

Tribhuvan University

***M. Butterfly and Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* : Exploration of Homosexual Self**

A Thesis Submitted to

**Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University in Partial Fulfilment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English**

By

Rabindra Prasad Sapkota

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

April 2009

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled "*M. Butterfly* and *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* : Exploration of Homosexual Self " submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Mr. Rabindra Prasad Sapkota, 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: _____

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Rabindra Prasad Sapkota has completed his thesis entitled "*M. Butterfly* and *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* : Exploration of Homosexual Self " under my supervision.

I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva.

Bijay Kumar Rauniyar

Acknowledgements

First of all, I take this opportunity to express my heartfelt gratitude to Mr. Bijay Kumar Rauniyar under whose special guidance this thesis has been prepared.

I am also credited to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English, for providing me an opportunity to conduct this research work.

Again my grateful and sincere thanks go to all the teaching and other staff of the Department guiding and helping as required.

I must also acknowledge the most generous help of my friends in providing valuable and required inputs for my research. Timely typing of my thesis by Jee Computer Center is equally appreciated.

Rabindra P. Sapkota

Abstract

Tennessee Williams' *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly* depict the struggle of the characters like Brick Pollitt and Song Liling to stand in the society with their particular identity, which is almost in crisis. They are treated as social pariah within their own societies. These characters have to face the accusation of being outcast. In the play, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* Brick has been presented emotionally and psychologically disturbed. On the other hand Song, being Chinese can not fulfill his homosexual desire openly and has to hide himself in the disguise of woman who does performances in opera. Slowly Song practises him homosexuality with Gallimard, a male character. Brick's internalized homophobia does not let him speak openly about his relationship with Skipper, where other view his homosexuality as 'Suspect'. Brick is in a position when he can neither accept nor deny his intimate relationship with Skipper. Song's homosexuality is restricted by Chinese communism since it does not allow any such dirty activities and he is the agent of same political group. The contemporary American society was not willing to accept the possibility of different sexuality and gender identity of a person. Since, in Oriental society like China, the homosexuality was beyond imagination.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

I.	Exploration of Homosexual Self	1
II.	History and Criticism of Homosexuality	9
	Definition of Homosexuality	
	Development of Homosexuality	
	Gay Criticism	
	Queer Criticism	
III.	Constructing Homosexual Self	28
	Brick Pollitt's Homosexual Obsession in <i>Cat on a Hot Tin Roof</i>	
	Song Liling and Gallimard as Homosexual Couple in <i>M.Butterfly</i>	
	Homosexuality as a Construct	
	Social Attitude Towards Homosexuality	
IV.	Conclusion	51

Works Cited

I. Exploration of Homosexual Self

Homosexuality comprises choosing a same sex partner. The homosexual trait characterizes individuals who prefer romantic attachment and sexual interaction with the same sex. The person with homoerotic nature perpetually tries to establish the space where he can secure his identity though he has to face the accusation and stigma in society. Societies and different cultures have the long history of stigmatizing the queers practices during past and present. However, this recently established subculture has been forcing themselves to the mainstream culture. To claim what society calls it queer, they initiated the collaborated movement in America. Norms in the society create binary opposition between nature and culture, and it cannot accept the homosexual as natural phenomena but terms as social stigmas. But on the other hand the members in that subculture hideously perpetuate behind the curtain which parts the straight society. 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 variations of sexual behavior, 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 'disgrace to human nature'.

One of the congenial theorists Havelock Ellis has accepted environmental factors in the formation of homosexuality. Ellis redefined homosexuality as an inborn condition rather than a form of sin. He furthermore, differed from many of his European counterparts in explicitly rejecting the vocabulary of 'degeneration', insisting that homosexuality should be seen as a harmless physiological variation

rather than a neuropath taint. He admits that external environmental factors might excite the tenant condition although he insists such factors require favorable pre-disposition.

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

For those Gays and Lesbians World War II served as a critical divide in the social history of homosexuality. When large number of youngs run away leaving family and hometown to enter sex-segregated military or to migrate to large cities for wartime employment. Then they made sexual choices designed to support their gay and lesbian identity. For example, Pat Bond a woman from Iowa who first met other lesbians while in the military, decided to stay in Francisco after her discharge. Donald Vining too remained in New York to have gay shelter rather than going to his home in New Jersey. Other countless sustained a vibrant gay subculture that revolved around bars and friendship network. Many cities saw their first gay bars during the 1940s.

For Foucault, the construction of homosexuality since the mid-nineteenth century has engendered innumerable transformations in the manner in which men relate to one another in their ordinary social interaction. 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

ensured 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 relationships with other men has been conflated with sexual desire and the practice of homosexuality.

As history has no traces of approve the homosexuality Gay and lesbians knit movement unitedly throughout the long period in history. Some symptoms of such attempt to create one new culture of Gays and Lesbians were seen firstly in American societies. They explored their identity through writing like Tennessee William. But still unidentified. They dare not to identify themselves as queer as the society in which they have born, scorns as abnormal human being. Abnormality, Stigma and queer are the scorns deposited for such activities.

Biologically, homosexuality is the natural instinct like male and female. But difference is at least these homosexuals occupy the space for 'third sex'. So it can be considered as the variation in sexuality, if not so then why they practise such activities in some societies since it is punishable activities. They explore their identify through the rebellious way to fix the 'self' like other male and female. Biologically this sort of feature in some human is fixed by the nature. The political transformations of such homosexual groups are the evidences of their exploration of homosexual self. The example of the politically organized group in Los Angles in 1950 of Gays shows how they rebel against the authoritative society. This group of Gays was led by Hany Hay and Chunk Rowland and it remained under the name 'Matt Chine Society' Mostly male in membership, it was joined in 1955 by a lesbian organization in San Francisco.

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

To identify homosexual self in the society and to protect it the people with homosexual nature either gays or lesbians struggle over the conformities of society. They even politicize their movement to establish this attempt as new subculture. They try to blur the demarcation kept for homosexuals. And still homosexuality has been challenge to the society which cannot tolerate its newly existence. Society cannot consider it to be the fact naturally. From many medical research homosexuality has been proved to be instinctual difference like other sexes. One great German sexologist Magnus Hierchfield identified homosexuality as 'third sex' and integrated into this notion the discoveries of the significance of hormones in the development of sexual differences.

The homosexual existence is not supposed by the societies so mostly the struggles adopted by the homosexuals is directed obviously against the societies brutal attitudes toward them. The partial judgment upon these queers is the strong block to shadow on the homosexual identity.

Socially organized identity of human being is on the grip of social norms and values. The human civilization and artificiality determine one's identity. But in the womb of nature this queerness remains normal. Even within the power of society the homoeroticism is in constant. Power works as the key device to change one's identity

and to fix the truth in it. These outcasted gays and lesbians as society calls them, do not suffer because of the action or circumstances that make them outcast but because of the destructive impact of conventional morality forced upon them. They driven in the conflict between their values and those of conventional moralities, to confess their transgression against humanity and to suffer, at their own hand or by placing themselves in dangerous situation, in atonement for their violations of conventional morality created throughout the history by prevailing power.

In this regard Foucault states in his *The History of Sexuality*: "Power effectively 'produces' individual subjects, both in the sense of being subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to (one's) own identity by a conscience or self knowledge" (2). 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 exotic perversions, via the "specification of individuals" (42).

There are different concepts of 'identity' or 'self' besides our very common understanding. Earlier views of individuals as "self determined, integrated beings" have been replaced by a more complex notion of "individual as multiple subjectivities, sometimes described as fractured and split" (Cranny- Francis et al. 33). "Identity" is used as political weapon to fight against marginalization and exploitation. For examples, blacks, females, homosexuals were united under their identities respectively and fought against the mainstream culture and marginalization of these multiple cultures. On the basis of some shared physical features, sexual orientation and shared desires certain groups form an identity.

Certain practical political movements in the early 1990s raised serious difficulties regarding the coherence of gay and lesbian identity as well as the

coherence of the identity of homosexual in the homo/hetero binary. These political movements involved rejection and exclusion of certain groups from gay and lesbian organization for denying fixed identity of these categories. An organization named NAMBLA (The North America Man/Boy Love Association) was expelled as not belonging to within homosexual collective politics in 1994 from ILGA (A world Confederation of Gay and Lesbian Organization)" (Gamson 11).

