

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Homophobic Discourse in Tennessee Williams: A Comparative Study of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire***

**A Thesis submitted to the Central Department of English,  
Tribhuvan University, in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree  
of Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Saroj Chandra Regmi**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal**

**May, 2009**

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**  
**Central Department of English**

**Letter of Recommendation**

Mr. Sraoj Chandra Regmi completed his thesis entitled **Homophobic Discourse in Tennessee Williams: A Comparative Study of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire***, under my supervision. He had carried out his research from June 2008 A.D. to May, 2009 A.D. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for Viva Voce.

-----

Mr. Shuv Raj Ranabhat

Supervisor

Date: -----

## **Acknowledgements**

It would not have been possible to complete this thesis without the valuable suggestions, guidance, support and inspiration rendered from various institutions, individuals, friends and family members. I would cordially like to express sincere thanks formally to all who helped me to make this thesis possible.

I am greatly indebted to my supervisor Mr. Shuv Raj Ranabhat. His effective guidance, frequent monitoring and constant input during the work are all what made this thesis come to this form. Similarly, I am thankful to all of my respected teachers in the Central Department of English who directly or indirectly helped me in the course of my writing.

I would especially like to thank my beloved wife, Basu Poudel for her mutual trust and cooperation during the research. I would also like to thank my brother Sushil Chandra Regmi and my sister-in-law Radhika Dhakal for their encouragement.

I sincerely thank my father, brother and sisters for their inspiring words and their moral support to complete my thesis.

Date: May, 2009

Saroj Chandra Regmi

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Letter of Approval**

This thesis entitled **Homophobic Discourse in Tennessee Williams' A Comparative Study of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire*** submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Saroj Chandra Regmi has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Head  
Central Department of English

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Abstract

This dissertation basically makes a comparative study of homophobic discourse found in Tennessee Williams's play *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Brick in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and Allan in *A Streetcar Named Desire* are homosexual characters. Both of them are central characters and exemplary outcasted figures of the then contemporary heterosexual hegemonic society. Williams tries to show the different sexual orientation as natural as heterosexual counterpart by making his homosexual characters more loving and understanding in comparison to their heterosexual characters. However, while dealing homosexuality of his characters, there is Williams' mixed signal regarding homosexuality and at the same time his obsession with public exposures as if it is really a terrifying and taboo subjects. Being a gay himself, the discourse of homophobia is only to conceal his true identity because homosexuality is an inadmissible thing in his plays.

This thesis tends to prove the idea that only the partial evasions of full-fledged homosexuality of the characters and Williams' inability to express the different sexual orientation like homosexuality openly and directly is because of his own split identity and split vision.

## Contents

	<b>Page No.</b>
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
I. Homophobia in Tennessee Williams	1
II. Definition of Homosexuality	16
Development of Homosexuality	18
Theory of Discourse and <i>The History of Sexuality</i> (Vol.1) by Michel Foucault	27
Gay Criticism	38
III. Brick and Skipper as Homosexuals	40
Allan Gray as Unseen Homosexual Character in <i>A Streetcar Named Desire</i>	42
Homophobia in Tennessee Williams's Plays <i>Cat on a Hot Tin Roof</i> and <i>A Streetcar Named Desire</i>	44
IV. Conclusion	54
Works Cited	60

## **I. Homophobia in Tennessee Williams**

Throughout his career, Tennessee Williams was attacked from all sides for his treatment or non-treatment of homosexuality in his work. During the early years of gay liberation, gay critics complained that he was not out enough in his work and demanded that he stop writing around his homosexuality. Tennessee Williams wrote *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire* almost around the so called-period of pre-gay-liberation movement. Homosexuality is an inadmissible thing in both of his play. However, his treatment of homosexuality to his major characters is not clear.

Tennessee Williams was a well-renowned playwright, who highlighted his personal experience in his plays and stories. He enjoyed writing about what was considered taboo subjects like homosexuality. In his memoirs, he claims that he became sexually active as teenager. Williams was the victim of a gay bashing in January 1979 in Key West. He was beaten by five teenage boys during anti-gay violence, but not seriously injured. Some of his literary critics believe that these were attacks on William's homosexuality. Gay critics have debated in recent years whether Williams work is marked by 'internalized homophobia' or whether he is a subversive artist whose work can be interpreted through the lense of leftist French theorist like Roland Bathes and Michael Foucault. In both of these plays written by Tennessee Williams, homosexuality is not openly expressed.

Born to Cornelius and Edwina Dakin Williams on March 26, 1911, in Columbus Mississippi, Thomas Lanier "Tennessee" Williams was amply prepared for writing about societies outcast. His mother was an aggressive woman, obsessed by her fantasies of general southern living. His father, a traveling salesman for a large shoe manufacturer, was at turns distant and abusive. His elder sister, Rose was emotionally

disturbed and destined to spend most of her life in mental institutions. He remained aloof from his younger brother, Dakin, whom his father repeatedly favored over both of the older children. In 1918, the family moved to St. Louis. Tennessee had a very difficult childhood in St. Louis and was the butt of classmates' jokes because of his short height and lack of athletic ability.

He is a major figure of theater in America His major contribution as a dramatist was his creation of characters, situation, dialogue form and scenic environment. He wrote the rigid convention of drama. His theater is mostly extra-verbal and the dramatic form which seeks to explore not only rational, but irrational sides of human experience too. He also broke away from the language bound realistic drama of the nineteenth and early twentieth century and produced drama in which language, symbols, and scenic images speak simultaneously and as powerfully as what issues from the mouth of the characters. It represents the conscious effort to mirror new perceptions of reality.

In terms of themes too, Williams rebels against general tradition of American society. But he is an uneasy rebel, since he alternately condemns and worships the life and the body. The body and soul comprise one of the great dualities, which provide conflict in both his place and his own life. Discomfort with sex underlies most of his plays and many of his characters are perfections of varying parts of his own complicated sexuality. A character like Alma wine miller, the divided heroine of *Summer and Smoke* is represented with almost diagrammatic simplicity, William's own split between refinement and rapacity. Characters like Seratina of the *Rose Tatoo* and *Maggies Politt* and *Big Daddy* of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* celebrates Williams' worship of sex, while a character like Blanche Dubois's in *A Streetcar Named Desire* indicates his fear of it. A character like Brick Politt in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* has an

ambiguous sexual nature because Williams never shakes of the notion that sex is at least partly sinful. All of his sexually troubled characters are held to a moral reckoning and their histories are designed as warnings. Brick's present state, death in life is closely related with that history. This has a direct relationship with his isolated and frustrated life as well.

More than half a century has passed since critics and theatergoers recognized Tennessee Williams as an important American playwright whose plays follow dramaturge, David Mamet calls the greatest dramatic poetry in American language. Williams's repertoire includes some thirty full length plays, numerous short plays, two volumes of poetry and five volumes of essays and short stories. He won Pulitzer prizes for *A Streetcar Named Desire* in 1947 and *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* in 1955, and was the first playwright to receive, in 1947, the Pulitzer prize for drama, the Donaldson Award, and the New York Drama Critic Circle Award in the same year.

Although Williams first professionally produced play, *Battle of Angels*, closed in 1940 because of poor reviews and a censorship controversy, his early amateur productions *Candles to the Sun* and *Fugitive Kind* were well-received by audiences in St. Louis. By 1945, he had completed and opened on Broadway *The Glass Menagerie*, perhaps his best known play which won that year's New York Critic Circle, Donaldson and Sidney Howard Memorial awards. He was honored by President Carter at Kennedy center in 1997, and named distinguished writer in residence at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, in 1981.

The conflict between sexuality, society and Christianity, so much a part of Williams's drama, played themselves out in life as well. Tennessee Williams claimed that all of his major plays fit into the Memory Play format he described in his production notes for *The Glass Menagerie*. The memory play has three structure, (1)

a character experiences something profound, (2) that experience causes what Williams terms as an "arrest of time", a situation in which time literally loops upon itself, and (3) the character must re-live that profound experience until he or she makes sense of it. The over arching theme for his plays, he claimed, is the negative impact that conventional society has upon the sensitive non-conformist individual.

With their emphasis on the irrational, the depression on humanity in a universe in which comic laws do not work, and their tragic-comic examination of the conflict between the gentility of old southern values and the brute force of new, Northern values, Williams plays fit nicely into a genre critics call Southern Gothic. He shares this field with such literary lights as Flannery O'Connor and William Faulkner, who like Williams, struggled with the macabre and eccentric natures of individuals in America's South. Although, like Faulkner, Williams spent much of his adult life in New York, his work focuses on the southern experience.

Why has so little been written about Tennessee Williams, compared to other important American playwright such as O' Neill? Perhaps, the most Common theory is that Williams work is considered Popular, academicians have ignored his work for the same reasons contemporary scholars avoid Tom Clancy and Stephen King. The second most frequently iterated theory as to why Williams has been relatively neglected involves sexual prejudices. Some scholars believe that the playwrights homosexuality makes him unfit as a critical Subject. Such prejudice appears to be common, particularly from some scholars in new critical movement. Regardless of the reasons for the relative neglect of Williams and his work, the fact is that his plays and other writings are pregnant with possibilities for scholarly research.

Enough new information is available to afford a closer examination of Williams work. For example, a considerable amount of biographical information

concerning Williams can be found in accounts from family, friends, and professional acquaintances. Considering what critics and researchers know about his life, they argue that the outcast character examined in this dissertation seem central to Williams poetics. The outcast characters in Tennessee Williams major plays do not suffer because of the actions or circumstances that make them outcast but because of the destructive impact of conventional morality forced upon them. They are driven, in the conflict between their values and those of conventional morality to confess their transgression, against humanity and to suffer, at their own hands by placing themselves in dangerous situations, in atonement for their violations of conventional morality.

