in London* (1967) was constructed in part of interviews with those seen as central to the phenomenon of the new London, one of whom was Christie herself. Whitehead's particular style of interviewing here seemed at times intended to undercut both subject matter and interviewee, and arguably, only Christie and artist David Hockney hold their own, somehow triumphing over both director and context. Both are cheerful, unpretentious, and lacking in arrogance and emerge with credit, unlike some of the actors, models, musicians, and artists we hear in the film. Whitehead also found and featured an anonymous "dolly bird," whom he interviewed while she swung back and forth on a child's swing, musing on her own status and function. Here, questions around class, gender, and sexuality are raised, highlighted, and then left unanswered.

*Darling* has been discussed within the academy, while *Billy Liar* has been, by comparison, sidelined.[7] What is of importance to this chapter is that, in all the understandable focus on Christie's casting and persona, no one has actually noted the quite extraordinary difference and discrepancy between the two heroines she portrays. Liz in *Billy Liar* is cheerful, straightforward, honest, and utterly lacking in ambition or desire for material gain. As Billy tells his friend Arthur when they (and the audience) first spot Liz in the cab of a lorry on her arrival in the city, "She just goes wherever she likes." Liz supports this nomadic existence by working at a series of odd jobs. She does love Billy and in fact suggests that they should finally sleep together. Unlike his other girlfriends, she does not demand an engagement ring, and she tells him, "You know, there have been others." She says she would like to marry him one day, but first they must escape to London. Billy, trapped by cowardice and fantasy, contrives to miss the train. But Liz has her independence and will doubtless survive alone in the metropolis.

Diana Scott, the heroine of *Darling*, seen by some feminist critics as showcasing the new independence of young women, is also, as they are of course aware, selfish, manipulative, dishonest, and mercenary.[8] Despite her conscious attempts to advance her status, she ultimately does not fare well in the complicated "London" that the film depicts. Most tellingly, she can see only one way to advancing her career and altering her life—through the use of her sexuality as she moves from man to man. Although she too is seen moving throughout cities, and even

across national borders, she is always, until the final sequence, escorted and seemingly guided by a man.

Interestingly, the line of dialogue that is so telling, in which she admits to Mal, the gay photographer, that she could easily do without sex—"I don't even like it all that much"—has been completely ignored by critics. There are also two important shots of her face at separate moments of intense sexual activity with two of the three lovers she takes in the film that seem to have escaped critical scrutiny. In the first of these, Robert (Dirk Bogarde) kisses her passionately after a quarrel, and as he unbuttons her shirt to fondle her breasts, she watches herself in a mirror with a kind of horrified fascination. In the second, suave Miles (Laurence Harvey) bends over her naked body in bed, and the camera closes in on her face as she winces with a mixture of pleasure and possible distaste. Diana's sexuality may indeed have presented on film the new freedom of 60s women, but she uses it for the most part as a bargaining counter. And her forceful seduction of Robert has also been overlooked, for it is she who takes the physical initiative that will move their affair on from a series of snatched romantic encounters and, so, free her from her stultifying marriage.

In the 1980s, Sara Maitland edited a volume of essays that looked back at the 60s, where her contributors—all women, including a novelist, a journalist, and a leading politician—reflected on what they had achieved. Maitland herself chose to interview Christie and called her essay, inevitably, "Everybody's Darling," describing the Christie of the 60s as "the embodiment of all my adolescent yearnings."[9]

It is, of course, Christie herself, rather than Diana, who is the "darling" in question and who made that problematic character so attractive. She herself describes Diana as "a new kind of heroine . . . who didn't want domesticity, didn't want to be tied down," not unlike Christie herself, who had stressed her own unwillingness ever to marry from the start.[10] And she also preempts academic writing on the film: "Of course at the time this was seen as greedy promiscuity and she had to be punished."[11] To this anthology, Maitland gave the title *Very Heaven*, quoting Wordsworth seemingly without irony.

Instead, it was Christie herself, so central to the iconography of the period, who was to sound a cautionary note about the 60s, speaking here with great honesty of her own self-doubt and insecurity in that period, when there were very prescriptive rules about what constituted a fashionable appearance. It is perhaps the tensions Christie herself notes that, combined with her increasing dislike of fame and her growing political involvement in different campaigns, in fact served paradoxically to reinforce her status and influence. Jean Shrimpton, one of the first supermodels, now describes herself as having been "a waif astray" for most of the 60s, and at their close, she fled from the city to a commune in Wales.[12] Her fellow model, the Biba poster girl Ingrid Boulting, also left London and now teaches yoga on America's West Coast.[13] Christie's flight from London and then

from stardom reinforces the way in which she epitomizes both the decade and its repercussions.