By the 1960s and 70s the liberal humanist's ineffective assimilationist's model was slowly replaced by more radical same-sex position. This approach offered a liberationist and libertarian stance under the banner of Gay liberation and the notion of sexual revolution. When Lesbian and Gay people in the United States began to organize and press for social change, they did so in an atmosphere that defined them as sinful, sick and criminal. The social groups like "Mattachine society".

The fluidity in identity occurs when they neither have sexual relation with the heterosexual partner nor remain static in their homosexual relation. The seemingly opposite sex reflects heterosexual norms whereas their inability to have opposite sex reflects homosexuality. So they are neither heterosexual nor homosexual rather their behaviors prove the fluidity in their identity. The situation of unstable identity in their relation (proves) reveals the queer sensibility.

Jeffery Weeks in the articles "The Construction of Homosexuality" argues that homosexual behaviour has existed in a variety of different culture and it is an eradicable part of human sexual possibilities. Further he cites social psychology and new-Freudian thought and suggests that "the development of heterosexual propensities at the level of young human are not a product of inherent biological imperatives but are the effect of historically families and other social influences" (Seidman 42).

Sociologists in 1960s and 1790s who turned to the study of sexuality took sex as an obvious domain of investigation. They were against naturalized sexuality. Ken Plummer has viewed that sexuality should not be placed in the "realm of the extraordinary" as something at a remove from ordinary human behaviour that obeyed a logical all its own. Instead "in any given society, at any given moment in history, people become sexual in the same way they become everything else. Without much reflection, they pick up directions from their social environment" (Epstein 188-202).

In fact, it wasn't until the nineteenth century that the notion of homosexual identity and even the word homosexual were 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 a homosexual came along with the idea, promoted by the medical professions, that such an identity was a form of pathology. This is why many gay men today prefer to refer to themselves as gay: the word homosexual is associated , for many, with the belief that homosexuality is a medical or physiological disorder.

So homosexuality is an inborn quality. This feature is possessed by some persons in the society and it is particular nature because it has been proved by medical research. By surveying all theorists' conceptions about the term homosexuality and by undergoing the analysis upon this in various cultures and societies, we can say that 'homosexuality' became odd or unique practices in this world of human society because of the negative attitudes toward this particular human nature, instead it's the particular individual nature hidden into the society because of the fear that the conventional does not accept it naturally. This sort of exercises has its own existence though the norms and values which are traditionally constituted does not approve it to

be social and cultural. Homosexuality simultaneously undergoes practices since it's the naturally accepted inborn quality. Since it's biologically established self or identity, it ultimately comes out in the form of explosion if the extreme pressure is imposed upon it. All those Gay and Lesbian movements held around 1950s to 1960s in America are the notable example of rebellious presentation of those identities against scornful attitudes of society towards them. They are seeking the area in society and culture to establish their homosexual identity to celebrate the selves openly as the straight practices are done openly in a conventional way.

II. History and Criticism of Homosexuality

To be a gay is not the abnormality since it's biological feature in individuals and sometimes because of the situation and the environment they are born into. It's natural and normal. And truth in a particular circumstances.

Sexuality is not concerned only with physical attraction between same sexes or opposite sex but goes beyond it. It is exposed in appearances, personality and even bodily movement and structure. Sexuality describes a whole range of a person's personality related to sexual behaviour. Throughout history and generation, gender differences is regarded as natural, unproblematic and culturally accepted. However, sexual act involving the same sex partners is characterized as a deviant form of sexuality. This sexual deviation however cannot be defined in terms of the participating gender only. It is social definition rather than natural phenomena. What is normative in behaviour in a particular period may be a deviation or crime in another. There is no any universal type of sexual behaviour. The entire meaning and value of any statement of sexuality is determined or defined by the social temporal context in which it occurs. Through the power, society defines that particular activity.

Homosexuality comprises choosing a 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 sexuality is often referred to as lesbianism. Of all variations of sexual behaviour, 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 'disgrace' to human nature'. Michel Foucault argues that sexual act 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 literatures were one of the few sites of explicit engagement with the question of sexuality during this period and they held substantial definitional power within a culture that sanctioned science to discover and tell the truth about the body. For sexologists interested in same sex sexual behavior, the key issue is the relationship between the sexual partners and their identity.

Homosexuality depicts the multiple meanings in the course of time. In its first hand definition, it describes a sexual orientation characterized by lasting aesthetic attraction, romantic love, or sexual desires exclusively for others 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 adjective homosexual is also used for same sex sexual relations between persons of the same sex who are not gay or lesbian. Three major forms of homosexual relationship are proposed by anthropologists : egalitarian, gender-structured and age-structured. Of these, one is usually dominant in a given society of a given time. As there are different biological, historical and psychological components to sex and gender no single label or description will fit all individuals.

Definition of Homosexuality

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica (Vol. VIII) "homosexuality is "a preference for sexual relations with a person of same sex" (603), *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/romantic attraction between individuals of the same sex. In modern use, the adjective homosexual is used for intimate relationship and /or sexual relationship between people of the same sex, who may or may not identify themselves as gay or lesbian.

Development of Homosexuality

The word homosexuality came into general usage following the 1892 translation of Krafft Ebbing's *psychology sexuality*. Previous record of the usage of this term was by Swiss Doctor Karoly Mariya Benker who described as "in born, therefore irrepressible drive" to response the anti-homosexual legislation of German in 1869 (Plummer 142). Foucault records the use of this term in his 1890 paper *Archiv Fur Neurologie*, by Carl Westphal 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). Consequently it can be said that, the general use of this term has been initiated since 1890's by some writers like J.A. Symonds and Havelock Ellis. Like Benker, all these theorists 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 word places emphasis on sexuality, it should be avoided in reference to non-sexual context. 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' and lesbian' are generally preferred when discussing a person of this sexual orientation, whose sexual history is predominated by this 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 bisexuals and transgender individuals). Some same sex oriented 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.

Although some early writers used the adjective 'homosexual' to refer to any single gender context, today the term is virtually exclusively used for sexual attraction. The term homological is now used to describe single sex context that are not specifically sexual. The more generic term 'homophobia' (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 the 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 homo, which are common terms among adolescents to harass each other and dyke, which refers specially to lesbians. The manifestation of sexual orientation is subject to considerable variability. Thus it is common for homosexual individuals in heteronormative societies to love, marry and have children with individuals of the opposite sex, a practice that may be done primarily for social reason in societies which reject same sex relations, as a cover for one's orientation. These adaptations are forms of situational sexual behaviour. A further and extremely common manifestation of situational sexual behaviour involving homosexual acts is seen in prisons where individuals only meet members of their own sex for long periods of time.

Regarding the orientation of homosexuality, writers can create such impression in the environment of his writing or they can bestow their characters with distinctive markers in their performative behavior. Certain features such as effeminacy, excessive preoccupation with male beauty, misogyny, inability to express their deep feelings to their soul mate, etc. are described in pathology as the description of homosexuality. Only a single among aforementioned characteristics may be inadequate to identify that someone with such predilection is unmistakably a homosexual. These all aforementioned characteristics must be seen in one to claim him as a homosexual. But as pathologists agree when excessive preoccupation with beauty comes jointly with any of those features, they are traces of homosexuality at the most, or homocroticism at the least. The character having same sex passion detests nature at the cost of artificiality.

Different societies and cultures have different attitudes toward homosexuality since it exists in different societies and cultures. Most ancient Greek accepted homosexuality to be an ideal relationship. It may be that they were taught to consider women as inferior. Because of the conventional belief that only man can maintain the role of true friend and lover. Likewise, in some ancient african culture the same sex marriage was possible because of the belief in that culture that such couple can transmit the social and spiritual guidance so it was practised between man and the male teenager and sometime between two women of different generation. Specially it was in the culture of Nzema of Ghana. Sometimes it was called friendship marriage. There is a long tradition in the christian west of hostility toward homosexuality although this usually took the form of formal regulation of male homosexual activities rather than female lesbian activities. Christian taboos against homosexuality have varied in strength through time and have had different effects on male and female

homosexual behaviour. Attitude towards homosexuality are thus, culturally specific and vary enormously across different cultures and through various historical periods. Not only attitudes vary, the social and subjective meanings given to homosexuality are also culturally specific.