Williams' outcast can be placed, first are sexual outcasts who, like the playwrights, offer insight into Williams's feeling about his own sexuality; second are religious outcasts, who are vehicles for the playwright's commentary on contemporary Christianity; and third, fugitive outcasts whose flight reflect Williams's own insecurity and alienation. Such a threefold distinction serves as a useful way to group Williams's outcasts. The conflict between these outcasts characters and conventional morality is tied to the myriad tensions that form twentieth century America. To examine William's outcast is to open avenues toward understanding those tensions.

Williams is regarded as one of the greatest American playwrights, and a great innovator of his genre. He used his life experiences of alcoholism, homosexuality, family life and friends in his plays. Most of his works are set in the south and portrays a Romantic Gothic feel of the area in which the contemporary decay is juxtaposed to the more refined old ways. Williams, more so than any other playwrights is remembered for his characters who have all become prominent figures in American

theater. All of his famous characters are modeled after his family members or friends. For example, Laura in *The Glass Menagerie* is a representation of Williams's sister. He also brought many issues such as homosexuality, fetishisms, sex and his belief in the falsehood of religion and domestic violence that shocked the audience of his time. Williams's language is often thought of, as too poetic and his plays are often called too wordy, others would say that his language is highly stylized but still natural sounding. Williams's plays often contain an overbearing male figure often a husband and an almost overly emotional female. A major theme is survival in a world that seems bent on crushing the human spirit and the inescapability of the human condition. Overall, Williams was able to bring new issues to the theater and the great characters while still touching on many universal themes. What one can not turn away from his Mr. Williams's unflinching preoccupation for getting at truths which at the time represented a real breakthrough and was even considered shocking. Showing the effect of American social background in Williams's play, Raghuvaran in his book *History of American Literature* writes:

Williams's plays represent the side of American life, and they do not have happy ending. They plumb the depths of problems such as homosexuality, symbolic cannibalism, alcoholism and lurid behaviours. Williams's general view of life is pessimistic, morbid and tragic. The world of Tennessee Williams, according to R. Watt is certainly dark, tormented and haunted by evil. This is description of his work, not hostile criticism of it. There are indignant reviewers who insist that his plays are psychopathic in their subject matter. Though Williams' plays deal with frustration, their frustration unlike those of Greek plays, is not universal. (150)

In this way, the presentation of 1950s social background of the United State is the dark aspect of life. The characters are depressed in one or the other way. But Williams's entire psyche is not to see all of the life of humans so pessimistically.

Benjamin Nelson explains that "*The Glass Menagerie* several of Williams's weakness as well as his strength as playwright" (987). He discusses Williams' characterizations, especially of Laura and Amanda. He also points to "Poetic Passages" in the play that he feels are weakness. Ultimately, Nelson poses an interesting dramatic question: is the play a tragedy? The search for an answer to this question involves a full consideration of the play's strengths and weaknesses, its success or failure. *The Glass Menagerie* was Williams's first successful play. The play is set in St. Louis, Missouri Untied States, during the great depression deals with the troubled relationship between an aging mother, Amanda Wingfield and her painfully shy daughter Laura Wingfield as told by the son and brother, Tom Wingfield, who is supposedly relating the events from memory. Amanda is fixated on her idealized version of her southern childhood and is the perfect example of the 'faded southern belle'. Her current life involves such sorrow as a complete reversal of fortune. Amanda is worried about Laura and about getting her married. Laura has a physical handicap. She wore a brace in high school and now has a slight limp. She has become cripplingly shy as result. The outside world frightens her and she prefers the comfort of her collection of glass animals and the sounds of her father's old Victoria records. Although Tom provides financial support, working long hours in a shoe warehouse (a job he thoroughly despises), Amanda sees Tom as a selfish dreamer who irresponsibly retreats into movies, alcohol and novels instead of doing more to provide for the family. Though Tom invites Jim for dinner on Amanda's insistence, things don't work out the way she had hoped for. Jim reveals that he is engaged and

therefore cannot marry Laura. The play closes with an image of Laura blowing out the candle, leaving darkness.

Characters in his plays are often seen to be direct representations of his family members. The motif of lobotomy also arises in *Suddenly Last Summer*. Amanda Wingfield in *The Glass Menagerie* can easily be seen to represent Williams's mother. Many of his characters are considered autobiographical including Tom Wingfield in *The Glass Menagerie* and Sebastian in *Suddenly Last Summer*. Actress Anne Meacham was a close personal friend of Tennessee Williams and played the lead in many of his plays including *Suddenly Last Summer*.

Both of the drama carried out by Williams was written around the so-called homophobic era of 1950s in the history of America. That was the era on which no playwrights could express their homoerotic affliction to their work. *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire* reflect the reality of so called homophobic era of 1950s America.

Tennessee Williams was gay playwright. During that time, it was almost difficult for him to deal with the subject of homosexuality openly, as drama is the public form of art. As a Gay-playwright, he neither hid his desire to deal with the subject matter of homosexuality nor did he deal that subject openly because of that homophobic era.

The study will try to find out the partial evasions of full of homosexuality in his two plays *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire* by shedding light on the discourse of homophobia and finally prove that his split identity or split visions are main reasons to show his homophobia while dealing his character's homosexuality.

The primary source of observation and analysis will be text itself. A comprehensive study of both the dramas will be carried out. For secondary sources, available critical reading and evaluation from authentic sources of the text and the playwrights will be thoroughly studied. The social and cultural judgement of the American Society on homosexuality will be looked into. This dissertation will be looked into. This dissertation will take idea developed in the field of homosexuality as a supportive tool to prove the hypothesis. Michel Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. 1) as well as his idea of discourse, power and truth will be a part of the theoretical modality.

The study is divided into four chapters. The first chapter deals with an introductory aspect of the study. It incorporates the thesis title clarification, hypothesis elaboration, introduction to the playwright's background, their works, themes and techniques etc.

The second chapter delves into theoretical modality that is to be effectively applied in the analysis of dramas. Therefore, it provides an introduction of the tool that is homosexuality, its history and development. The chapter also presents an elaborate commentary on *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. 1) by Michel Foucault.

The third chapter of the dissertation presents an analysis of the dramatic texts at considerable length on the theoretical modality defined and developed in the second chapter. It quotes the necessary extract from the dramas to support and justify the hypothesis of the research work.

The fourth chapter concludes the research work. Standing the firm foundation of the analysis of the text done extensively in the third chapter, it tries to prove my hypothesis stated in the thesis proposal.

## **II. Definition of Homosexuality**

It is biologically natural for some people to be gay no matter what environment they are born into and therefore homosexual ought not to be accepted as abnormal. Homosexual is a normal response to particular environmental factors.

Sometime sexuality is not only concerned only with physical attachment to opposite sex but it also goes beyond it. It is revealed in appearance, personality and even bodily movement and structure. Sexuality describes a whole range of a person's personality related to sexual behavior throughout history. Generation and gender difference is regarded as natural unproblematic and culturally accepted. However, sexual act involving the same sex partners is characterized as a deviant form of sexuality. Sexual deviation, however, can't be defined in terms of the participating gender only. It is a social definition rather natural phenomenon. What is normative in behavior in a particular period may be a deviation or crime in another. No sexual type or behavior is universal. The entire meaning and value of any statement of sexuality is determined or defined by the social temporal context in which it occurs.

Homosexuality comprises choosing same sex partner. The homosexual trait characterizes individuals who prefer romantic attachment and sexual interaction with the same sex. People with such traits are roused by the same erotic imagery. The term homosexual is used for both sexes, although female homosexuality is often referred to as lesbianism. Of all variation of sexual behaviors, homosexuality has provoked the greatest social pressure and evoked the liveliest historical account. It is regarded as problematic and culturally unacceptable. It has become subject to extreme prejudices in most western societies. It is largely considered 'perverted and sick' and a 'disgrace to human nature'. Michael Foucault argues that sexual acts between two persons of the same sex has been punishable through legal and religious sanctions well before the

late nineteenth century. Only in the late nineteenth century did a new understanding of sexuality emerge in which sexual acts and desires could be considered constitutive of identity. Medical and serological literature were one of the few sites of explicit engagement with the question of sexuality during this period and they held substantial definitional of power within a culture that sanctioned science to discover and tell the truth about the body. For sexologist interested in same sex sexual behavior, the key issue is the relationship between the sexual partners and their identity.

The word 'homosexuality' has acquired multiple-meaning overtime. In the original sense, it describes a sexual orientation characterize by lasting aesthetic attraction, romantic love or sexual desire exclusively for other of the same sex or gender. Homosexuality is usually contrasted with heterosexuality or bisexuality. The term gay is used predominantly to refer to homosexual males. The adjectives homosexual is also used for same – sex sexual relations between persons of the same-sex who are not gay or lesbians. The three major forms of homosexual relationships are proposed by anthropologist: egalitarian, gender-structured or age – structured. Of these, one is usually dominant in a given society at a given time. As there are different biological, historical and psychosocial components to sex and gender, no signal level or description will fit all individuals.

Homosexuality has been historically viewed as an illness, a sin a aberration and a crime. One probable source of this attitude is the Bible (Levitations 20:13). Which in many translation describes homosexuality as abomination, most religious institution maintains that homosexuality as morally unacceptable life style.

According to *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Vol. viii), homosexuality is "a preference for sexual relations with a person of same sex" (603). Likewise, *New Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary* defines homosexuality as “a person, usually a

man, who is sexually attracted to people of the same sex" (747). The *Website Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia* defines homosexuality that refers to sexual interaction and or romantic attraction between individuals of the same sex. In modern use, the adjective homosexual is used for intimate relationship and sexual relations between people of the same sex, who may or may not identify themselves as gay or lesbians.

