I. Masculinity and its presentation

This research entitled "Masculinity in Crisis in Caryl Churchill's *Cloud Nine* and Tomson Highway's *Dry lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*" probes into the problems of male subject on the verge of crisis. Moreover, the masculinity is simply a matter of discovering or choosing a single, unified and coherent gender identity constructed from a range of cultural possibilities. Because of many causes and consequences that are developed in the post-war period such as late capitalism, radical feminism, practice of homosexuality and decolonization-strike the normative masculinity into the state of crisis. This crisis threatens to transform or even overthrow the whole concept of gender identity, especially, masculinity. Focusing on these causes, this research interprets Caryl Churchill's play *Cloud Nine* and Tomson Highway's play *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing* in the light of Masculinity studies and Queer theory by highlighting the socio-political, cultural and economic areas of the 1980s and 1990s of England and Native America.

The exploration of masculinity in crisis is projected through the male characters, who lose economic power, involve in household activities and fail to perform conventional masculine roles. Masculinity is a social definition given to boys and men by societies; like gender it is a social construct. Nature makes people male and female, it gives them their biological definition how they should be treated etc. So, masculinity is a characteristic in socio-cultural bases. But, an argument- what will be the situation if the boys/men unable to perform the masculine role and start the feminine roles is a striking question. Certainly, if so happens the concept of masculinity will be problematic. Addressing this problematic change, Kamala Bhasin says- "masculinity is not static, like gender, it is constantly reconstructed. It may keep change in response to community and economic pattern"(6).

This work also has drawn the psychology of White English masculinity and its expression in the contemporary global/political context from Churchill's play *Cloud Nine,* and the Native American masculinity from Highway's play *Dry Lips*. The basic argument here is that what is termed masculinity is a phenomenon intimately linked to the experience of western hegemonic discourse that was developed in colonial period which is linked to religious-patriarchal heroic-masculinity. Thus, in these plays, masculinity is taken as the serious gender discussions because the male-female subjects are uniquely associated in socio-cultural texture, and in this light, men are taken as the principle holders of economic and political power. The essentialist concept of men is constantly reinforced by the society, culture and then, media.

In the conventional views the power is exclusive to men. If women exercise any power emanating from their sexuality or by physicality, that power is considered always at the mercy of men. On the level of sexuality, heterosexuality is manly concept that men accept the first or appear in position. The very essence, definition and nature of heterosexuality is men first . Heterosexuality has reinforced men's supremacy over women. Women, who had sex with men, were supposed to surrendering themselves to the dominance of men. But in the postmodern era, lesbianism and gay activities came into practice that blurred the conventional view of sexuality. By anticipating this view, Scott Gunter writes:

> [F]or American queers, the goal is to defy the social and historical
> construction of categories of sexuality and gender, and in particular the
> fixed identities of "straight sex", "gay", "lesbian", and "homosexual";
> because any construction of identity only serves to restrict the
> autonomous expression or performance of desire. This act of defiance
> presuppose the essence of sexual identities. (23)

Since the plays are written in postcolonial era, the consequence of colonialism, and now globalization of the mindset permeates the global resurgence of religious fanaticism both of which are inherently misogynist. In *Cloud Nine*, the main character, Clive, bearing Victorian colonial mentality controls all family members. He shows the stereotyped masculinity as the controlling factor. The role-doubling and cross-dressing techniques and the sudden changes brought by the shifting time reverse the conventionality. The exhibition of modernity and post modernity of sociological and cultural aspects make a key commonalities as the hyper-masculinity, intense misogyny and psychopathological attitude to gender. Consequently, in changing time, Betty, the female character and other counter the hyper-masculine, misogynist tendency and clear a ground that is conductive to a more balanced female masculinity.