Social and cultural judgements 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 characters of a particular type of person Karl Wist Phal, for instance, in the 1860s, described contrary sexual feelings and argued that homosexuality was a product of moral insanity resulting from congenital reversal of sexual feelings. Karl Uriehs, a German Lawyer and writer who was himself homosexually inclined, pioneered congenital theories and argued that the 'Urning' (as he terms homosexuals) was the product of the anomalous development of the originally undifferentiated human embryo, resulting in a female mind in a male body or vice versa. Such bodily structure is known as intermediat 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 up by homosexual apologists to form the basis for an explanation of homosexuality, which was free of the pejorative implication of sin or moral weakness of theories. This latter established new theory about such homosexuality by Magnus worked as a catalyst to decrease the brutal attitude toward same sex intimacy and helped add more strength to their identity.

Sexologist like Edward carpenter subjected emotion that concerns to fix the sexual life, who was especially anxious to know about emotional sexual feelings.

Carpenter, the gay socialist and free thinker who wrote a number of books in defense of homosexuality, introduces differences between love and sexual feelings. Talking of *The intermediate sex* (1908) he writes:

The word love is commonly used in so general and almost indiscriminate a fashion as to denote sometimes physical instinct and acts, and profound feelings; 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 is meant as, for instance, sexual relations and actions this is clearly stated and expressed. (188)

The linguistic demarcation that carpenter sets 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 relations, he argues for greater moral rectitude in gay love, which was, in experience, often unconsumated. 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 urnings 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 to gender, it popularized the notion of universal bisexuality. Weininger urges that it is impossible to love actual women. Men who love women can do so only by projecting on to them their own narcissistic

ideal. Conversely women who have not essence and no existence can not love. Thus, weininger regards homosexuality not as degenerative or pathological, but as an internal human quality.

Along with invigorating congenial theories, Havelock Ellis also accepted environmental factors in the formation of homosexual desire. Ellis redefined homosexuality as an inborn condition rather than a form of sin. He further more, differed from many of his European counterparts in explicitly rejecting the vocabulary of 'degeneration', insisting that homosexuality should be seen as a harmless physiological 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 differences between the sexes had traditionally been mapped upon 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 favourable pre-disposition.

By the early twentieth 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 towards psychological modes of sexuality, sexologists relied less and less upon the methodologies of comparative anatomy and implicitly acknowledged that 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 of persons. He believes homosexuality as arrested psychological development.

Homosexuality remained for long the 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 earned the stature of special species. Homosexuals were considered a 'social freak' which has to do something with the effect of power circulating within the society. Power in its productive phase functions to install limits through 'marking off' the discursive domain specific to individual subject positions. Late in the 19th century, as large cities allowed for greater anonymity, as wage labor apart from family becoming common and as more women were drawn out of homes, evidence of a new pattern of homosexual expression suffered.

A prominent theorist, Judith Butler questions the need for a stable categories of identity. In her book *Gender Trouble* (1990) she offers an analysis of sex and gender. She argues that sex and gender rather than the inner capacities, attributes and identities, they are a set of "repeated performance that congeal overtime to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being" (p. 190). According to Butler, gender only exist in the service of heterosexism, gender identities come about and are dependent upon what she calls "heterosexual matrix".

She argues in her next book *In Bodies that Matter*, that it is not one who decides on a bright sunny morning to go out and become a woman by putting on a dress. It is an assertion of a series of performance-putting on nylon and high heels or wearing work boots, day after day-which provides people with their sense of gender and sexual matrix. You create yourself by repeating a series of steps over and over

that produces you. So Butler is convinced that compulsory heterosexuality is not a natural category but rather a system built up by repeating over and over.

Challenging the formulation that "biology is destiny" some feminists proposed the alternative view that sex is natural, grounded in the biological body, where as gender is cultural related by various attitudes, behaviours, style of dress and social norms. In *Gender Trouble* Butler argues that by accepting sex (male/female binaries) as natural they are perpetuating heteronormative hegemony. She claims that sex itself is historical and constructed idea. Sex cannot be distinguished from "gender" both are cultural. Sex itself is a gendered concept.

In *Reader's Companion to American History* Houghton Mifflin describes the situation after World War II, when the lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgenders etc. came out of the prejudiced realm of them making choice of their sexual desire in violating manner. It further summerizes that this new visibility provoked latent cultural prejudices. Firings from government jobs and purges from the military intensifie in the 1950s president Dwight D. Eisenhower issued an executive order in 1953 barring gay men and lesbians from all federal jobs. Many state and local governments 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 raised 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 chunk Rowland met to form What would become the Matt chine 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).

A massive grassroots gay liberation movement was born. Mixing their voices with that of the radical protest of blacks, women, and college students in the 1960s, gays challenged all forms of hostility and punishment meted out by society. Choosing to come out of the closet and publicly proclaim their identity, they have led 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, 5000 gay men and lesbians marched in New York City to commemorate the first anniversary of the Stonewall Riots; in October 1984, 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 their civil rights status, as did Wisconsin and Massachusetts, first among the states 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 business, 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.

Michel Foucault's Vision

In *The History of Sexuality*, introduces power which creates a series of binary identifications. The creation of new political and social identities is one of the most distinctive effects of power/knowledge nexus. As such, power effectively 'produces' individual subjects, both in the sense of being "subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to (one's) own identity by a conscience or self knowledge" (12). 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 perversions hitherto regarded as temporary aberration (s). Around the figure of homosexual in particular was constructed a whole "personage, a post, a case history and a childhood, in addition to a . . . life form and a morphology" (43). The specification 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 medicine 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 regulates the experience of subjectivity in the wider population. This is in fact one of the most important functions of these deiving 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 relations of power and knowledge, so to is the heterosexual couple" (105). 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 abject. Foucault argues that the constitution of subjectivity through such practices effects the reification of the 'normal subject' thereby facilitating a pervasive normalization of subjectivity so characteristic of modern societies. Foucault's studies provide a series of histories of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subject" (208). Identity and subjectivity are not, for Foucault, the realization of some deep, interiorized essence, ostensibly the very distillation of human nature. Rather the question of humanity's nature is a problem generated in discourse, arising at certain moments and belying a particular discursive history. As Foucault concludes, even the history of man has a 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 understanding 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 a profusely discussed and regulated entity. It is something which is produced through discourse, not repressed through censorship.

The most significant aspect of Foucault's research centers on the production of the homosexual. 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 characters and the formation of characters like the homosexual:

There is no question that the appearance of nineteenth century psychiatry, jurisprudence, and literature of a whole series of its course on the species and subspecies of homosexuality inversions, pederasty and "psychic hermaphroditism" 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 categories by which it was medically disqualified. (101)

Foucault offers an account of the social production of identities which are assumed to be natural in current dominant knowledge. Foucault views the invention of the homosexual and the addict as predicated upon the modern epistemic regime in which particular acts and behaviours like sodomy and drug taking were transformed into criminalized and pathologized identity through the positive effects of power. The modern regime which organized through a division between normal and abnormal, are mutually dependent 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 norms. The strategies and operations of modern power are concealed but work to produce and render visible the deviant, the pathological, the delinquent:

There can be no possible exercise of power without a 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 can not exercise power except through the production of truth . . . In the end, we are judged, condemned, classified, determined in our undertalkings, destined to a certain mode of living and dying as a function of the true discourse which are the bearers of the specific effects of power. (35)

Foucault wished to prove beneath such abstract system in which practices are interwoven with social practices 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 changes as system changes. Hence, he avers that homosexuality is socially created, historically variable and therefore deeply politicized.

Gay Criticism

Gay criticism doesn't tend to focus on efforts to define homosexuality. Sexual relations between men, or even just the sexual desire of one man for another, are the generally accepted criterion of gayness in white middle-class America today.

Nevertheless, not all cultures share this definition. For example, in Mexican and South American cultures, 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 penetrator (never allowing himself to be penetrated orally or anally), a man remains a *macho*, a "real" man. As a *macho*, a man can have sex with both men and women and not be considered what North Americans call homosexual. The same definition of homosexuality was used in white American working class

culture around the turn of the twentieth century. Only men who allowed themselves to be penetrated by a man during sex and behaved in a traditionally feminine women-submissive, coy, flirtations, "soft" were considered homosexual.

It wasn't until the nineteenth century that the notion of homosexual identity, 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 weren't viewed as evidence of a specific sexual identity. The idea that one could be a homosexual came along with the idea, promoted by the medical professions, that such an identity was a form of pathology. This is why many gay men today prefers to refer to themselves as gay: the word homosexual is associated, for many, with the belief that homosexuality is a medical or psychological disorder.