### **Development of Homosexuality**

The word homosexuality came into general use following the 1892 translations of Krafft-Ebing's *Psychological Sexualis*. Some earlier usage has been recorded: Swiss Doctor Karoly Maria Benkert used the term 'homosexual' in a response to German anti-homosexual legislation in 1869 to describe "inborn therefore irrepressible drives" (Plummer 142). Foucault also records the use of the term in his 1890 paper *Archive Fur Neurologie*, by Carl Westphalia to describe "less a type of sexual relations than [. . .] a certain quality of sexual sensibility, a certain way of inverting the masculine and feminine in oneself" (43). However, the 1890s marks the general adoption of the term by writers such as essayists J.A. Symonds and theorist Havelock Ellis. Like Benkert, all these theories were involved in a debate about whether desires and behaviors described by the term 'homosexual' were innate or culturally acquired.

By virtue of this definition, the term homosexual can be used to describe individuals as well as their sexual orientation, sexual history or self-identification. Since, the world places emphasis on sexuality, it should be avoided in reference to non-sexual contexts. Some people also feel the term is too clinical and somewhat dehumanizing. Much of that sentiment arose while homosexuality was still classified in the early nineteenth century as a mental illness in the Diagnostic and Statistical

Manual of Mental Disorders. As a result, the terms 'gay' 'lesbian' are generally preferred when discussing a person of sexual orientation, whose sexual history is predominated by then behavior or who acts as such. The first letters are frequently combined to create the acronym LGBT (which is also written as GLBT, in which B and T refer to bisexual and transgender individuals) some sex orientate people personally prefer the term 'homosexual' rather than 'gay' as they may perceive the former as describing a sexual orientation and the latter as describing a cultural or socio-political group with which they do not identify with.

Although some early writer used the adjectives 'homosexual' to refer to any single gender context, today the term is virtually exclusively used for sexual attraction. The term homo-social is now used to describe single sex context that are not specifically sexual. The more generic term 'hemophilia' (same love) is also preferred by some.

Derogatory terms include faggot (or the common abbreviation fag), which generally refers to gay man, poof or poofster, which are used mostly in United Kingdom and Commonwealths, queer which is generally used against anyone who is not exclusively heterosexual but also reclaimed as an affirming term by many gays and academics, gay and home, which are common terms among adolescents to harass each other and dyke which refers especially to lesbians. The manifestation of sexual orientation is subject to considerable variability. Thus it is common for homosexual individuals in hetero normative societies to love, marry and have children with individuals of the opposite sex, practices that may be done primarily for social reason in societies which reject same sex relation, as a corer for one's orientation. These adaptations are forms of situational sexual behavior. A further and extremely common manifestation of situational sexual behavior involving homosexual acts is seen in

prisons where individuals only meet members of their own sex for long period of time.

Regarding the orientation of homosexuality, writers can create such impressions in the environment of his writing or they can bestow their characters with distinctive markers in their per-formative behavior. Certain features such as effeminacy, excessive preoccupation with male beauty, misogyny, inability to express their deep feelings to their soul mates etc, are described in pathology as the descriptions of homosexuality. Only a single among aforementioned characteristic may be inadequate to identify that someone with such predilection is unmistakably a homosexual. But as pathologist agree when excessive preoccupation with male beauty comes jointly with any of these features, they are trays of homosexuality at the most or homoerotism at the least. The character having same passion detests nature at the cost of artificiality.

Throughout history, homosexuality has existed in most societies. Various cultures have different attitude toward it. The ancient Greek not only accepted homosexuality but considered it to be an ideal relationship perhaps because they were thought to consider women as inferior. Such men felt that only man could fulfill the role of true lover and friend. Similarly, some ancient African cultures accepted same sex marriage. Among the Nzema of Ghana, 'Friendship marriage' between man and the male teenager and sometimes two women of different generations was taken as means of transmitting social and spiritual guidance. This is a long tradition in the Christian west of hostility toward homosexuality although this usually took the form of formal regulation of male homosexual activity rather than female lesbian activity. Christian taboos against homosexuality have varied in strength through time and have had different effects on male and female homosexual behavior. Attitude towards

homosexuality are, thus, culturally specific and very enormously across different cultures and through various historical periods. Not only attitudes vary. The social as subjective meanings given to homosexuality are also culturally specific.

Social and cultural judgments on homosexuality have, however, relied on theories developed in the field of sexology after the late nineteenth and early twentieth century pioneer sexologists of the period developed the notion that homosexuality was characteristics of a particular type of a person . Karl Wistphal, for instance, in the 1860s, described contrary sexual feelings and argued that homosexuality was product of moral insanity resulting form congenital reversal of sexual feelings. Karl Ulrichs, a German lawyer and writer who was himself homosexually inclined, pioneered congenital theories and argued that the 'Unning' (as he terms homosexuals) was the product of the anomalous development of originally undifferentiated human embryo, resulting in a female mind in a male body or vice versa. Such bodily structure is known as inter mediate sex. On a more scientific level, the great German sexologist Magnus Hirschfield developed the notion of 'third sex' and integrated into this notion the discoveries of the significance of hormones in the development of sexual differentiation. His ideas were taken by homosexual apologist to form the basis for an explanation of homosexuality which was free of the pejorative implications of sin or moral weakness theories.

The role of emotion in sexual life was a matter of concern for later sexologists like Edward Carpenter who was especially anxious to know about emotional sexual feelings. Carpenter, the gay socialist and free thinker who wrote a number of books in defence of homosexuality introduces difference between love and sexual feeling. Talking of intermediate sex, (1908) he writes:

The word love is commonly used in so general and almost indiscriminate a fashion as to destine sometime physical instincts and acts and profound feeling; and in this way a good deal of misunderstanding is caused. In this book the word is used to denote the inner devotion of one person to another; and when anything else meant as, for instance, sexual relations and actions – this is clearly stated and expressed. (188)

The linguistic demarcation that carpenters set up between love feelings and sexual acts are partly, of course, strategic rather than scientific. He is concerned with defending homosexual men. By stressing the significance of the emotional rather than the physical aspect of sexual relation, he argues for greater moral rectitude in gay love, which was, in experience, often unconsummated. Eroticism between men, in his opinion, easily reaches a state of transcendence not because of its sexual possibilities but because of its tendency to run along emotional channels. Differentiating between emotional states of being and sexual acts, Carpenter describes his version as something emotional rather than sexual. Borrowing the notion of intermediate sex from Karl Ulrich, Carpenter says that Unnings have a specific part to play as reconcilers of the sexes to one another. Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character* (1903) appeared two years before Freud's first edition of *Three Essays on Sexuality*. Though the book is quite unbalanced in its view of gender, it popularized the notion of universal bisexuality not as degenerative or pathological but as an internal human quality.

Along with invigorating congenial theories, Havelock Ellis also accepted environment factors in the formation of homosexual desire. Ellis redefined homosexuality as an inborn condition rather than a form of sin. He furthermore,

differed from many of his European counterparts in explicitly respecting the vocabulary of degeneration, insisting that homosexuality should be seen as harmless psychological variation rather than a neuropath taint. His sexual inversion is a distinct and definitive investigation of homosexuality. This book seeks to normalize male homosexuality by rendering it acceptable to a wider audience and downplaying its association with effeminacy. The book largely intends to defend homosexuality. Ellis assumed that the invert might be visually distinguishable from the normal body through anatomical markers, just as the difference between the sexes had traditionally been mapped into the body. He argues homosexuality is an innate condition. He admits that external environmental factors might excite the latent condition although he insists such factors require favorable pre- disposition.

By the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, theories of sexuality had begun to shift in emphasis moving away from a focus on the body towards psychological theories of desire with the movement toward psychological modes of sexuality. Sexologist relied less and less upon the methodologies of comparative anatomy and implicitly acknowledged that physical characteristics are inadequate evidence. Physical characteristics are inadequate evidence of the truth of the body in question. In this regard, psychoanalytic theory developed by Sigmund Freud is of vital importance. Freud doubts the very existence of innate inversion and strongly opposes the earlier sexologists who believed homosexuals should be demarcated as special category persons. He believes homosexuality as arrested psychological development.

Recent advantages in social psychology and neo-Freudian theory suggests that development of heterosexual or homosexual propensities during youth is not a product of inherent biological imperative but the effect of historically condition familial and social influences channeling sexual possibilities which exists in a young

child the changing family, the changing notion of childhood and the role of parents and so on actually have profound effects in the construction of individual heterosexual or the other sexual categorization. Emotions are differentially structured according to different social forms and pressures. But, even if primary difference were biologically formed, this wouldn't fundamentally alter the argument. Society plays a very crucial role in respect to homosexuality. The important point to be observed while studying homosexuality is that there is no automatic relationship between social categorization and individual sense of self- identify. The meaning given to homosexual activities can vary enormously. It depends upon a variety of factors social class geographical location, gender differentiation and so on. In the construction of homosexuality, Jeffery weeks writes, "It is vital to keep in mind when exploring homosexuality which has always been defined in our culture as a deviant form that what matters is not its inherent nature of the act but the social construction of meaning around that activity and the individual response to it" (177).

Homosexuality remained for a long term of abuse. The same sex practice encountered not only legal hurdles but more severely, many people were massacred in the name of being homosexuals. But later, homosexuality carried the stature of special species. Homosexuals were considered social freak which has to do some thing with the effect of power circulating within society powered in its productive phase functions to install limits through making off the discursive domain specific to individual subject positions.

Late in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as large cities allowed for greater anonymity as wage labor apart from family becoming common, as more women were drawn out of homes, evidence of a new pattern of homosexual expression surfaced.

Regarding Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Transgender, Intra-sexual and Queers, (LGBTIQ) movements, in *Reader's Companion to American History*, Houghton Miffling has described how these individuals developed ways of meeting one another and institutions to foster a sense of identify. By 1915, one participant in this new gay world was referring to it as “a community distinctly organized” (5). An urban gay sub- culture had come into existence by the 1920s and 1930s which for the most part remained hidden from view because of social hostility.

World War II served as a critical divide in the social history of homosexuality. Large number of young people left their families, small towns, and closely knit ethnic neighborhood to enter a sex-segregated military or to migrate to larger cities for wartime employment.