## Radical and Stylish: A Heroine for Changing Times

Christie had appeared in small starring roles before her success in this film. The actress originally meant for her role dropped out, and she was cast as Liz, the only girl to understand Billy and to share his dislike of their claustrophobic lives in this anonymous northern city. If "Liz" escapes by hitchhiking and visiting other cities on a whim (she has tried to persuade Billy to go with her to France in the past and failed) Billy, by contrast, escapes into an elaborate fantasy world. The film follows a single day in Billy's life when Liz appears in the city halfway through the morning. We—and Billy—spy her in the cab of the lorry as she arrives. While he moves off, the camera chooses instead to follow Liz as she clambers down and strolls nonchalantly through the city, seeming to command the grim industrial landscape around her. Of course, to move through urban space is not necessarily to command it; the flâneur of Baudelaire's poetry has no female equivalent, for the only woman who shares his nocturnal exploration of the city streets is the *passante*. But Liz, unlike Diana in the following film, actually does give the audience the impression that she can move happily through this city (and others) alone and unchallenged. She skips along a pavement, pulls a face at herself in a shop window, jumps across puddles, and trails her hand along a railing, all the while swinging her small shoulder bag.

What is as important as her command of her surroundings are the clothes she is wearing, the effect they would have had on contemporary audiences, and the sharp visual contrast with Billy's other girlfriends. Liz is seemingly set up here to represent, in every way, a new and different kind of life. She passes a wrecking ball as it demolishes a Victorian building, calls in at a record shop where the Top-Ten list is displayed in the window, and ends up at the official opening of a supermarket, that dubious symbol of the modern city. In her movement and her dress she looks forward, whereas Billy's two fiancées in this momentous year that brought so many changes seem to be looking back to the 50s. Middle-class Barbara has carefully set semi-pageboy hair with regulation "kiss curls," while her A-line skirt and white blouse with its Peter Pan collar evoke the middle-class styles of the 1950s. His other girlfriend, Rita, a waitress in a coffee bar, has heavily outlined eyes and the fiercely backcombed "beehive" hairstyle popular in the first years of the decade. Rita's skirts are tight, her heels are high, and she evokes a different kind of 50s look, the "glamour" of its British film stars. The J. Arthur Rank "charm school" had produced indigenous variants on Hollywood styles, homegrown answers to Marilyn Monroe and Liz Taylor in the opposed styles of Diana Dors and Joan Collins. Rita is styled and presented throughout to look as if she might well be an avid reader of British magazines such as *Picturegoer*.

Fig. 8.1 Liz waits at the station—behind her, the train to London and the chance of escape.

Liz, however, looks radically different. Many iconic stars of cinema, in their most memorable fashion moments, look as if they could step from the screen, move across the fashion pages, and then go out to command the streets around them: James Dean in his jeans and leather jacket and Steve McQueen astride his motorbike in combat trousers and T-shirt. Like Liz as she is presented here, they have an instant contemporary appeal. Here, as throughout the film, Liz wears a long black jacket belted over a simple white shirt and straight skirt, while the bag that she swings is small and on a long strap. In the closing moments, when she waits for Billy on the station as they prepare to leave for London, she has added a checked muffler—a look forward, perhaps, to Bob Dylan's *Blonde on Blonde* album cover of 1966—and she now waves a tartan duffle bag. Billy, who carries an old-fashioned suitcase, loses his nerve and gets off the train on the pretext of getting them something to drink. Liz, the girl who is experienced, free, and above all likeable, is whirled away, alone, to a London that, though not yet swinging, was changing swiftly.

This particular year, 1963, was famously celebrated by poet Philip Larkin as an *annus mirabilis*, the year in which he suggests "sexual intercourse began." This he locates as being "somewhere between the Lady Chatterley ban . . . and the Beatles' first LP." He has in mind the "Profumo affair," a very British scandal involving two high-priced call girls, a member of Parliament, and a "society osteopath," in which some of the key events had taken place at Cliveden, the home of Lord Astor. The other momentous event of 1963 was, of course, the assassination of President Kennedy in November, along with the sense of instability it generated. Cinematic character Liz—like Christie herself, as interviews revealed—was

moving forward, both aware of and part of the tumultuous changes taking place in the country around her. Paradoxically, it is the would-be mobile Diana who shows in her behavior and costuming the difficulties of adjusting as British society tried both to accommodate change and to shake off the legacy of the 50s.