Attitude towards homosexuality, like attitudes towards sexuality in general differ widely from one place to another and from one historical period to another. The intense anti-gay sentiment that emerged in an especially concentrated and virulent form in American during the early 1950 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 members of the mainstream, dominant culture, and the complex feelings that result from an implicit, ongoing social oppression. In other words, part of seeing the 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 poetics, 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 critics also examine how gay sensibility affects literary expression and study the ways in which heterosexual texts can have a homoerotic dimension. They try to rediscover gay writers from the past whose work was under appreciated, distorted, or suppressed, including gay writers who have been presumed heterosexual. They try to determine the sexual politics of specific texts, analysing, for example, how gay characters or "feminine" men are portrayed in both gay and heterosexual text. Finally, gay critics identify and correct heterosexist interpretation of literature that fail to recognize or appreciate the gay sensibility informing specific literary works.

Queer Criticism

There may stand several answers to the question that why the lesbians and gays adopted the homophobic word *queer* to designate an approach within their own discipline. These answers may serve well as an introduction to some of the basic premises of queer theory.

First, the use of the term *queer* can be seen as an attempt to reappropriate the word from what has been its homophobic usage in order to demonstrate that heterosexists shouldn't be allowed to define gay and lesbian experience. The act of defining the terms of one's own self-reference is a powerful move that says, among other things, "We are not afraid to be seen", "You don't tell us who we are—we tell us who we are !", and "we're proud to be different !" Or as the popular queer slogan sums it up, we're here, we're queer—get used to it !" As gay men and lesbians have learned, the term is a tool for oppression, but it is also a tool for change.

Further, some lesbians and gay men have adopted the word *queer* as an inclusive category for referring to a common political or cultural ground shared by gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and all people who considered themselves, for whatever

reasons, nonstraight. Used in this way, the term tries to reunite the heretofore divided camps that resulted, in part, from the white middle-class roots of the gay liberation and lesbian feminist movements of the early 1970s. As products of the white middle class, those movements were blind to their own white middle-class privilege. As a result, through the 1970s and into the 1980s, the experiences of gay people of color and of working-class gay men and lesbians were generally ignored, for the groups had little or no opportunity to assume visible leadership positions within the gay power structure. In addition, certain forms of gay sexual expression were excluded or marginalized such as the butch-femme lesbian couples who played such important role in lesbian culture during the 1950s and 60s. Butch-femme couples resemble heterosexual couple in terms of clothing, grooming, and personal style. Although they did not necessarily resemble heterosexual couples in terms of emotional or sexual relatedness, it was usually assumed that they did, and they were therefore criticized for reproducing the same power imbalance generally found in heterosexual relationships. The word *queer*, then, as an inclusive term, seeks, to heal these divisions by offering a collective identity to which all nonstraight people can belong.

For the most part, however, the word *queer* is used to indicate a specific theoretical perspective. From a theoretical perspective, the word *gay* and *lesbian* imply a definable category-homosexuality-that is clearly opposite to another definable category; heterosexuality. However for *queer theory*, categories of sexuality can not be defined by such simple oppositions as homosexual/heterosexual. Building on deconstructions' insights into human subjectivity (selfhood) as a fluid, fragmented, dynamic collectivity of possible sexualities. Our sexuality may be different at different times over the course of our lives or even at different times over the course of a week because sexuality is a dynamic range of desires. Gay sexuality, lesbian

sexuality, bisexuality and heterosexuality are, for all of us possibilities along a continuum of sexual possibilities. And what these categories mean to different individual will be influenced by how they conceive their own racial and class identities as well. Thus, sexuality is completely controlled neither by our biological sex (male or female) nor by the way our culture translates biological sex into gender roles (masculine or feminine). Sexuality exceeds these definitions and has a will, a creativity, an expressive need of its own.

The Queer theory became a very influential postmodern theory in western literary, cultural as well as social theories, however the term "Queer Theory" had entered the theoretical discussion in 1990:

In 1990 Teresa de Lauretis used the term "Queer Theory" as the little of a conference held at University of California, Santa Cruz, and the rest is history of consciousness [. . .]. Queer theory became the hot new thing in academia. It seemed, the "Queering" of anything and everything. (Harlperin qtd. in Gross 508-526).

By "Queer Theory" she refers to the necessary critical work of deconstructing our discourse and what they silence. Queer theory is aligned with anti-essentialism. It has a postmodern turn in theorizing. Queer theory marks the suspension of identity as something fixed, coherent and natural. Queer theory's primary focus is on denaturalization of natural identity categories" (Beasley 16).

To sum up, the word *queer* tries to occupy the parted identity from the society of the straight. It denotes the group practices which is historically or even conventionally suppressed and marginalized.

III. Constructing Homosexual Self

Brick Pollitt's Homosexual Obsession in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*

In the drama *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* William projects the homosexual relationship between characters. Through this odd depiction he tries to introduce the obsessed homosexual selves of both characters like Brick and Skipper. Obviously presented homosexual aspect of the drama, leads us upto the point where we can assess their attempt to establish the non-straight identity. The force spent by these characters, their struggle and practices against the society sign their desire to play in their own world. William has intentionally appointed one dead character Skipper, who is supposed to be close friend of Brick. This appointment of dead character in the drama and Brick's weak attempt of forgetting him coincide powerful nostalgic sentiment of Brick. In this drama Brick can not express his actual identity nor remains static in his position, here, his dynamism in nature signifies the process of exploration of identity or self. As another strong point to be considered here is; the distance between Brick and his wife Maggie proves Brick's unnatural intimacy toward skipper. And the backdrop of the play has been occupied by the homosexual traces.

Other off stage characters like Jack Straw and Peter Ochello the previous owner of the same plantation, which is now possessed by Brick's family, had spent their lives together in the same room where Brick lives. They were too homosexual lovers.

Maggie's effort to convince herself about the fact that Skipper's failure to fulfill her sexual desire and his real weakness fully supports her guess about the odd relationship between Brick and Skipper. The relationship, restricted by the contemporary social or cultural morality. Once Skipper tries to evade Maggie's speculation but he fails, he wasn't able to satisfy her sexuality. Then Maggie realized

that the love between her husband and Skipper was a love that dare not speak its name and a love that couldn't be satisfied or discussed. Ashamed by his feeling, Skipper began to drink heavily. One night, after finally acknowledging he was gay, Skipper's heart couldn't take it any more and he committed suicide because of depression and alcoholism.

Maggie's complexity of suspicion sustains until the moment when she opens her mouth without hesitation that Brick's relation, with Skipper was not other than the homosexual. She remembers the past in the college when they spent together. The moments being together with Skipper and Brick however it was not the moment for them all but specially for secret intimacy between Brick and Skipper too. Her presence in that company accidently worked to make the public attitude common. She says, "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 a good public impression" (I. 1213).

Brick can't express his obsessed feelings related to his friend Skipper though his wife assures him. Because of the fear that his secrecy will be opened to the public. His illusory mask over the fact of his own becomes transparent for Maggie because she knows all about the relation between Brick and Skipper. Once she checked Skippers ability of fulfilling her sexual desire to be assured the weakness in him. He doesn't let her words to touch the ground. What she explains about their relation abruptly Brick becomes frightened and attempts to be away from Maggie's blame. He states, "Maggie, shut up about Skipper. I mean it, "Maggie, You got to shut up about Skiper" (I, 1212).

The ability in Brick of twisting the ideas about his fact, can be considered. The reality over his relation with Skipper remains obvious in the eyes of Maggie though he tries to hide it in his own way. The philosophy of life and its reality in Brick's perspective hints what he did with his friend and even we can guess the reality of the relation between them is connected with love, the love which is not digested in the society where Maggie and Big Daddy inhabit.

BRICK. One man has one great true thing in his life. One great good thing which is true !—I had friendship with Skipper.—You are naming it dirty ! (I. 1213)

Maggie's hopeless expression about Brick's inability to show his masculinity over herself provokes sympathy upon both characters. It is obvious when she says to Brick, "You know, our sex life didn't just peter out in the used way, it was cut off short, long before the natural time for it to" (I. 1208). A feminine thirst in Maggie remains unfulfilled, similarly Brick's mendacity connected with Skipper has become never ending and ever haunting elements throughout his life. As long as that mendacity inhabitates in Brick's mind, Maggie's expectations can't be fulfilled. Brick's indulgence towards Skipper's memory approaches upto the extent that he even encourages Maggie to have a lover. There is no any projections of masculinity in Brick. In a patriarchal society where Big Daddy and Margaret live, in that society a man should have power of protection, strength and jealousy over his property like Maggie, a wife but there is no any traces of such power and strengths in Brick over his wife. Rather he feels relief when his wife finds another husband. There will be no any objection from him to his wife but realizes his success. He persuades her, "Maggie, I wouldn't divorce you for being unfaithful or anything else. Don't you know that? Hell. I'd be relieved to know that you'd found yourself a lover" (I. 1209).