After the war, many of them made sexual choices designed to support their gay identities. Pat Bond, a woman from Iowa who first met other lesbians while in the military, decided to stay in San Francisco after her discharge. Donald Vining remained in New York City rather than return to his small hometown in New Jersey, they along with countless others, sustained a vibrant gay subculture that revolved around bars and friendship networks many cities saw their first gay bars during the 1940s.

RCAH further summarizes that this new visibility provoked cultural prejudices. Firing from government jobs and purges from the ministry intensified in the 1950s presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower issued an executive order in 1953 barring gay men and lesbians from all federal jobs many state and local government and private corporations followed suit. The FBI began a “surveillance program against homosexuals” (9).

The lead taken by the federal government encouraged local police forces to harass gay citizens. Government officers regularly raided gay bars, sometimes arresting dozens of men and women on a single night. Under these conditions, some gays began to organize politically. In November 1950, in Los Angeles, a small group of men led by Harry Hay and Chuck Rowland met to form what would become the Mattachine Society. Mostly male in membership, it was joined in 1955 by a lesbian organization in San Francisco, the Daughters of Bilitis, founded by Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon. In the 1950s, these organizations remained small, but they established chapters in several cities and published magazines that were a “beacon of hope to the readers” (11).

In the 1960s, influenced by the model of a militant civil right movement the 'homophile movement' as the participants dubbed it – became more visible. Activists such as Franklin Kameny and Barbara Gittings picketed government agencies in Washington to protest discriminatory employment policies. In San Francisco, Martin Lyon and other targeted police harassment. By 1969, perhaps fifty homophile organizations existed in the United States, with memberships of a few thousand.

A massive grassroots gay liberation movement was born –mixing their voice with that of the radical protest of blacks, women, and college students in the 1960s, gays challenged all form of hostility and punishment meted out by society. Choosing to come out of the closet and publicly proclaim their identity, they have ushered in a social change movement that has grown substantially. By 1973, there were almost eight hundred gay and lesbian organizations in the United States; by 1990, the number was several thousand. By 1970, 5,000 gay men and lesbians marched in New York City to commemorate the 1<sup>st</sup> anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, in October 1987; over 600,000 marched in Washington, to demand equality.

The changes were far-reaching over the next two decades, half the states decriminalized homosexual behavior and police harassment was sharply contained. Many large cities included sexual orientation in the civil right statutes, as did Wisconsin and Massachusetts, first among the students to do so. In 1975, the civil service commission eliminated the ban on the employment of homosexuals in most federal jobs many of the nation's religious denominations engaged in spirited debates about the morality of homosexuality and some, like Unitarianism and Reformed Judaism opened their doors to gay and lesbian ministers and rabbis. The lesbian and gay world was no longer an underground subculture but in larger cities, especially a well organized community, with businesses political clubs, social service agencies, community centers, and religious congregations bringing people together. In a number of places, openly gay candidates ran for elective office and won.

These changes spawned opposition. In 1977, the singer Anita Bryant led a campaign to repeal a gay rights ordinance in Dade county, Florida. Her success encouraged other and by the early 1980s a well organized conservative force had materialized to target the gay rights movement. Politicians such as senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina and fundamentalist ministers such as Jerry Falwell of Lynchburg, Virginia who formed Moral Majority, Inc. joined forces to slow the progress of the gay movement.

***The History of Sexuality (Vol. 1) by Michel Foucault***

This is a much-used word in contemporary theory and it is most importantly used in such terms as sexual discourse which is specifically derived from Foucault's use of the concept. Discourse was originally used from about sixteen century to describe any kind of speaking, talk or conversation but became increasingly used to describe a more formal speech, a narration or treatment of any subject at length, a

treatise, dissertation or sermon. More recently, discourse has been used in technical sense by linguists to describe any unit of speech longer than a sentence.

However, the Foucauldian sense of the term has little to do with the act of speaking in its traditional sense. For Foucault, a discourse is a strongly bounded areas of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known. The key feature of this is that the world is not simply there to be talked about, rather, it is through discourse itself that the world is brought into being. It is also in such a discourse that speakers and hearers, writers and readers come to an understanding about themselves, their relationship to each other and their place in the world (the construction of subjectivity). It is the complex of signs and practices which organizes social existence and social reproduction.

There are certain unspoken rules controlling which statements can be made and which cannot within the discourse and these rules determine the nature of that discourse. Since, a virtually limitless number of statements can be made within the rules of the system, it is these rules that characterize the discourse and that interest analysts such as Foucault. According to Foucault, any truth is created within discourse but power plays important role to create any truth and knowledge. As soon as the system of authority or the system of power changes, truth or knowledge accordingly changes in the course of shifting power from one point to another.

Power creates a series of binary identification. The creation of new political and social identify is one of the most distinctive effect of power/knowledge nexus.

Foucault's treatment of homosexuality provides a characteristic example. In the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault speaks of the invention of homosexuality, among other exotic perversions, via the "specification of individuals" (42). Such a process effected the creation of new sexual identities around particular

acts and perversion hitherto regarded as temporary aberration (s). Around the figure of the homosexual was made possible by the confluence of a network of disparate discourses and practices targeted at the body of the pervert. The new science of sexology, psychiatry and medicines were particularly instrumental in the construction of this new identity, whilst the articulation of power in the practices of confinement and treatment enabled such discourses to have practical effects.

The example of the homosexual also illustrates the extent to which the government of socially marginal identities simultaneously regulate the experience of subjectivity in the wider population. This is, in fact, one of the most important functions of those dividing practices examined above. In the example cited. The specification of homosexuality inevitably calls forth the establishment of heterosexuality and its attendant social and political identities, “just as the homosexual is enmeshed in a series of relation of power and knowledge, so to is the heterosexual couple” (05). Beyond this particular case, Foucault explores a number of other marginalized identities, including the delinquent, the madman, the pervert and the criminal, each of which only further illustrates the construction of limits distinguishing normal from deviant and self from object. Foucault argues that the constitution of subjectivity through such practices effect the reification of the 'normal subject' there by facilitating a pervasive normalization of subjectivity so characteristic of modern societies. Foucault's studies provide a series of histories of the “different mode by which, in our culture, human being are made subject” (*The History of Sexuality*, 208). Identity and subjectivities are not, for Foucault, the realization of some deep, interiorized essence, ostensibly the very distillation of human nature. Rather, the question of humanity's natural is problem generated in discourse arising at

certain moments and belying a particular discursive history. As Foucault concludes, even the history of man has history.

In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault examines the organization of homosexuality in the west. He begins his analysis with a powerful critique of what he terms "the repressive hypothesis". Conventional understandings of western sexuality appeal to the repressive nature of Victorian society. Sexuality is a taboo, something about which nothing can be said. Silence and censorship are the law. In the contrast of this view, Foucault suggests that sexuality is talked about all the time in Victorian society. From the rise of sexology to judicial institutions, sexuality is profusely discussed and regulated entity. It is something which is produced through discourse, not repressed through censorship.

The most significance aspects of Foucault's research centers on the production of the homosexuals. The proliferation of discourse of sexuality gave rise to the category "homosexual" originally a taxonomic device employed within sexology, the terms subsequently gained currency in judicial and psychiatric fields of knowledge. By demonstrating that "homosexuals" did not exist before this classification, Foucault shows that social identities are effects of the ways in which knowledge is organized. He observes the politically ambiguous character and the formation of the character like the homosexuals:

There is no question that the appearance of nineteenth century psychiatry, Jurisprudence and literature of whole series of discourse on the species and sub-species of homosexuality; inversion, pedantry and "psychic her- maphrodism" made possible a strong advance of social controls into the area of "perversity"; but it also made possible the formation of a "reverse" discourse; homosexuality began to speak in its

own behalf, to demand that its legitimacy or “naturally” be acknowledged, often in the same vocabulary- using the same category by which it was medically disqualified. (101)

Foucault offers an account of a social production of identities which are assumed to be natural in current dominant knowledge. Foucault views the intention of the homosexual and the addict as predicted upon the modern epistemic regime in which particular acts and behaviors like sodomy and drug taking were transformed into criminalized and pathologized identities through the positive effect of power. The modern regime which organized through a division between normal and abnormal are mutually depended categories: the self's border is produced through a social power of producing and policing the other. As Michel Foucault explained, the shift from acts to identities is an effect of a modern epistemic regime that produces, locates and contains what and who are threatened and threatening in order to produce and stabilize the norm. The strategies and operation of modern power are concealed but work to produce and rendered visible the deviant, the pathological, the delinquent:

There can be no possible exercise of power without the certain economy of discourse of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth. In the end, we are judged, condemned, classified, determined in our undertakings, destined to a certain mode of living and dying as a function of the true discourse which are bearers of the specific effects of power. (35)

Foucault wished to prove beneath such abstract system in which discursive practice are interwoven with social practice by the circulation of power. Truth, then, is itself a

product of relations of power and of the system in which it flows and it changed as system changed. Hence, he avers that homosexuality is socially created, historically variable and therefore deeply politicized.

At the juncture, we should be aware of the fact that sexuality as a metonym for a homosexuality and in *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault traces unmistakably the history of homosexuality of “sodomites”. Thus, whenever I m stating Foucault’s concept of sexuality, I ms stating homosexuality, like Sedgwick says:

[homosexuality is] the metonym for sexuality that the two stories of sexuality actually installs is homosexuality [. . .] and the history of sexuality is the history of homosexuality, under the heading incorporation of perversions and a new specification of individuals. (Sedgwick 281).

Hence, the terms themselves are interchangeable. Foucault’s discussions here of the invention of ‘the homosexual’ is presented as an exemplifying instance of a process of specification of the emergence of identities where previously there had been acts that also included all those minor perverted whom nineteenth century psychiatrists entomologized by giving them strange baptismal names.

Foucault’s claim reflected its shift the tactics of power from an emphasis on sexual behavior to one on sexual personhood is the place of the opposition between natural and unnatural acts, sexual experiences would be divided into normal and abnormal identities. Sexuality, therefore became a central cite of the construction of subjectivism.