It is important to note that the "Liz" of the novel on which the film is based was far less photogenic. Its author, Keith Waterhouse, was involved in the screenplay here, but he helped to transform his original "Liz"—plump, indifferent to her appearance, her green suede skirt slightly scuffed—into this visual emblem of modernity. British *Vogue* swiftly responded to her radical and stylish appearance by featuring both "Billy" (Tom Courtenay) and Christie-as-Liz posed on what looked like one of the Yorkshire dales seen in the film, with Christie wearing one of the newly fashionable smock dresses. The photographer here was the leading Paris-based American, William Klein.

During the years to follow, Christie would be photographed by Richard Avedon, Irving Penn, and David Bailey for fashion magazines, rather than for publicity purposes. In her former incarnation as a starlet, she had earlier posed for Bailey's friend Terence Donovan, a fellow member of London's "terrible three." This was the nickname given to the triumvirate of new working-class photographers (the third being Brian Duffy) who were to dominate British fashion pages across the next decade.[14] Donovan had portrayed her in 1962 naked except for a bed sheet, deliberately evoking the famous "last session" in which a naked Marilyn Monroe posed for Richard Avedon on an enormous double bed, her modesty protected by judicious rearrangements of the sheets. Significantly, after *Billy Liar* had defined Christie's on-screen and off-screen persona, there were no more shoots like this. She was now in more control and, for the most part, in fashionable dress rather than a state of undress, whether or not the pictures were for a fashion shoot.

## Costume, Character, and Complexity in *Darling*

The most notable costumes for Diana in *Darling* were the designs of Julie Harris, who would be rewarded with an Oscar. She created the formal gowns and smart clothes that the successful model acquires as she moves onward and upward. But it is important to note that the Diana of the early sequences has a style of her own, rather as Hepburn does in the pre-Givenchy frames of her transformation films. Some of the clothes the young Diana wears were, in fact, purchased by Christie herself. There were trips with Harris, but she also went shopping alone.[15]

Barbara Hulanicki, who co-owned the new boutique Biba and created its clothes, tells us in her autobiography of watching a "tiny, beautiful blonde girl" trying on several outfits and discovering that it was Christie "choosing her wardrobe for *Darling*."[16] Her choice of boutique was significant. The clothes here were edgier and, above all, more affordable than those designed by Mary Quant

for Bazaar, which had now been open for nearly ten years. Even though Quant wrote in her own autobiography that she dressed "dockers' daughters and dukes' daughters," her prices would have excluded many young girls.[17]

Quant has frequently claimed, too, that she was mainly responsible for the invention and the appearance of the miniskirt, though she has had to admit that couture designer Andre Courrèges played his part: his "space age" collection of 1964 featured short tabards and flat boots.[18] In fact, we see in this film these very same boots, worn by Diana on her trip to Paris with Miles. Obviously, no one designer could take the credit for the appearance and popularity of the miniskirt. There are a multitude of other factors to be considered, one which is surely the highly publicized appearance of Jean Shrimpton in January 1965 at the Melbourne Gold Cup in a skirt three inches above her knees. The many press photographs of the model were speedily beamed around the world, as the Gold Cup was a highly formal event and her appearance—without hat, gloves or stockings—was deemed both provocative and sensational.

The costuming of *Darling*, of course, took place in the previous year, but Christie, who swiftly adopted the new fashion, became linked in the public imagination with very short skirts. Two years later, when she presented an Oscar at the Academy Awards, her abbreviated dress attracted an extraordinary amount of press attention. There is an apocryphal suggestion that she was personally responsible for the edict that would follow and that is still in place: all women who attend the Academy Award ceremonies are required to wear long dresses.

Diana in *Darling* (ironically, since she becomes a fashion model) leaves her Biba smock dresses, trouser suits, and kilts behind as she progresses onward and upward. Her first lover, Robert, is a journalist, television pundit, and presenter of a new programme on the arts, and they meet when he is conducting interviews with passersby about changing social conventions. Her young, casual clothes are perfect in Robert's world, and she simply leaves her modest marital home for a larger flat in Chelsea.