It's obvious that Brick's obsessive desire for Skipper's love has been so complex that he persuades his wife to have another lover. Maggie's devotion towards Brick has been proved to be nothing than the love between Skipper and Brick. The past love and intimacy between two men has been flowing in Brick's Veins.

MARGARET. [. . .]. — when I came to his room that night, with a little scratch like a shy little mouse at his door, he made that pitiful, in effectual little attempt to prove that what I had said wasn't true. . . (I. 1214)

Margaret piles up the mass of proofs that Skipper was not like what he was expected to be. Skipper too couldnot prove himself well when he attempted to fulfill Maggie's sexual desire. She blames his relation with her husband Brick as dirty relation, the relation that can't be appreciated in the society where like Maggie lives and Big Daddy live. The blame which was bestowed upon Skipper by Maggie abruptly enrages him and finally he slaps in her cheek.

BIG DADDY. You started drinkin' when your friend skipper died. (II. 1242)

To kill the haunted feeling of separation with Skipper Brick begins drinking. Brick tries to kill himself poisoning the body using excess drinking. It signifies that his life is worthless without his friend, Brick, a pathetic creature, hunted by the grief of his friend's death, becomes very weak and starts drinking to pacify his frequently grooming pain of separation. Not only that the accusation imposed upon him by his family members attacks every moment in his mind. So he cannot stand all these things and takes the help of liquor to minimize that depression.

Sexuality not only refers to the sexual attraction between same sex or opposite sex. The deep love or affectionate between men or women is more than the opposite

sexes. The sensual desire of Maggie towards Brick cannot overcome the spiritual love or attraction between Brick and Skipper.

Maggie frequently tries to be copulated by Brick, which is practised only in the culture of straights or heterosexuals. There is nothing more than fulfillment of individual desire, the desire not only of the fulfillment of sexual appetite but also interior motives for conquering the properties. But Brick's pathetic condition of loss can't be considered in the society. The spiritual attachment between Brick and Skipper is understood as outcast and unnatural.

Brick hates the sensual love which Maggie possesses, he doesn't even believe that love and faith. Brick supposes the cause of Skipper's death is Maggies. Had Maggie not enticed Skipper, may be he would still be alive. For what Brick does not accept Maggies' forced company. Brick furiously presents himself against Maggie. This act of Brick symbolizes the rebellions response to the society which has no sympathy over such inferiorized identities like Brick. This is the violence upon historically constructed views over minorities. Brick denies the ironical support and love from his wife.

BRICK. I don't want to lean on Your shoulder, I want my crutch ! Are you
going to give me my crutch or do I have to get down on my knees on
the floor and— (I. 1199)

In this dialogue between Brick and Maggie, Brick can only believe on his own crutch, not in Maggie's affection. His crutch becomes a faithful instrument and he is attached to it. In a sense this crutch symbolizes his present state of being and the past related with Skipper, a homosexual partner. The love manufactured in the culture of heterosexuality can not even move Brick since he has been blindly engaged in homosexuality. How powerful is the past in Brick's life, to throw it he has been

drinking. He almost killing himself. Maggie's love has not been able to protect him from disaster.

In this drama the playwright has employed a character, who is unseen but dominant in the drama. The primary motive of presenting such character is to demonstrate the power of human intimacy. The ambiguous presentation of homocroticism between skipper and Brick works as a peripheral aspect in the drama. Homosexuality is the product of indulging in profane spirituality. This drama obviously transcends this spiritual homosexuality from the materialistic world. The representative of heterosexual society, Maggie is eager to grab the property from pollitt family which is the culture of materialistic society, whereas on the contrary, Brick, who represents homosexual culture, is absolutely away from such greed and remains in the spiritual realm.

Song Liling and Gallimard as homosexual Couple

In the drama *M. Butterfly*, Song a Chinese actor and opera singer in the form of a woman, who continues a twenty-year affair with a French diplomat Gallimard without knowing his identity. Such a long period affair between two man remaining unknown about the fact of sexuality, stimulates our imagination and compels us to think why a man could deceive another man for twenty years and not letting him to doubt about 'he' or 'she'. Here, in this tragedy the playwright is trying to deceive audiences presenting such mysterious character who does not even realize the coarseness of male body. It can't be believed that a man cannot realize the gender of his partner for a long period intimacy. Ambiguously the playwright projects the homosexual phenomenon in this play. And if it was certainly common representation of society that man can not recognize the gender of his mate then is it really a challenge to the human knowledge?

MAN 2. (laughing) He says . . . it was dark . . . and she was very modest !

MAN 1. So—what? He never touched her with his hands?

MAN 2. perhaps he did, and simply misidentified the equipment. A

compelling case for sex education in the school. (I. III. 1836)

Fluctuated from his previous heterosexual to homosexual Gallimard doesn't even try to recognize the sexual organ of Song. It's not the ignorance but the negligence.

Gallimard has been intoxicated with his excess homosexual feelings but not the more physical activity. That is why he doesnot care about the sexual equipments (organs).

While in the sexual intercourse most of the opposite sexual organs are played but here in this tragedy Gallimard was unknown to that fact. He must have been aware of the fact about Song, Sometimes during the so long affair of twenty years.

GALLIMARD. [. . .]— they should be scratching at my door, begging to learn my secrets [. . .]. (I. III. 1836-37)

Gallimard's relation with Song, which he calls the secret has been slightly slept here through his utterances when he expresses his statement. Because of the fear of being casted in the society he never expresses his desire. Actually he has been comforted with a male body, that idea might not have existed in his mind. But ultimately, when it is revealed that the opera singer with whom he is in love, is not a woman but man, he kills himself in repentance.

Gallimard sometimes utters his weak masculinity and more feminity saying, "[. . .]. we, who are not handsome, nor brave, nor powerful . . ." (I.V. 1840) All the characteristics, man like handsomeness, bravery, powerful, strong must be in a man to possess manhood. But all these elements of masculinity can't be found in Gallimard and moreover he is engaged in love with so called perfect woman song, as Gallimard appreciates her. Therefore the lack of proper masculinity in Gallimard presents more

evidence of not representing the heterosexuality. And his negligence towards his wife but powerful bond with a man in woman disguise can even prove his homosexuality.

Gallimard's tenderness in behaviour, delicacy in expression and obsessive characters are the symptoms of gay in homosexuality, so here in this tragedy *M. Butterfly* he is practising gay culture. The playwright of this play tries to maintain the coherence of the drama, that develops the plots, with a playful connection, i.e. the mystery of ignorance upon the gender of sexual partner for the period of twenty years. This is unbelievable and indigestible.

On the other hand Song Liling, who sings in the Chinese opera is, in fact, maintaining her double intentions; she is Chinese spy for communist firstly, and secondly she is practising her homosexual self in disguise of woman. In Chinese communism homosexual activities are not allowed in these days. The strict rules in china does not let him to celebrate his homosexual self so he is compelled to masquerade himself. The cult value of Chinese culture and political perspective try to control his privileged extra sexual impulse. (2. IV.1861)

CHIN. Don't forget: there is no homosexuality in China!

Not only the society but also political ideology cannot stand homosexuality. What Foucault says the power creates the truth or power makes the discourse and the truth is determined in that discourse. The convention is a kind of discourse which has its history and throughout it the truth has been perpetually practiced. Conventions prefers only heterosexuality. So it has become the natural in the society. But newly born homosexual as a subculture is problematized which can not stand its head in the society of straights. However they are practicing their self by disguising form like Song Liling in this drama.

The dynamism in sexuality is possible, Gallimard is not only what he is rather he possesses other identity too. People sometimes call Gallimard as Madame Butterfly. Gallimard, appearing with masculinity, possesses the feminine quality.