In constructing the genealogy of the homosexual/ heterosexual divide. Sedgwick’s work draws on Foucault. To be homosexual is not to be heterosexual, and in the more direct terms, to be male is not to be female. It is precisely this fixing of

identity, this government of individualization that Foucault is so opposed to (208-223). Foucault thus, exhorts us to consider the cost of our subjectification in terms of the active restrictions of freedom and agency. Foucault's intention is to wake us from our great 'anthropological sleep' such that "we might become aware of the extent to which our subjectification erects limit our experience" (430-433). Whilst limits have very immediate and very concrete practical effects, Foucault stresses that limits remain 'events of thought' and as such might be discursively and practically reconstituted. In this sense, the subject may actively the pervasive observation of limits through his or her own aesthetic practice, through a realization of a limit 'attitude'.

For Foucault, the construction of homosexuality since the mid nineteenth-century has engendered innumerable transformation in the manner in which men relate to one another in their ordinary social interactions. In particular, Foucault argues that intimacy between men and the access to other men's bodies has been problematized through the reification of homosexuality and its attendant homophobia. The construction of what Foucault calls a homosexual 'mode of existence' has thus injures that friendship and intimacy between men have become aligned with a sexual identity, hopelessly problematizing the manner in which men might come to share "their time [. . .] their leisure, their grief, their knowledge, their confidences" (136). Foucault here notes the extent to which the desire to develop intimate relationship with other men has been conflated with sexual desire and the practice of homosexuality.

Recent critical studies on "sexuality" undoubtedly half to deal with it as a category consisting of wide range of sexuality rather than only a monolithic heterosexual one. The traditional formula of 'normative' heterosexuality, it seems, has

erased the historiographies of many people or groups whose sexual behavior defines such norm. Contemporary studies on sexuality seek to describe the repressed historiographies, and these “other” sexuality that were ignored or denied by traditional scholars. Michel Foucault, Judith Butler and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, among many others, have illustrated and emphasized the shift- worthwhile to be noted from sexual behavior to sexual identity with the commencement of modern practice of putting mortals into either or camp of sexuality from nineteenth century onwards. In which influential *The History of Sexuality*, volume one, Foucault argues that homosexuality and homosexuals date from the 1870s. Foucault argues:

The nineteenth century homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form and morphology, with an indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology. Nothing that went into his total composition was unaffected by his sexuality [ . . .]. Homosexuality appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed.

From the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphroditism of the soul. The sodomites had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual now was a species. (43)

Foucault, however, does not mean to say that sexual acts that we refer to as homosexual acts were unknown before the 1870s. Rather, such behaviors already had a long rich history and as Sedgwick comments, “What was new from the tone of the century was the old mapping by which every given persons, just as he or she necessarily assignable to a male or female gender, was now considered necessarily assignable as well to a homo- or a heterosexuality [ . . .]” (2). This shift obviously was a political one. In the name of maintaining morality, the society exerted a set of

limitation by constructing parameters of normalcy. It is interesting to note the use of concepts of 'normalcy' in the modern sense and its connection to the act of rendering sexuality other than heterosexuality as deviant. Though early Christianity had adopted anti- sexuality as different on the sexual permissiveness of Hellenistic time as its major tenet, watertight classification of individual into heterosexual and homosexual accord only in the late nineteenth century. The then bourgeoisie, by making use of what Foucault calls deployment of 'technologies of power', was able to make that arbitrary imposition of hetero/homo division in seemingly natural ways, which, in turn made hetero-desire a compulsion.

No area was exempt from this strict regulation and polishing of sexuality, whether that is medical, legal, judicial, and academic or any other for that matter. Classical psychoanalysis, for instance, simply takes heterosexuality for granted. So is the case with mainstream feminist: even though, sexuality and literature related to it or representing it had first become an issue within the very movement. The mainstream feminist contention of sexuality as a construction of patriarchy would not satisfy the radical/lesbian feminists, for whom there was no less oppression within the movement. In similar fashion, gay liberation movements- notably after Stonewall Riots in 1969, developed collective activism, openly affirming what they were. Many gays, who were in 'closets', due to the rigorous sexual taxonomy of individuals 'came out' only then.

Along with Foucault, Jacques Derrida's poststructuralist contribution of deconstructive strategies, has similarly disclosed the credibility of the spectrum of sexualities, demarcating "the insecure divisions between male and female, femininity and masculinity, heterosexual and homosexual, friend and sodomite" (337), as Rachel Adams and David Savran ascribe in the introductory part of *The Masculinity Studies*

*Reader.* Since all such terms as historically contingent, talking only of homosexuals and heterosexuals, for example, is not only insufficient to refer to conscious or unconscious performance such as “queen, dyke, butch, transsexual, nelly, femme”, (*Chinn* 295) but absurd also, as the system of constructing such binaries is less a condition of human nature than being a feature of certain kind of society.

Binaries, such as Adams and Savran mentions, especially their traditional formulaic referential significance are inefficacious to include the dynamic range of sexual desire and multiple identities. At present, the terms ‘sex’, ‘gender’ and ‘sexuality’ often blur into each other in a complicated way. ‘Sex’ not only refers to what Sedgwick calls ‘chromosomal sex’ but to the cultural expectations of male and female, namely masculinity and femininity. ‘Gender’ again fares the same schema, as due to the hardcore impositions of masculine/feminine qualities, individuals are forced to act accordingly. If gender was not limited to the logic of the binary, sexuality would also be able to cater to wider range of other repressed or unacknowledged desires and practices. Moreover, ‘sex’ and ‘sexuality’ also overlap, as Sedgwick clarifies:

[. . .] the whole realm of what modern culture refers to as ‘sexuality- and also calls ‘sex’ - the array of acts, expectations, narratives, pleasures, identity formations and knowledge, in both woman and man, that tends to cluster most densely around certain genital sensations but is not adequately defined by them- that realm is virtually impossible to situate on a map delimited by the feminist defined sex/ gender distinction. (29)

Sexuality, thus, can be seen as a fluid category which incorporates not only concrete and real activities but ruminations, fantasy and what- not. Moreover, due to the

individual differences, it is very hard to define a precise boundary of sexuality. Even identical sexual acts may mean very different things to different people. Many people may even have rich mental or emotional involvement with sexual acts they do not do or which they even does not want to do. Thus, the homo-hetro-opposition turn out to be overtly contracting in this regard.

In a nutshell, rather than being embroiled in the accuracy of biological essentialism versus historical constructivism regarding sex, gender and sexuality, it would be more reasonable as Sedgwick argues, to keep such understanding and “cultural and material reproduction, plural, multicapillary, argues- eyed, respectful and endlessly cherished” (44) and as Garber’s concept “clothes make the man” (75) in her *Vested Interests: Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety* also suggests, the concept of male and female or masculinity and femininity sexuality must be viewed as an unstable historical and political construct in our societies and such an awkward issue have only has continually to be revisited, disavowed, rediscovered and affirmed.

Gay men and lesbians who are the members of racial minorities in America face a complex system of discrimination. For in addition to the oppression, they suffer in white heterosexual culture, gay and lesbian African-Americans, Asian-American, Chicanos and Latinos are sometimes heavily stigmatized in their own communities.

The myth that gay people are sick, evil, or both and that is therefore in their “nature” to be insatiable sexual predators, to modest children and to corrupt youths by “recruiting” them to be homosexual. Another myth portrays gay men and lesbians as a very small population of deviants, when, in fact, it is estimated that gay people comprises at least ten percent of the population of the United States. Other common misconceptions include the belief that children raised by gay men or lesbians will

group up to be gay that unchecked homosexuality will result in the extinction of the human race and that gay people are responsible for declines in U.S. foreign power

### **Gay Criticism**

Gay criticism does not tend to focus on efforts to define homosexuality, sexual relation between man or even just a sexual desire of one man for another are the generally accepted criterion of gayness in white middle class America today.

Nevertheless, not all cultures have this definition. For example, in Mexican and South American culture, the mere fact of sexual activity with or desire for another male does not indicate that a man is homosexual. As long as he behaves in a traditionally masculine manner -strong dominant, decisive - and consistently assumes the male sexual role as penetrate (never allowing himself to be penetrated, orally or anally), a man remains a macho, a 'real' man. As a *Macho* a man have sex with both men and women and not be considered what North American homosexual. The same definition of homosexuality was used in a white American working class culture around the turn of 20<sup>th</sup> century: only men who allowed themselves to be penetrated by a man during sex and behaved in a traditionally feminine manner—submissive, coy, flirtatious, soft were considered homosexual.

It was not until the 19<sup>th</sup> century that the notion of homosexual identify or even the word homosexual was adopted in Anglo-European and American culture. Before that time, certain sexual acts generally speaking all forms of non-procreative sex – were forbidden by church or state but they were not viewed as evidence of a specific sexual identity. The idea that one could be homosexual came along with the idea promoted by the medical profession that such an identity was a form of pathology. This is why many gay man today prefer to refer to themselves as gay: the word

homosexual is associated for many with the belief that homosexuality is a medical or psychological disorder.

Attitudes towards homosexuality, like attitudes toward sexuality in general differ widely from one place to another and one historic period to another. The intense anti-gay sentiment that emerged in an especially concentrated and virulent form in America during the early 1950s and that which lingers today does not represent some kind of universally held attitude toward or even definition of homosexuality.

Gay sensibility includes an awareness of being different at least in certain ways from the member of mainstream, dominant culture and the complex feeling that result in form an implicit, ongoing social oppression. In other words, part of seeing a world as a gay man includes the ways in which one deals with being oppressed as a gay man.