But the particular milieu that she later enters, under the subsequent patronage of suave advertising tycoon Miles, requires her attendance at a series of very formal events. The social world of the 50s and its codes of dress and behavior have not disappeared, and Diana, far from symbolizing 60s independence in her search for self-advancement, seems instead to become trapped, as the narrative progresses, in a lifestyle redolent of the previous decade. The charity ball where we first see her perform as Miles's protegée is attended by businessmen, by one or two young "image makers" like the film director she fails to charm, and by the "old order," here represented by duchesses and a member of Parliament. She wears, here, the first of a series of increasingly formal evening gowns. For the premiere of her only film role, she wears a very low-cut evening dress that makes her look the epitome of a 50s starlet, an interesting contrast to the gold halter-neck

Fig. 8.2 Diana, youthful and relaxed once more during the holiday on Capri.

garment with its wide trousers that Christie the actress wore to collect her Oscar for *Darling*.

In fact, it is only on Diana's holiday in Capri with her friend and ally Mal, the gay photographer, that she is seen once again in truly youthful apparel: smocks, a striped T-shirt, white trousers, and a bikini. Otherwise she becomes more and more elegant in her dress: the Courrèges boots we see her wearing in Paris and the Cardin hat that she dons on her return for a gallery opening are attempts at Parisian chic and couture rather than a reflection of the style of "swinging London." And, by her marriage to the Italian prince, she finally removes herself from London, even from youth itself, and certainly from the new and rapidly changing fashions she wore and modelled earlier in the film.

Significantly, Diana divests herself radically of all her formal accoutrements at the film's close. We see her incarcerated alone in a vast palace as the result of this shrewd, loveless marriage to a prince old enough to be her father. After a lonely dinner with elderly servants looking curiously on, she rampages through her rooms, ripping off first her jewels, then her sumptuous evening gown with its embroidered train, and then her silk slip, until finally she stands, naked, before the glass in her bedroom. Her resplendent couture clothes are seen as symbolising the catastrophic choices she has made.

Academic Frances Tempest interviewed Julie Harris on September 16, 2010, after her appearance as the guest of honor at a special British Film Institute screening of *Darling* sponsored by *Elle* magazine. Leading British designer

Fig. 8.3 Diana's splendid gown reflects the grandeur and formality of the palace where she is immured—far away from London, from youth, and from change.

Roland Mouret had chosen this as his favorite film and one that had a lasting influence on him. Harris, however, declared to Tempest that "it was just another contemporary film—I had no idea then that it would become such an iconic portrayal of the time." She goes on to say that, with hindsight, she can see exactly why that happened: the Americans, as she tells us, "fell in love with the whole swinging London image at that time."[19] Harris and Tempest discussed neither the contradictions I have noted within Diana's character nor the conflict between two decades, both of which, as I have suggested, are reinforced by the costume narrative.

These tensions, however, were lurking within that interview room, for Tempest noted that Harris "was more comfortable with the expensive, elegant outfits that Julie Christie wore when she became the Principessa della Romita than she was with the now iconic headscarves, caps and knee-socks of Sixties London." Harris explained that those accessories and all the youthful outfits Diana wears in the first half of the film were the result of "a quick shop with Julie Christie on the high street." But, when Tempest observed that the gingham and the headscarves reminded her of the early Biba "look," Harris was quick to say, "No, not—we didn't get anything from there."[20] Hulanicki's reminiscences, however, are obviously correct, for if we inspect her designs for 1964, we recognise several of the outfits that Diana wears. Harris was, however, happy to remember buying the elegant mink hat that Diana wears on her last unhappy trip to London. She tells

Tempest, "We bought that in Woollands," a very smart department store that has long since closed its doors.[21]

Diana's problematic progress and contradictory desires can, then, be charted clearly through her choice of clothes. We first see her in a deliberate reprise of her famous entry in *Billy Liar*: Robert spots her on the street as she walks confidently past a billboard swinging her handbag and wearing a simple trouser suit. He thinks she is just the right person to answer his onscreen questions as to why young people want to dispense with conventions. Diana tells him that "you just have to break away." But, although the film shows her managing to "break away" from her dull marriage, her fledgling career as a brassière model, and (briefly) from a dull if privileged middle-class background, what is interesting is her ultimate failure here.