GALLIMARD [. . .] My name is Rene Gallimard-also known as Madame Butterfly. (3.III. 1885)

This dialogue suggests that one never is in one's gender. It is only in a perpetual and uncertain, though inescapable condition of doing gender, of repeating the acts and gestures that produce and sustain the notion of gender identity. Song Liling produces and sustains herself as a female before the eyes of Gallimard by repetitive acts and gestures that heterosexual society has prescribed to be a female. But this repetition as in Butler's term in *Bodies that Matters* "temporal and contingent groundless of . . . the 'ground' of gender identity. The groundlessness of the identity revealed precisely through an occasional discontinuity in performance" (141). This occasional discontinuity occurs in *M. Butterfly* when Song Liling has to stand in the witness box in the court to deliver a testimony. When she puts off her drag (dress) it exposes the fallacy of the dominant belief in an original or primary gender identity. There is no heterosexual original, that straightmen and women embody; that gay, lesbian, or transvestite subject deviate from the original; is itself a mythical figuration.

Song Liling, we know she is a man, who practices homosexuality throughout the play in the guise of woman. But when it is slowly disclosed in front of Gallimard's eyes, still the charm is the same or he realizes the same.

SONG. It's the same skin you've worshipped for years. Touch it.

GALLIMARD. Yes, it does feel the same.

SONG. Now—close your eyes. (3. II. 1883)

Song masquerades as a female to hide her reality. He feels secure in that guise and also she can play without any hesitation. He is perfect in womanizing his identity, even he perfectly entertains his sexual mate. Song tries to assure Gallimard that without him (Song), Gallimard can't live. Song, himself can confidently declares the undergoing obsession within Gallimard. It is obviously understood by the song's statement when he says, "[. . .]" (3. II. 1883). Rene, you can't live without me. [. . .]. The love that both of them have nurtured for so long, the dream of conjugal life, which has been cherished for twenty years.

Gallimard finally falls in the ground of reality when the illusory perfect world of love breaks into the pieces being disclosed and prefers the world of fantasy. He doesn't like to depart from that world where he could realize the love, perfection of life. The joy of imagination is the unbeatable for him. The self flies freely in fantasy.

GALLIMARD. Get away from me ! Tonight, I've finally learned to tell

fantasy from reality. And, knowing the difference, I choose fantasy !

So, both characters in the drama gradually celebrates their homosexuality. The forms of practicing their gayness is different, however their fluctuating identities equally work to build their homosexual selves. This drama not only presents the political phenomenon but also the crisis of identity and pathetic condition of those who possess the homosexual identity even in the prosperous country like China and France.

Homosexuality as a Construct

Homosexuality is not the extraordinary Sexuality in the society rather it's simply human nature like what society prefers heterosexuality. The heteronormative homophobia has constructed an attitude towards these non-strights, that is painful and scorning. There are so many sexual potentialities in the society like bisexuality,

homosexuality, transsexual, transvestism etc. All these potentialities have been stigmatized by the sexual category based on gender differences.

Conventionally built concepts about the sexuality cannot approve such rarely found sexual behaviours. It's because of the power of conventional culture or society as Foucault defines the truth which is created through power. A society creates discourse and that discourse determines the sexuality based on cross-gender. The created discourse is the authentic instrument to evaluate all such norms and values prevailed in a particular culture, community or as a whole a society. The creation of a series of binary identifications is due to the effect of power in the society. It creates the new political, social and religious identities with its distinctive effects of power/knowledge nexus.

As mentioned in the second chapter about Foucault's concept upon the sexuality, power effectively 'produces' individual subject both in the sense of being subject to someone else because of the control and dependency or tied to (one's) own identity by a conscience or self knowledge. We depend on the rules and regulations of the society which is built historically and these rules and regulations have their own perspectives upon the individuals. The individual has its subordinated existence, so it's continually suppressed or controlled by such norms and values. Homosexuality is the same phenomenon in the society, which keeps negative eyes to the homosexuals naming it as a dirty activities, as social pollutions etc. In the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault talks about the invention of homosexuality along with other exotic perversions via the specification of individuals, that effected the creation of new sexual identities around particular acts and perversions hitherto regarded as temporary aberrations. The confluence of network of disparate discourses make possible to specify the homosexual concerning to the perverted body in his opinion,

all the science of sexology, psychiatry and medicine work collaborately as instrument to construct such new identity. Well articulation of power can have the capacity to confine and treat such elements in society. That is what we can see in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*.

BRICK. Not love with you, Maggie, but friendship with Skipper was that one great true thing, and You are naming it dirty ! (I. 1213)

Big Daddy and Maggie represent the society which names such relation between same sex as dirty and perverted. 'Abnormal', 'Unnatural', and 'dirty' are the names given to such relation in the society. The spiritual love between Skipper and Brick has been called the dirty relation though they have the perfect intimacy. They are so close to each other by their feelings and emotion, which is unbearable for them who only knows about heteronormative norms and values. Such kind of remarks are the products of ideology in a society. Outcasting these relations, as Brick and Skipper have, society punishes severely with those words to them. Their desires are suppressed out of the society. It is discouraged out of the values. In *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* Brick starts to have drink to kill what he calls mendacity due to his partner's death. And such attitudes towards the minorities like Brick in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* can be obviously realized through Maggie's statement;

MARGARET. [. . .]—In this way, I destroyed him, by telling him truth that he and his world which he was born and raised in, yours and his world, had told him could not be told? (I. 1214)

The truth, and reality between Brick and Skipper as well as the failed relation between Brick and Maggie and Skipper and Maggie can't be expressed in the society because it is the dirty and polluted relation for society. This reality should be suppressed within themselves. This condition which deserves sympathy, is created by norms and values.

The mainstream society in the play is represented by Big Daddy and Maggie. They use their power to get their hold over the minorities in the society. In *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* the minorities are represented by Skipper and Brick. So as minorities they have been prey to the power of society.

Power constructs and destruct everything. Power is the key that determines the world, it evaluates and creates the world. Foucault comes with his 'discursive' model of subject formation. Foucault argued that discourses such as medicine or psychiatry—yoked together power and knowledge, and then subjected individual to them. A discourse such as medicine defines a position that someone can hold patient—doctor relation and the power or lack of it in that position. The subject is not something that exists in advance, but it is produced through the operation of discourse. This is a fluid model of the way the subject and social field interact. Foucault "Conceptualizes 'subject' as produced by and in the negotiation of discourses. Big Daddy imposes the same power upon Brick with the same force. The notion of right and wrong in the society are determined by the power. And here the reality of Brick has been supposed to be wrong. Historically articulated power as a determining instrument judges Brick's existence. Big Daddy complains with Brick, "I'm suggesting nothing – But Gooper an' Mae suggested that there was something not right exactly in your—" (II. 1243).

Brick's reality towards skipper has been easily evaluated by Big Daddy that it was not right. Time hasnot been changed yet that straight thinking of society can approve such relations as natural and right. That is why Big Daddy looks from the same parameter that is ever stable. The power of the society doesnt count such relations between these two homosexual couple.

The imposed identity through the power against such subordinated groups are constructed in such a way that it almost compels them to kill themselves. They are

thrown into the burning flame of hatred. This is the inhuman aspect of society. The power as a determining force of society, remarks them so piercingly that they have to adopt death to purify themselves from that smear imposed by society. The behaviour of Brick and Skipper creates an effect in the society, that can not be exposed against the morality of society. The relation of Brick and Skipper has no space in that society it should be kept on ice or only it can go with their death Maggie says, "[. . .]— You two had something that had to be kept on ice, yes, incorruptible, Yes ! — and death was the only icebox where you could keep it. . ." (I. 1213).

So this dialogue depicts the severe representative assault on the existence of such minorities in society. The heteronormative culture nurtures the homophobic perspective against homosexuality which is the creation of power through practised discourse or ideology. This occurs because of the power relations one's relation to the society and its power. Majority creates the so called truth which ultimately converts into the convention and according to it, the minorities are treated because they are newly united and powerless. The same condition has been depicted vividly in this play *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*.

Similarly construction of homosexuality can be viewed in the drama *M. Butterfly*. The supposed gender of the character's are performed adversely. It is not that what is expected to be. Song Liling an opera singer in China, has affair with a French diplomat Rene Gallimard for twenty years. Gallimard cannot recognize the security of his partner though he spent much of time with song. It shows that only the dress determines the sexuality. In heteronormative society sexualities are seen through the gender perspectives. In this tragedy *M. Butterfly* too presents the society with such power—the product of convention.

SONG. Perhaps I am slightly afraid of scandal.

GALLIMARD. What are we doing?