Gay critics attempt to determine what might constitute a gay poetic or a way of writing that is uniquely gay; to establish a gay literary tradition; and to decide what writers and works belong to that tradition. Gay critic also examines how gay sensibility affect literary expressions and study the way in which heterosexual text can have homoerotic dimension. They try to rediscover the gay writer from the past whose work was underappreciated, distorted, or suppressed, including gay writers who have been presumed heterosexual. They try to determine sexual politics of specific texts analyzing for example, how gay characters or "feminine" men are portrayed in both gay and heterosexual text. Finally gay critic identities and correct heterosexist interpretation of literature that fail to recognize or appreciate the gay sensibility informing specific literary works.

### III. Brick and Skipper as Homosexuals

Williams presents homosexual in the play *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Though not stated clearly and given a back door entry by Williams, Brick and Skipper are homosexual couples in the play. The idealized friendship between Brick and Skipper deserves the sympathy of the readers that none of the heterosexual relationship can match. Williams appreciates Maggie but even, she cannot come to the level of communication shared by the friends. Homosexuality is the inadmissible thing that hovers over the background of the play.

The room in which the action takes place between Brick Politt and Maggie is the same room that was occupied for so many years by the former owner of the plantation, Jack straw and Peter Ochello, who were homosexual lovers. Williams admits that the two, “shared this room all their lives together” (939). Never appearing in the play, an integral character, Skipper was Brick’s best friend.

Skipper and Brick shared a closed bond-possibly too close by the moral standards of time. Maggie became convinced that they loved one another. She confronted Skipper with her suspicions and tried to ‘prove’ her wrong but he was not able to satisfy her sexually. Then Maggie realized that the love between her husband and Skipper was a love that not speak its name and a love that could not be satisfied or discussed. Ashamed by his feeling, Skipper began to drink heavily. One night, after finally acknowledging himself as a gay, skipper’s heart couldn’t take it anymore and he committed suicide because of depression and alcoholism. Guilt ridden over the death of his best friend, his own deeply repressed feeling, ashamed of his nature, Brick stops sleeping with his wife and starts sleeping with a bottle:

MARGARET: Why I remember when we double-dated at college,

Gladys Fitzgerald and I and You and Skipper, it was more like

a date between you and Skipper. Gladys and I were just sort of tagging along as if it was necessary to chaperone you! - To make good public impression. (954)

Brick hung up on his friend's submission of desire and shut out his wife both sexually and emotionally. Unable to endure any kind of intimacy, Brick drinks himself into detachment:

MARGARET: You know, our sexual life didn't just peter out in the usual way, it was cut off short, long before the natural time for it to. (952)

Maggie seduced Skipper to find out what his relationship with Brick was and when he was unable to perform sexually with her, she felt she knew the truth. Because of his sexual predisposition toward Brick, Skipper decided to 'skip' Maggie:

MARGARET: He slapped me hard on the mouth-then turned and ran without stopping once. (965)

Brick's real problem is that he can not face the complexity of his own emotions and sexual desires. He needs to see his feeling for Skipper as pure because the thought of being branded as queer terrifies him. Like all deeply closeted people, Brick is obsessed with what his audience will think.

BRICK: One man has one great good thing in his life. One great thing which is true- I had friendship with Skipper- you are naming it dirty! (956)

Brick feels that the cause of the death of Skipper is because of Maggie. Had Maggie not enticed with Skipper, may be the later would still be alive. For this reason Brick is not able to forgive Maggie and doesn't like her forced company:

BRICK: Give my crutch.

MARGARET: Lean on me.

BRICK: No, just give me my crutch.

MARGARET: Lean on my shoulder.

BRICK: I don't want to lean on your shoulder. I want my crutch or do  
have to get down on my knees on the floor and. (948)

Skipper, Brick's deceased friend embodies some of the most important issues. The issue of sexual preference is more peripheral. The primary motive of the unseen character (Skipper) was to demonstrate the power of human relationships, to reveal the incredible hold that one individual can have over another. Skipper is the sexual barometer in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Skipper's voyage with Brick leads to troubled waters for them both.

Williams's made Brick's homosexuality with Skipper as ambiguous as possible. Even Brick doesn't like to express his actual relationship with Skipper openly to Big Daddy, as it is terrifying and inevitably public as well. But still their presence as homosexual couple can not be ruled out. Moreover, homophobic discourse is created while trying to get the truth of Brick and Skipper's relationship throughout the play.

### **Allan Gray as Unseen Homosexual Character in *A Streetcar Named Desire***

Allan Gray is one and only unseen homosexual character in Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Though he never appears stage, he is the most important character that brings many ups and downs in the life of its main character. He is also such a character who dares not face reality in heterosexual hegemonic society. As a result, he could not see any option rather than to commit suicide. He is unseen character dies before the play begin, however; his vision is very clear through other important characters while presenting their homophobic attitude towards him.

Allan Gray, Blanche Dubois's late husband is a gentle, poetic young man who took his own life after his wife discovered his homosexuality. She tells Mitch about his private romantic preference to same sex, "[. . .] By coming suddenly into a room that I thought was empty- which hasn't empty, but had two people in it [. . .]"(183).

Allan Gray was bisexual person. He was very handsome person having poetic qualities who came near to Blanche for help but she couldn't understand him. She failed to help what he needs. Rather she falls in love with him and get married with him. Blanche tells Mitch about her husband's same sex preference:

[. . .] there was something different about the boy, nervousness, softness and tenderness which wasn't like a man's, although he wasn't the least bit effeminate-looking-still-that thing was there [. . .]. He came to me for help. I didn't know that. I didn't find out anything till after our marriage when we'd run away come back and all I knew I'd failed him in some mysterious way wasn't able to give the help he needed but couldn't speak of! [. . .]. (183)

Alan is a homosexual as heterosexual. There is nothing wrong to live with bisexual person. Moreover, had Blanche tried to bring him normal heterosexual life, maybe she could have changed. But instead of doing that, she openly defends his private homosexuality to the public area. She tells Mitch, "It was because-on the dance floor-unable to stop myself-I'd suddenly said-'I saw, I know! I know! You disgust me [. . . .]" (184).

As Allan grey is the representative of the homosexual of post-war era, homosexuality is certainly terrifying thing. When people like Allan's sexual preference is exposed, they are often branded as 'queer'. Being afraid of it, all of a sudden he commits suicide. Blanche tells his reaction,"We danced the Varsouvianna!

suddenly in the middle of the dance the boy I had married broke away from me and ran out of the casino. A few moments later- a shot” (183).

Not only Blanche but Stella Kowalski, Blanche elder sister also sees epitome of divine qualities in Allan, however, she has also the same prejudiced homophobic attitude towards her brother-in-law:

STELLA: I mean her marriage, when she was- almost a child! She married a boy who wrote poetry [. . .]. He was extremely good-looking. I think Blanche didn't just love him but worshipped the ground he walked on! Adored him and thought him almost too fine to be human! But then she found out [. . .].

STANLEY: What?

STELLA: This beautiful and talented young man was a degenerate [. . .]. (189-190)

Like other unseen character in Williams's play, here Williams tries to show the power of unseen character how one individual has power over another. Allan is working here as powerful off-stage character to compel other character express the homophobia of mid-twentieth American hegemonic heterosexual society.

### **Homophobia in Tennessee Williams's Plays *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire***

The word homosexuality has acquired multiple meaning over time. In the original sense, it describes a sexual orientation characterized by lasting aesthetic attraction, romantic love or sexual desire exclusively for the same sex or gender. Homosexuality is usually contrasted with heterosexuality and bisexuality.

As an author, Tennessee Williams's treatment of homosexuality as taboo is because of sex as socially constructed. Homosexuality is almost inadmissible thing in

Tennessee Williams plays especially in reference to *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Although homosexuality is the heart and soul of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire*, author's homophobic attitude can be seen through his main character in both of his plays.

As discussed in earlier chapter about homosexuality being a social construct, so is the case in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. The Native American culture viewed both gender and sexuality very differently from their European colonists. Religious and civil authorities condemned such act as sinful and unnatural. Participants on such act, then began to be known as 'homosexual', 'pervert', 'inverts', and gradually later came to be known as 'gay' and 'lesbians'- in the mid-twentieth century. *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* was written before the emergence of Gay Right Movement of the 1960s and 1970s, which forced many societies and countries to alter their prejudiced views on homosexuality.

*Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* premiered in 1950s. After the end of Second World War, Americans had begun to re-evaluate themselves. The old values and system had collapsed and men felt orphaned and defrauded. Faith in religion had been shaken. The result was loss of identity and stability, both in individual and social life. Homosexuality had also existed at that time also when *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* was premiered after the War. But Tennessee Williams was not able to talk or present his views on homosexuality during this very critical period. As discussed in earlier chapter that power is always exercised within discourse and the very truth (law and censorship) is created within discourse in association with power nexus. Tennessee Williams himself was a gay playwright and it was because of his gay sensibility that he made Brick's homosexuality as ambiguous as possible in *Cat* or in other words, his

homosexual affliction is twisted and hidden whenever he is forced to confess his relation with self-hating homosexual in the play.

Williams's split vision, his divided self is the main reason that he presents homosexual character and there is always Williams's obsession of public exposures through the homophobia of his characters. The relationship of Williams and Merlo parallel the relationship between Brick and the Skipper:

BIG DADDY: you started drinking when your friend skipper died.

BRICK: what are you suggesting?