Her on-screen appearance in the early scenes, of course, not only reflects Christie's own personal style, followed so eagerly in the press, but also shows off the new clothes then being created by young London designers she modelled in the growing number of fashion features in which she featured. These early images and their contemporary resonance show exactly how Moya Luckett could have constructed an argument designed to prove that both 'Diana' and Christie epitomized female mobility and independence. It is, of course, Christie herself, as she is inflected here, who is in fact the "key icon of female mobility in 1960s Britain."[22]

But Luckett's attempt to configure Diana in the same way is much less successful, and she has to admit that "Diana's agency is ultimately erased by men."[23] Diana certainly does not have any real control over her changing environment. Husband Tony is soon replaced by arts journalist Robert, but she finds life with an aspiring writer claustrophobic. She embarks on a sexual liaison with Miles, who has made her the "Honeyglow Girl" for a very lucrative advertising campaign and goes on to secure for her a small part in a horror film and then to make her the "Happiness Girl" in a second advertising campaigns. But, for all the emphasis on what Diana wants, what she achieves is only a modest modelling success, and it is in fact while filming a commercial for chocolates that she meets the Prince who offers her the chance of an advantageous marriage.

The world of advertising and high finance into which she moves with Miles is, as I have suggested, not at all the world of "swinging London." Miles—like Robert, rather older than Diana—may work in a very modern office block flanked by contemporary sculptures, but he travels to and fro in a series of 50s cars. We see him driving Diana across Paris in an American convertible, and he takes her to a supposedly "swinging" party in what seems to be an expensive brothel. He lives in a tasteful modernist flat complete with a set of Fornasetti plates, but his clothes are the smart clothes of a Fifties "lounge lizard," well-cut suits for the most part, with one glimpse of Italian "casual wear." His companions, with

whom he takes Diana to a very sedate disco, are middle-aged, and in their company, Diana seems to be cut off completely from the London that reviewers and academics suppose her to embody. Robert leaves her, Miles turns out to be completely unreliable in every way, and she flees in panic into the twofold patriarchal embrace of the Prince and of the Catholic Church.

Interestingly, she can be "rescued" in this way only because of her middle-class credentials. Carrie Tarr twins her case study of *Darling* with that of a slightly earlier film centred around a sexually active young woman specifically to raise issues around social class.[24] Sapphire, the mixed-race heroine of that earlier film, is stabbed to death and her body left on Hampstead Heath, but Diana can be rehabilitated. The 60s have been configured as a decade when, supposedly, class barriers in Britain were lifted, but Diana's narrative suggests the opposite.

The cinematic heroine, like Christie herself, is a middle-class girl from a comfortable, affluent background: we glimpse a crocodile of convent girls, see her elegant mother proudly smiling at a school play, and finally attend a stifling dinner party hosted by her sister from which our heroine escapes, travelling across England in her nightdress. This rebellion is short-lived. Diana—and perhaps Liz, too—is cloaked in the protection of Christie's middle-class persona. Liz is clearly marked off from Billy's friends, fiancées, and family in both accent and demeanor.

All this is vital if we are to see Liz, Diana, and Christie herself as part of the supposed plethora of young, sexually active women in Britain so eagerly profiled within contemporary American journalism. Part of the problem around the figure of the "dolly bird" is that her sexual activity and her presumed availability raise questions around social class and gendered power.[25] Diana calls herself a "breakaway" in Robert's television interview, but as I have argued, her breaking away, motivated by a mixture of impulse and material ambition, is both unsatisfactory and short-lived.

Christie herself was quite different and later became increasingly identified with both counterculture and radical politics. This particular rebellious streak, one facet of her star persona, was celebrated in American *Vogue* of February of 1966, after the release of *Darling* and its many Oscar nominations. She was the model chosen for the main fashion feature that month, *The Breakaway Girl*. Here she wore dresses by British design duo Foale and Tuffin, which were now stocked, significantly, at Paraphernalia, the New York boutique where Edie Sedgwick shopped. The fashion copy stressed the particular way in which Christie was perceived: "With her thick pale hair worn just as it pleases her to wear it, her easy vitality and her level-eyed spill-the-beans candour, Julie Christie is the Breakaway's Breakaway."[26] Information now in bibliography