SONG. I'm entertaining you. In my parlor. (1. X. 1851)

Here Song, being an opera singer in the disguise of a woman, is maintaining two responsibilities; milking the secret plan from that French diplomat and again celebrating her homosexual eagerness with the help of Gallimard. Song ambiguously expresses his fear of his reality. Homosexuality is the Sin in the society. In the same society he is practising his self which is more risky for him. The act which is being done by Song is a scandal a perversion.

GALLIMARD. In France, that would hardly—

SONG. France, France is a country living in a modern era. Perhaps even ahead of it. China is a nation whose soul is firmly rooted two thousand years in the past. (1. X. 1851)

China, very conventional country, has its conservative attitudes towards everything. What such culture calls natural sexuality, is even under pressure, still the homosexuality is beyond the imagination in Chinese culture. It has cruel dealing with those. Modernity, in Western culture has begun to consider slightly. France, for example has changed its views upon the sexuality what Gallimard's expression informally hints about that Homosexual like Song has been victimised by the Concept of gender identity prevailed in the society. Consequently he has to transvestite to exist in a released environment. They can only relieve themselves when they get shelter. In this drama Song masquerades as a 'ideal woman' in the eyes of Gallimard. He comes to enter an illusion to hide 'What he is' and begins to accomplish 'What he needs'.

Deprived of the fetishistic fantasy that enable him to express his femininity and sensuality covertly, characteristics degrading to Western men, Gallimard comes face to face with his homosexuality. In assuming the comparison of Butterfly, Gallimard

acknowledges the truth, but in literalizing desires through drag, he loses the fantasy. This ultimate revelation of homosexuality again reveals that homosexuality is not an unnatural, and an identity to be excluded and punished rather it is to be included openly without any biasness. Rather than sustaining the binaries: heterosexuality/homosexuality, the situation reveals the necessity of blurring the boundaries between these two. The sense of blurring the boundaries reveals that it is the matter of nature. What the society calls it that is merely the constructed ideas.

SONG. I'm pregnant (Beat) I'm pregnant. (Beat) I'm pregnant. (2. VI. 1868)

Song is constructing the truth here, she convinces Gallimard that she has been conceived by him. It is not believable that a male can be conceived. But it has been true to Gallimard. So everything is constructed by the power of discourse which has been practised regularly.

A notable point in Butler's idea about sexuality, that heterosexuality is fiction produced through practices and discourse to challenge the idea that any individual's sexual identity reveals the 'truth' about them, is best applied in *M. Butterfly*, Rene Gallimard and Song Liling's identities are products of "performance". The truth of their identity, which appears to be, is rather an effect of repeating over time, a series of gestures, dressings and acts. They create the impression of an essential gendered identity and heterosexual compulsion but there is no essential gender identity underpinning them. The gendered subject as masculine or feminine is thus not established through a single constitutive act, and it is same for the homosexual. The previously constructive notion of heterosexuality evaluates the minorities either its permissible or not in the society.

SONG. I was a plaything for the imperialists !

CHIN. What did you do?

SONG. I shamed China by allowing myself to be corrupted by a foreigner. . . .

(II. IX. 1873)

The heterosexuality, which is considered to be natural, is allowed to the society. They (heterosexuals) can fly with freedom. But the homosexuality is forbidden severely because they are supposed to be pollution. Song's celebration of her self has been corruption for the China. She has been deviant to that culture. This expression is the result of her subordinated feelings in such heteronormative society of all variation of sexuality, homosexuality has provoked the greatest social pressure and evoked the liveliest historical account. It is regarded as problematic and culturally unacceptable that is why in *M. Butterfly* Song expresses her pathetic condition of being pollution for Chinese culture. Her act has proved to be shame in her own statement. It has become subject to extreme prejudices in most western and eastern societies. It is largely considered 'perverted and sick' and 'disgrace to human nature'.

SONG. I engaged in the lowest perversions with Chinese enemies !

CHIN. What perversions? Be more clear !

SONG. I let him put it up my ass ! (2. IX. 1873)

Song herself confesses her sin committed against the historical norms and values. Her act is perverted by the ideology but not by the nature. Her soul has been called perverted by the constitutive force of the society. In this expression song confesses her homosexual identity obviously. So her expression is the masochistic realization suppressed by the social determining power.

So homosexuality is the perverted and sinful act for the heteronormative society. The homophobic nature of heterosexuality has its own partial perspective towards the minorities like lesbians and Gays. Social rules, norms and values and spectrums of morality are made by the powerful Church and the majority of

mainstream society. Building the strict rules and regulations according to the values and perceptions, they regulate everything through the discourse they control.

The minorities like homosexuals are subordinated and almost ignored. They are stigmatized as abnormal, unnatural, perverted etc and voices of them are suppressed. All sorts of identities are the creation of nature and no artificial rules have the privileges to determine their existence. People who are treated as members of the minorities, often begin to act 'normal and common' to avoid being portrait of scorns and stigma. They do their best not to be perceived as different from the majority Brick in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* tries to hide his identity which is supposed to be. On the other hand Skipper too kills himself not being able to sustain his homosexuality. They both hide themselves from the horrific attitudes of society. In *M. Butterfly* Song Liling masquerades to be counted as other normal in society. Rene Gallimard, when he recognizes his own self eventually, commits suicide calling it honorable death. It is because of the wild treatment of society. If the homosexuality is permitted as heterosexuality, neither skipper nor Gallimard would kill them. So those catastrophes are the consequences of constructed perspectives towards homosexuality.

Social Attitude Towards Homosexuality

The drama *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* is the representative of circumstances concerning American society. In this drama Brick and Skipper represents the contemporary homosexuals and other characters like Margaret, Big Daddy, Big Mama, Gooper and Mae etc. represent the society of 1950s and 60s. Brick represents the social victims that how the homosexuals were victimized at that time. This drama focuses on the plight of Brick and the life and difficulties he faces are the symbols of the then homosexual culture. The play presents the social stigmas and which results Brick's story of conflict, suffering and the mind-breaking situation. Brick's inability to

have sexual intercourse with his wife to give birth to children, has given birth to the problem in him, that inability has become question on his masculinity. To suppress this anxiety he begins drinking liquor. He is living taking help of that liquor. He sees no other alternative solution except wine to live with distorted life.

BRICK. [. . .] Sir there is something else that you can live with !

BIG DADDY. What?

BRICK. This !—Liquor. . . .

This expression depicts the condition of homosexuals who take the help of poison to kill the stress in them. The ambivalence attitudes towards their life. Neither they can live nor die forever. They love the live but can't stand the social stigmas.

Some congenial theorist like Havelock Ellis has accepted environmental factors in the formation of homosexuality. He redefined homosexuality as an inborn condition rather than a form of sin. He furthermore, differed from many of his European counterparts in explicitly rejecting the vocabulary of 'degeneration'. He emphasis on the physiological aspect rather than the neuropath in the formation of homosexuality. However the attitudes of society has not been changed still. The homosexuals are partially prevented from every aspects of society like job, property, ritual performance etc. as a whole they are considered not deserving any worth. Rather they are merely unable to maintain the sexuality which is expected by that heterosexual culture.

MARGARET. [. . .] Mae an' Gooper are plannin' to freeze us out of Big

Daddy's estate because you you drink and I'm childless . . . (I. 1211)

Brick is going to be prevented from the property in his family. His brother Gooper and his wife have their children so they need money and property but Brick and Maggie are childless so they are not getting that property. Because of the fault in

Brick his family doesnot favor in this matter, Brick has been the figure of worthless in that society. Brick and Maggie are treated worthless. This is the perspectives prevailed in the society.

Not only this, here Maggie is also victimised of Brick's homosexuality. Being wife of a homosexual, Maggie is not being able to sustain naturally in this drama. Her desire of begetting child remains unfulfilled. She has to bear the stigma of being barren. The internalized plights in Brick has ruined him unexpressed to the extent that he even cannot tolerate Maggie and her monotonous requests. If Brick's reality had been disclosed to the family of course, Maggie wouldn't be the object of scorn. So the impact of claiming Maggie's barrenness is indirectly or automatically falls on Brick.

MAE. How beautiful, how touching, this display of devotion ! Do you know why she's childless? She's childless because that big beautiful athlete husband of hers won't go to bed with her ! (III. 1262)

The stigmatizing statements of Mae sharply pierces Maggie's infertility however it ultimately directs to Brick's inability. Mae's mark towards the couple is the insult to Maggie and Brick's inability to maintain the heterosexual responsibility. This society has no other alternative conceptions what it has is only the heterosexuality. It claims the homosexuality as abnormal an unnatural not being able to love opposite sexuality, not being able to have cross-gender relation. But it does not consider the other sexual potentiality in the world rather suppresses stigmatising it with the historically moulded ideology.