BIG DADDY: I am suggesting nothing. Not, well, exactly normal in your friendship between with [. . .]. (970)

Tennessee Williams fell in love with Frank Merlo in 1947. In 1961, Merlo died of lung cancer and playwright went into the deep depression that lasted for ten years. There is parallelism between Tennessee Williams/ Merlo and Brick/ Skipper. In the play, Big daddy and Maggie represented the mainstream society where as the minorities are represented by Brick and Skipper. The central scene of the play is usual father-son confrontation over the supposed homosexual relationship of Brick with Skipper. Here, son Brick is horrified that Big Daddy is not shocked at the thought of homosexuality. To hide his homosexuality from the other family members, as it is not acceptable to them, Brick says that his friendship with Skipper was pure. Brick is unable to compromise neither with his social image nor with his platonic ideal. He represents the homosexual personality of the era of transition and also its failure and crisis:

BRICK: Both of us married into society, Big Daddy. (961)

Big Daddy loves Brick dearly favoring him the rightful heir. The confrontation between Big Daddy and Brick in the second act has been forced by the former

because of his love for his son. It is his feeling for Brick which makes Big Daddy to bring the young man out of psychological paralysis and back into the world of living. Big Daddy was old and dying. He realized that he couldn't hand over his large estate to an alcoholic homosexual outcast. It would result the decimation of the biggest plantation estate into the south. During the confrontation, Brick charges two homosexual sisters Jack straw and Peter Ochello as "duckling sissies" but also with many words such as "sodomites", "perverts", "fairies" etc. Big Daddy actually is eager to know the causes of his present state right after the death of his friend, Skipper. However, Brick does not like to be compared between him/ Skipper and Jack Straw/ Peter Ochello at least by Big Daddy. The scene is dominated by Brick's homophobic diatribes to the old sisters:

BRICK: You think so, too? You think so, too? You think me an'  
Skipper did, did, did! – together?

BIG DADDY: Hold- ?

BIG DADDY: You think Skipper and me was a pair of dirty old men?

(971)

Brick is obsessed, terrified of being called a "queer" and conscious of the irony of being expected to perform sexually in Straw and Ohello's bed. Brick's homophobic diatribes to the two old sisters is Williams's choice. Right after the death of his friend Skipper, Brick indulges himself into alcohol, however, he defends the charge (allegation) made by Big daddy. His stated reason for his shock is not moral, religious or psychological: it is public opinion; 'Don't you know how people think about things like that? How, how disgusted they are by things like that?' ( 970). Homosexuality to Brick is terrifying because it is inevitably public.

On the other hand, Maggie also represents the mainstream society. She is not comfortable with the relationship that her husband had with skipper. She had turned Skipper into seduction but after he could not perform sexually, she was sure of their homosexual relationship. She calls herself a 'Cat'. She is the *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, in the sense that her married life with homosexual is very unpleasant. She longs for a healthy sexual relationship with her husband, but Brick does not want to go to bed with her, and they are childless:

MARGARET: Y' know what I feel, Brick?

I feel all the time like a Cat on a hot Tin Roof.

BRICK: Then jump off the roof, jump off it, Cats can jump off the roofs and la- ads on their four feet uninjured!

MARGARET: I can't see a man but you!

Even with my eyes closed, I just see you, Brick. (949)

Brick is a homosexual or at least a bisexual. Brick does not like Maggie because of her unceasing and uncompromising efforts to make him normal, social and responsible person. She wants him to return into normal life and accept the reality and responsibility of living like a family and a social man. She is struggling to make him understand the necessity of having a child and pleasing Big Daddy. She is sexually frustrated because her husband is no longer treating her wife. Another reason for her frustration is the possibility that the fortune she thinks she married into may be lost to her because of her drinking homosexual irresponsible husband.

MARGARET: You know, our sex life did not peter out in the usual

life: it was cut off Short, long before the natural time for it too.

BRICK: You could leave me, Maggie.

MARGARET: You can be young without money, but you've got to  
be old with money because to be old without is just too awful.  
(952)

Throughout the play, Williams privileges the troubled closeted homosexual over the heterosexual character. But as the heterosexuals are in majority and in power, heterosexual become secondary and marginalized. Homosexual persons are often defined and interpreted through the lenses of powerful heterosexual society. The knowledge and the truth created about homosexuals by heterosexual in the nexus of power are always dehumanizing so that an outcast heterosexual characters like Bricks are never open to express their exact identity because of the fear of being branded as "queer", "fairies" and "degenerates".

Similarly in *A Streetcar Named Desire* also, Williams has brought Allan Grey as troubled closeted homosexual character of 1950s America who became the victim of homophobic society. Allan Grey's private romantic preference to same sex- soul mates is made public, insulted and hated by the moral standards of contemporary society. His sexual orientation can't be regarded as normal through the lenses of heterosexual hegemonic society. His so-called queer sexual orientation definitely hurts his wife Blanche, as she represents the privileged heterosexual society. When she discovers her husband private homosexuality, she can't tolerate the situation. Deeply wounded by Allan's preference for male lovers, Blanche once retaliated by denouncing her emotion towards her sensitive husband in public. "We danced the Varsouviana". She tells Mitch:

[. . .] suddenly in the middle of the dance the boy had married broke  
away from me and ran out of the casino. A few moments later – a shot!  
[. . .]. He'd struck the revolver into his mouth, and fired- so that the

back of his head had been- blown away! It was because- on the dance-  
floor- unable to stop myself- I'd suddenly said "I saw! I know!~ you  
disgust me." (183-184)

As a playwright of mid-century post-stone war America, the subject of  
homosexuality is very playfully handled in *Streetcar*. As homosexuality is a social  
construct, dealing with the subject matter of homosexuality was very terrifying job.  
To do so, one of the techniques he has applied is flashback narration. Blanche  
discovery of her husband's homosexuality is not dramatized but it is narrated during  
the conversation between Mitch and Blanche. The most important thing in Williams's  
drama is that his important characters are always outcasts and neglected homosexuals.  
No matter whether Allan in *Streetcar Named Desire* is onstage homosexual or not.  
One thing is sure that he is the very important character to help the other character  
express their homophobic attitude in the play.

Blanche is very pathetic character, no matter how she is responsible for her  
husband's death. But, later her attitude towards her husband, her tragic predicament  
from one place to another compels audience to feel pity to her. She believes that it  
was she who drove Allan to commit suicide. She didn't try to bring change of her  
husband's homosexuality. Had she behaved normally with her husband, maybe he  
would change his behavior or at least he wouldn't commit suicide. The best example  
of homosexuality as a social construct can be seen especially in the concept of  
Blanche and Allan Grey. Both of them have been taught sexual categories since their  
childhood that same sex for friendship and opposite is for sex. Allan and Blanche's  
homophobia is due to sexual categories that same sex for friendship and opposite is  
for sex. The sexual categories created by orthodox heterosexual society create binary  
opposition between self and other, subject and object, normal and pervert. Allan's

inability to express his sexual identity is due to the same sexual categories often created on water-tight classification of heterosexual masculine society. Moreover, he has fear of being branded as 'queer'. Homosexuality to Allan is very much terrifying because it is inevitably public.

Although Allan Grey and Brick's in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* situation is completely different, there are certain similarities too. Both of them are homosexuals. Both are the victims of contemporary American hegemonic society. The difference is Brick is the central onstage character whereas Allan is off-stage character who only comes in the memory of other characters. In doing so, homophobia is automatically produced. Especially, we hear Allan through the mouth of his wife and her sister Stella. Throughout the play, he has never been presented in positive terms. Rather he is being described as degenerate or pervert. Stella tells her husband about Allan's homosexuality:

STELLA: [. . .] I think Blanche didn't just love him but worshipped the ground he walked on! Adored him and thought him almost too fine to be human! But then she found out-

STANLEY: What?

STELLA: This beautiful and talented young man was a degenerate [. . .]. (189-190)

Blanche gives a lot of clues that a person having different sexual orientation is always treated as outcast of the society. Blanche doesn't entirely hate Allan. As she is the representative of powerful heterosexual society, the immediate response of her husband's homosexuality is somehow reasonable:

BLANCHE: It was because- on the dance floor- unable to stop myself-

I'd suddenly said- I know, I know! You disgust me [. . .].

(184)

The most important aspect of Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire* is that he again prefers here the closeted homosexual character, Allan Grey, who is not outcast because of his own actions and circumstances but because of the standard of conventional morality forced upon him. To do so, he presents here a hydrophobic discourse as well, wherein, the most heterosexual character Blanche is punished because of her ill-treatment with Allan, her husband. Likewise, another heterosexually represented character Stanley, who brings tragedy in the life of Blanche, is negatively described and presented because of his down to earth heterosexual preference.

Williams always gives the theme of his plays in the first scene. The action in *A Streetcar Named Desire* begins with a hint of violence that is to come. In the first scene, we see Stanley, whom Williams calls a "gaudy seed-bearer", tossing a bloody package of meat to his wife. He is violently and barbarically presented throughout the play, both in costuming and in dialogue. Blanche shares the idea of strong feminist view that all males are rapists and heterosexists. Blanche describes Stanley with many dehumanizing terms. Immediately on arrival, Blanche refers to Stella's home as "this horrible place" (120). She reproaches Stella for not helping to save the plantation, "where are you? In bed with your Pollack! as if this is wrong" (127).

By presenting Stella as his mouthpiece, Williams has dehumanized Stanley as much as possible. Blanche is not satisfied with her sister and Stanley's marriage life. She tries to convince her sister leave Stanley but Stella ignores her proposal. When she is ignored, Blanche speaks to Stella about her husband:

There is something downright bestial about him! ...the acts like an anim-al, has animal's habits! [ . . .] there is even something subhuman something not quite to the stage of humanity yet! Yes, something ape-like about him, like on- of those pictures I've seen in anthropological studies. (163)

#### IV. Conclusion

Though Tennessee Williams has contributed significantly in introducing both gay and straight sexual issues to American stage, he did not venture to produce overtly gay-themed play despite the subject of homosexuality and gay characters appearing in the play. Although homosexuality is the heart and soul in both of his plays, Williams is never open to express homosexuality of his characters in both plays. Nevertheless, his homosexual sensibility can easily be traced. The best way to show his homosexual sensibility is the technique of the discourse of homophobia and the heterophobia in both *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *A Streetcar Named Desire*.

His Pulitzer Prize winning *Cat on a Hot tin Roof* deals with issues like homosexuality, addiction and other tensions (mendacity). The behavior of Brick is fully engraved by sexual frustration. The ideal of male companionship is one of the most enduring myths in American literature. Williams used this theme when he describes Brick's relationship with his friend Skipper. Yet the myth is twisted and subverted when his male characters perform an innocent relationship. The heterosexual couples of the play are full of lovelessness, mistrust, hypocrisy and mendacity. Brick and Maggie personify divorce, alienation and lack of communication. Neither does Maggie understand Brick's problem nor does Brick understand Maggie's plight. Their plight is symptomatic of the generalized failure of heterosexual love.