US *Vogue* was embracing the young, the new, and the British, and Christie represented the socially acceptable face of nonconformity, both on the screen and

off. Her off-screen persona, in fact, had managed to erase completely the petulance, selfishness, and narrow ambition of Diana Scott, and what was celebrated instead was the cheerful nomad, "Liz," the explorer of urban space seemingly inextricable from the actress who created her. For, the extradiegetic awareness of Christie herself, about whom so much information was swiftly made available after her instant popularity in *Billy Liar*, immediately became, in an extraordinary and perhaps unprecedented way, indelibly interwoven into the reception of her subsequent appearances on screen. Liz and Christie were, in fact, merged into one and the same person, her later screen incarnations would all be imbued with the perceptible warmth of that first character and fashion icon. Christie, like Liz, was seen as the stylish drifter to emulate: in May 1968, young girls across England bought *Petticoat* magazine for its free gift of a "Julie Christie tote bag." Drifters and nomads need a few essentials on their travels, and Christie/Liz had demonstrated new possibilities for young women.

PAMELA CHURCH GIBSON is Reader in Cultural and Historical Studies at London College of Fashion. Her publications include *Fashion and Celebrity Culture,* various edited anthologies, and numerous articles. She edits the journal *Film, Fashion and Consumption*.

## Notes

1. Kenneth Tynan, review of *Darling*, *The Observer*, September 19, 1965.
2. See Christopher Breward, "The Dolly Bird," in *Fashioning London*: *Clothing and the Modern Metropolis* (London: Berg, 2004), 151–77, and Pamela Church Gibson, "The Deification of the Dolly Bird," *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 14, no. 2 (2007): 99–111.
3. See Alexander Walker, *Hollywood England; The British Film Industry in the Sixties* (London: Michael Joseph, 1974), 272.
4. See Breward, "Dolly Bird," and Church Gibson, "Deification of the Dolly Bird."
5. Interviews with Julie Christie, quoted in Christine Geraghty, "Women and 60s British Cinema: The Development of the 'Darling' Girl," in *The British Cinema Book*, ed. Robert Murphy (London: BFI Publishing, 2001), 317.
6. Breward, "Dolly Bird," and Church Gibson, "Deification of the Dolly Bird."
7. See: John Hill, *Sex Class and Realism: British Cinema 1956–1963* (London: BFI, 1986); Carrie Tarr, "Sapphire, Darling and the Boundaries of Permitted Pleasure," *Screen* 26 no. 1 (1985); Geraghty, "Women and 60s British Cinema; Moya Luckett, "Travel and Mobility: Femininity and National Identity in Swinging London Films," in *British Cinema Past and Present*, ed. Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson (London: Routledge, 2000), 233–47.
8. See Geraghty, "Women and 60s British Cinema," and Luckett, "Travel and Mobility."
9. See Sara Maitland, "Introduction," in *Very Heaven: Looking Back at the 1960s*, ed. Sara Maitland (London: Virago, 1988), 4.
10. Maitland, "Everybody's Darling: An Interview with Julie Christie," in *Very Heaven*, 166–72.

11. Maitland, "Everybody's Darling," 167.
12. Jean Shrimpton and Unity Hall, *An Autobiography* (London: Ebury Press, 1988), 10.
13. Pamela Church Gibson, *Fashion and Celebrity Culture* (London: Berg, 2011), 167.
14. Elliott Smedley, "Escaping to Reality: Fashion Photography in the 1990s," in *Fashion Cultures*: *Theories, Explorations, Analysis*, ed. Stella Bruzzi and Pamela Church Gibson (London: Routledge, 2013), 143–57.
15. Frances Tempest, "Interview with Julie Harris," accessed September 13, 2013, Costumeonscreen.com 2011/06.
16. Barbara Hulanicki, *From A to Biba* (London: Hutchinson, 1983), 80.
17. Mary Quant, *Mary Quant by Quant* (London: Cassell, 1966), 75.
18. Caroline Evans, "Post War Poses 1955–1975," in *The London Look: Fashion from Street to Catwalk* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 117–39.
19. Tempest, "Interview with Julie Harris."
20. Tempest, "Interview with Julie Harris."
21. Tempest, "Interview with Julie Harris."
22. Luckett, "Travel and Mobility," 140.
23. Luckett, "Travel and Mobility," 139.
24. See Tarr, "Sapphire, Darling and the Boundaries of Permitted Pleasure."
25. See Breward, "Dolly Bird," and Church Gibson, "The Deification of the Dolly Bird."
26. US *Vogue*, "The Breakaway Girl" [fashion shoot], February 15, 1966, 120, 121.