In religion too homosexuality became the sin or perverted act. There is a long tradition in the Christian west of hostility. It keeps hostile relation towards homosexuality although this usually took the form of formal regulation of male homosexual activities rather than female homosexual activities. As mentioned in

second chapter, Christian taboos against homosexuality, either Gay or Lesbian have varied in strengths through time and have had different cultures and through various historical periods. Along with attitude the social and subjective meaning given to homosexuality are also culturally varied and specified. Before 1950s the circumstances in the American cultures and societies were very rude to the homosexuals. The consequences of second world war were intolerable and its major impact concerned to the adults. Chaosness of that time took depression on them and consequently they began to deviate from the moral values and norms of the society. Drug addiction, queer sexuality etc. And the play *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* represents the same condition of those deviants assimilating lesbianism, gayism, bisexuals, transvestism etc. Brick the representative character in this play has to face the same circumstances in the society at that time. The blame of being homosexual, having odd relation with skipper and not being able to have sexual relation with his wife Maggie. He even come to the condition of drinking to kill his depression resulted from his failed marital life and the bygone related with Skipper. The absence of his intimate friend and the presence of his present condition are the causes of his tensions.

The same effects of society towards the minorities can be seen in *M. Butterfly* too. Song Liling in the disguise of woman and Rene Gallimard practice homosexuality for twenty years with out recognizing to each other's actuality. Rene Gallimard being frustrated with is wife comes to China and indulges in sexual activities with a male body. These both characters are the representatives of the government. How secretly they indulge in that act which is the sinful act for the society they born in. They have the fear of being disclosed to the union. The strict communist ideology of China can not tolerate such act which Song Liling does even in China. Song has the fear that she may be thrown out of her job and it is same for

Gallimard who is also the agent of French government. Chin, the colleague of Song in communist union blames Song of passing time in luxuries and not helping to their organization he say," [. . .] You've just spent too many years in luxury to be any good to the revolution." (2. X. 1874) in this statement the domination upon homosexual practitioner is obvious. He abuses Song of being homosexual which is not allowed in communism. It's deviation in Chinese culture. Song greatly contributes to the communist revolution in China for so many years however her contributions have been undermined when her homosexuality is uncovered. Deeds done upon the society by the minorities utterly dismantled or undervalued by the society. Here Song's assistance to the mission becomes worthless. Penniless Song is recklessly treated here by her own colleague because she is 'homo' according to Chin. Chin says, "Shut up ! And you won't stink up China anymore with your pervert stuff. You'll pollute the place where pollution begins-the west." (2. X. 1874) Chin's Cruel attitudes towards Song are built immediately when she knows Song's reality. Song's contribution towards the revolution is counted with the pollution. It is clear that the act of homos' is merely to pollute the society which is considered to be sinful polluting others.

Attitude towards homosexuality like other differs largely from place to place and culture to culture and even historical period to another. The campaign held against gay known as anti-gay campaign, mentioned in the second chapter, constituted during 1950s and around in America still has its impact however doesnot represent the universally constructed view on homosexuality. Different culture has different definition of homosexuality. Gay sensibility includes an awareness of being different, at least in certain ways from the members of the main stream, dominant culture, and the complex feelings that result from an implicit, ongoing social oppression. The part of seeing the world as a gay man includes the ways in which one deals with being

oppressed as a gay man. Song says, "Comrade Chin he's not going to support me ! Not in France ! He's a white man ! I was just his plaything —" (2. X.1874). Song is gay practitioner and she has subordinated feelings. The expression sounds like resulted from oppressed mentality for a long period. So not only in the Christian civilized western world, the homosexuals like Song Liling and Gallimard are socially victimized even in oriental society. The perspectives of society upon them have been proved to be Cruel and partial. The justice and treatments of those minorities have been descriminalized in society.

In both plays *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *M. Butterfly* the representative characters are socially stigmatized with the power. These characters being members of different societies in different periods have been criticized by the heterosexual society. The internalized homophobic characteristics of society has been historical challenge to the minorities like Gays and Lesbians. Historically hegemonizing ideology rules over the inferiorized marginal groups who donot have approach to the mainstream culture.

IV. Conclusion

Concerning the both plays *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* and *M. Butterfly*, the characters and their behaviours show the traces of homosexual eagerness internalized in them. The illusory heterosexual relation between them is merely the mask to hide the real identity against heteronormative notion of society. These plays ambiguously represent the homosexual behaviours of some characters. Brick and Skipper's gradual deviation from normal sexuality and Song and Gallimard's desperate longing for homosexual practices signify their perpetual attempt to specify the homosexual self on identity. Social boundaries and cultural restrictions become hindrance to emancipate their soul to the protective realm.

In *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, Brick almost kills himself by drinking liquor to reduce his mendacity resulted from his friend's death. The deep love between them pushed Brick away from Maggie because Brick could not establish normal sexual relation with his wife. Skipper's suicide of being exposed unnatural intimacy with another man and Brick's inability to forget his deep love with Skipper prove that they both engaged in building homosexual self. Maggie, who represents the heterosexual attitudes, intervenes Brick's psychology and tries to impose her ideology gradually. The unexpressed reality of Brick ruins him every moments. The deep relation between Skipper and Brick is smeared by Maggie recklessly. Childless Maggies always blames Brick of neglecting her desire. Even Brick is deprived of properties of being childless. Still there is not social justice to him. And society has no any sympathy over his compulsion. Rather the treatment towards him is so sever that his homosexual existence is not counted rather considered to be perverted and morally dead.

On the other hand Song Liling and Rene Gallimard exercise homosexuality in China for twenty years even not knowing each other's real sexuality. Rene Gallimard, a French diplomat remains in China having relation with a Chinese Opera singer Song. Song is not a woman but a man who works as Chinese spy disguising as a woman. They both fall in love slowly. Gallimard can not know that his beloved Song is a male for twenty years of their affair. Song masquerades as a beautiful woman and even speaks like a woman since she has to milk secrecy about the mission of America towards Vietnam. She cleverly establishes sexual relation with Gallimard either in dark or not exposing herself fully naked. Gallimard is satisfied with Song sexually, he considers her as a perfect woman. He assumes himself in a privileged position in heterosexual society which has created binary opposite categories like heterosexual/homosexual, male/female. At the beginning of his affair he aligns himself with heterosexual male that is 'US' and Song Liling an oriental female that is 'Other' for Gallimard. But finally when Song was discovered to be male Gallimard realizes that Song as well as himself cannot be fit into the sexual categories constructed by the society.

But we find in both plays the discriminated position of the homosexuals. They are outcasted and stigmatized and their voices are suppressed with the power of mainstream culture imposing its own ideology. Only the gender sexuality is considered to be the natural and normal while the possible sexuality beyond the gender concept have been unnaturalized by so called homophobic attitude of heteronormative mainstream culture. Brick and Song's extraordinary behaviours challenge the norms of normal sexuality ultimately resulting in homosexual obsession. They gradually construct their homosexual selves by liberating themselves from normal sexuality.

Works Cited

- Adams, Rachel and David Saravan, eds. *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Carnny-Francis, A, et al. *Gender Studies : Terms and Debates*. New York: Palgrave Macmilan. 1993.
- Carpenter, Edward. "The Intermediate Sex." *Adams and Sarvan*. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.176-195.
- Ellis, Havelock. "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship." *Adams and Sarvan*. New York: Oxford UP, 1971. 340-354.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality : An Introduction*. 1. Vol. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Gamson, J. "Message of Exclusion: Gender, Movements, and Symbolic Boundaries". *Gender and Society*. New York: Apria-May 1997, 11-20.
- Hwang, D.H. *M. Butterfly*. USA: A Plum Book, 1989.
- Mofflin, Honghton. *Readers' Companion to American History*. New York : Chelsea, 1990.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User – Friendly Guide*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 1999.
- Weeks, Jeffry. "The Construction of Homosexuality." *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Ed. Steven Seidman. New York: Blackwell, 1993. 42-43.
- Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. 2007. Wikipedia Foundation Inc. 15th June 2007. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/homosexuality>>
- William, Tennessee. "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. 2nd ed. Ed. Lee A. Jocabus Boston: Charles H. Christensen, 1993. 1188-1271.