It is due to gay sensibility of Tennessee Williams, there are favorable references and remarks in the play to homosexual relationship. Homosexual relationship between Jack Straw and Peter Ochello affords the existential fulfillment of love. Their relationship is invested with mythic love, loyalty, and brotherly devotion as suggested by Big Daddy's account of Ochello's behavior when Straw

died. This exposes the corruption inherent in the heterosexual love, which highlights the possibility of Brick's homosexuality.

When Brick was asked to clarify his reason for disgust, he always says that he is disgusted by mendacity. His disgust with mendacity is actually his own disgusted revulsion against denying an aspect of himself and his friend that he finds unacceptable. His feeling is intensified by his wife's penetration into their male relationship. His disgust is self-directed because of his own failure to abandon Skipper because of society, its standard of norms and morality. The guilt of a crime, a transgression so dreadful that neither he nor his family dare speak its name is the cause for disgust.

Moreover, the play has widely dealt with the writer's own biography. Williams has apparently been discussing his own situation in most of the plays. The characters that collect his sympathy, failure and disappointments are the statements of his own needs. His idealism is constantly outraged by his carnality of the physical. The same conflict immobilizes Brick, the protagonist of the play, who is victimized character. He is not satisfied the behavior against him by members of his family. The environment that he faces outside and inside has a one on another relationship with his life. The side of writer's life is very much reflected by the protagonist of the play, Brick. The characters are therefore very lively sketch of 1950s society in America. The characters displayed are dissatisfied with one thing or another. They do not simply trust each other. Big daddy detests Gopper and Mae. Maggie is suspicious of Gopper and Mae's shy plan to take over Big Daddy's property and not disinherit her. Brick's present condition is mainly due to mendacity. He is in his own world of booze and desire for Skipper. Big Daddy's satisfaction with his wife and the position for sexual relationship can also be taken as a major cause of his disgust. All the major

characters are the representations of disappointments in one from or another. Brick as an isolated, alcoholic and an outcast homosexual depicts the playwright's success in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*.

Similarly after having fully analyzed *A streetcar Named Desire*, Williams's split vision or his homosexual sensibility can be clearly seen. As homosexuality is undoubtedly a taboo subject during the period mid fifties, the discourse of homophobia is produced through the major characters of the play. At the same time, Williams also presents the discourse of heterophobia to sympathize the troubled closeted homosexual person of the era.

Allan Gray is the self-hating homosexual character in the play. He commits suicide after he is discovered having homosexual relationship with a man. When his wife finds his private homosexuality, she subsequently reacts his private homosexual life on the public dance floor. Because of the fear of being branded as queer, he all of a sudden commits suicide. After the death of Allan, her tragic life begun. She started losing many valuable things such as her glorious title southern belle-reeve, later her home town etc. Deeply haunted by the memory of her late husband, as Brick indulges himself into alcohol, she tried to have sexual relationship with the men of her surrounding. She was also charged as sexual pervert and ousted from the job of school teacher. When she couldn't find anywhere to go, she came to take refuge in her sister's apartment. Though, homosexuality is heart and soul of *A Streetcar Named desire*, the play later focuses on her unsuccessful effort to begin new life in her sister's hometown. Nevertheless, Williams creates the situation in which Blanche never succeeds to hide her past life from other characters in the play.

As she is the representative of powerful heterosexual society, it is her right, she thinks, to have sexual healthy relationship with her husband Allan. But when her

husband's same sex preference is known, she can't tolerate the situation and expresses her disgust toward Allan. Similarly as Allan is the representative of the troubled closeted homosexual of the era, he never dares to express his homosexuality to his wife. Rather he secretly keeps his forbidden homosexual relationship with the man whom he dearly loves. Did they have mutual trust and understanding? Blanche might begin new life and Allan might not die untimely. Blanche is not guided by reason but by emotion when she announces her husband's homosexuality. Each and every character in the play looks Allan Grey as the epitome of the god, but nowhere in the play has he been described in positive terms whenever his sexual preference is referred. Moreover, he is always presented as pervert, degenerate or outcast personality because of his same sex preference.

Social rules, norms, values and spectrum of morality are made by the powerful church and the majority of mainstream society. They make all the rules according to the values and perceptions through the discourse they control. The minorities like homosexuals are always ignored. They are stigmatized, suppressed and oppressed. God has created everybody equal and the mainstream society does not have the authority to impose their *fatwa* on the minority homosexuals. Since the norms are the production of majority or power, they exert harsh impact on minorities. So is the case in *A Streetcar Named Desire*, the voice of the homosexual person like Allan is suppressed, oppressed and repressed.

The only positive terminology applied in *A Streetcar Named Desire* is Williams's technique of creating the discourse of heterophobia. To do so, he makes Blanche dominated by emotion rather than reason while denouncing her husband's homosexuality. Similarly, he has negatively presented Stanley through the mouth of Blanche.

Throughout his career, Williams was attacked from all sides for his treatment or non treatment of homosexuality in his work. Although, he always defends that he has nothing to do with the subject of homosexuality, the fact, however, is not exactly as claimed by Tennessee Williams. During the time of 40s and 50s in America, anybody used to take homosexuality almost as a taboo subject. The law of censorship was strictly applied for homosexual content. The censorship is a kind of law that is always created by those who hold power. The laws of censorship do not allow the marginalized subject openly. The American society was undergoing the same problem during mid fifties no matter how dreadful was that time period; Williams's play hardly lack the homosexual content. A gay artist like Williams is not an exceptional case in a homophobic society because they are always subject to be branded as queer, pervert, degenerate and morally corrupt writer. His sense of split identity, his nearness to homosexuality always compels him to expose the gay sympathetic character like Brick and Allan in the play. At the same time, again it is because of his another side of his own nature, he is always compelled to show his homophobia or the discourse of homophobia in the play. In both of the play carried out by Williams, the homosexual characters are central, loving, caring and understanding.

Brick is central character to whom Everybody loves. Almost all major characters are concerned with the present unhappy condition of Brick. Everybody wants Brick to have a normal life. Similarly, all major characters love Allan even after his untimely death. Each and every characters are bereaved and haunted by the memory of Allan, no matter whether they have previously despised his homosexual preference. He is always presence even in his absence through the mouth of other characters. Quite contrarily, Williams shows his indirect disgust toward the

heterosexual characters in his both plays. Brick represent William's one of the side of his nature so that he has fulfilled his desire to express homophobic diatribes through the mouth of Brick indicating that the homosexual preference is offendable crime. Whereas Allan represent his another side in which he represses his desire of homosexuality.

In summing up, Williams is totally wrong if he says that he has nothing to do with the homosexuality of his characters. Brick in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and Allan in *A Streetcar Named Desire* not only represent his own side of his split nature but the other characters who have the homophobic attitude and concepts towards them also are the representations of his own divided self. Since then American society was very rigid in terms of sexuality, there was no other option rather than to create the discourse of homophobia to get rid of the most possible charges from the audience, critics and the power holding authorities.

## Works Cited

- Adams, Rachel and David Sarvan, eds. *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Clum, John M Acxtng. *Gay Male Homosexuality in Modern Drama*. New York: UP of Columbia, 1994.
- Crandell, George W. "Echo Spring". *Reflecting the Gaze of Narcissus in Tennessee Williams's Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1999.
- Ellis, Havelock. *Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship*. Adams and Sarvan 1992, 340-354.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. I*. Vol. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Garber, Majrie. *Vested Interests: Cross- dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Gassner, John. "A Streetcar Named Desire: A study of Ambiguity." *Modern Drama: Essay in Criticism*. Eds. Travis Bogard and Williams Oliver. New York: Galaxy Book, 1995, 173-75.
- Hale, Allan. "Early Williams: The Making of a Playwright." *The Cambridge Companion to Tennessee Williams*. Ed. Matthew C. Roudane. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997, 82-84.
- Koprince, Susan, *Tennessee Williams's Unseen Character*. Ed. Harold Bloom, Southern Mississippi; Southern Mississippi, UP, 1991.

- Medhurst, Andy and Sally R. Munt, eds. *Lesbians and Gay Studies*. Cassell: Wellington House, 1997.
- Moffin, Houghton. *Reader's Companion to American History*. New York: Chelsea, 1990.
- Nelson, Benjamin. *Tennessee Williams: The Man and His Work*. New York: 1961.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. Wehmeier, Sally. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Price, Marian. *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof: The Uneasy Marriage of Success and Idealism*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1995.
- Sarvan, David. "By Coming Suddenly into a Room That I Thought was Empty: mapping the Closet with Tennessee Williams." *Literary Criticism*. 27.3 (2002): 45-61.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: UP of California, 1990.
- The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. VIII. Vol. USA: Williams Benton Publishers, 1998, 1943-1973.
- Tilak, Raghukul. *History of American Literature*. New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 1992.
- Unger, Leonard. *American Writers: A Collection of Literary Biographies*. Vol. 4. New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1974, 340-354.
- Weeks, Jeffery. *Construction of Homosexuality*. New York: Jones and Bratlett Publishers, 1986.
- Wikipedia. *The Free Encyclopedia*. Wikipedia Foundation Inc. 15<sup>th</sup> June 2007. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/homosexuality>>

Williams, Tennessee. "The Bedford Introduction to Drama." *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*.

2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ed. Lee A Jacobus. Boston: Charles H. Christensen, 1993.

Williams, Tennessee. *A Streetcar Named Desire and Other Plays*. Penguin

Publications, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Ed. E. Martin Browne, 2000.

Williams, Tennessee. *The Theater of Tennessee Williams*. Vol. III. New York: New

Directions Publishing Corporation, 1983.