Indeed, the drama *Cloud Nine* goes against the expectation of the readers of conformist literature by portraying its female characters in male apparel and male characters in female. Many critics have argued that Churchill's acclaimed use of techniques like cross-dressing and role-doubling underscores the social construction of gender and deconstruct the patriarchal character of representation. These theatrical techniques repeatedly cloth gay male and lesbian desire in heterosexual attire. According to James H. Herding, "the attempt to detach homoerotic desire from the paradigm of heterosexual culture was very much a part of the political climate surrounding Churchill's play"(260). In this context, he also extends his views:

> In the late 1970s, writers like Adrienne Rich, Monique Wittig, and to a
> lesser extent Laura Mulvey began to challenge the presumption of
> heterosexuality western patriarchal society. Rich and Wittig eloquently
> argued that throughout history western society has enforced
> heterosexuality by rendering invisible . . . the lesbian possibility and by

preventing lesbians from speaking unless . . . they speak in the 'items'

provided by heterosexual discourse. Earlier, Mulvey in her classic

feminist study of film, had noted that the cultural produces the film

industry reinforced male heterosexual desire. Like Rich's and Wittig's

theoretical arguments, Mulvey's identification of the male gaze in

cinema has had an enduring resonance in theater studies.(260)

Among scholars who have cited *Cloud Nine* as an example of feminist theater actively

engaged in subverting the dominant presumptions of the patriarchal culture are

Adrienne Rich, Wittig and Mulvey. According to Herding, these critics "provide a

theoretical foundation for radically questioning the subversion of Churchill's

representation of diverse sexual identities" (261). Making a claim in *Cloud Nine*,

Churchill took decisive strides toward making visible the gay male or lesbian

possibility. She arguably did so using the performative terms of heterosexuality on an

abstract, and in an intellectual level, nonetheless left the male heterosexual gaze intact

and reviled queer position in drama.

At the level of casting, female roles are played by male and vice versa,

Churchill distinguishes gender and sexual identities and appears to fulfill Butler's call

for "disruptive gender performances". For a different sort of stylization of acts,

Amoko Apollo in this context posits his note as:

The presentation of images of actors as perceived sexed bodies,

playing gender roles or repeating performative acts in conflict with the

genders that dominant ideology "naturally" and unnaturally assigns

them. 'Women' acting 'masculine' and men acting 'feminine'. The

uncoupling of gender and sexual identity is reiterated by doubling

where an actor plays more than one role in the course of a

performance, in some instances across the boundaries of biological sex. (55)

Clive, on the household level, envelops masculinity in a traditional source of duty. He typifies the emotional and physical strength of the privileged male and manifests his dominance over any other male. But at the last, the situation is reverse. The hero is submissive in role playing. Jeffery A. Barber, in this regard, characterizes his activities with his argument:

> Offering repeated maxims to his son, Clive provides a framework that enables the boy to reconcile his own understood notions and validates his own masculinity within the vague parameters established by his father [. ..] But the maxims provide a feeble boundary system within which Edward can practice and gain confidence in his manliness. (243)

Clive's offering of gender maxims to his son is the process of formation of masculine traits in him. It is because whatever masculine traits Clive bearing were inherited from his father and also practiced according to his father's guidance. Therefore, in Barber's analysis, Clive is controlling his family members and their roles.

Against the background of exciting feminist examinations of *Cloud Nine*, it is instructive to trace the rules of power that foster the appearance of mutual exclusiveness between two intertwined economies of white supremacy and phallotocracy. Amoko Apollo expresses this view:

> The phallotocratic economy and the colonial economy enacted in *Cloud Nine* are neither mutually exclusive sites of power that can be used to illuminate each-other, nor entirely separable sites of power that occasionally collide, rather the represent interrelated structures of

gender, social and sexual domination. Churchill's attempt to
investigate these two economies therefore enacts the complicated and
contradictory mechanics through which power is produced and
exercised. (46)

Toward the conclusion of *Cloud Nine*, Clive's authority as father to his family has been seriously undermined. He fails to perform the masculine roles on the level of family and household activities, gender and sexuality, race and ethnicity, and economy. In this final failure, his newly liberated wife Betty becomes economically independent and free, divorces him and begins a life of sexual exploration and self fulfillment. Clive's empire seems to crumbling. Concluding this, a despairing Clive remains alone at the end of the play.

The another drama that deals with similar ground as *Cloud Nine* is Tomson Highway's *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing.* This research work examines the configurations of masculinity and homo-social relationship by giving particular attention to the homosexual subtext and the extent to which this subtext subverts conventional gender roles. There is the consideration of the complicated interplay among colonization, political deprivation, shifting gender roles, and same-sex desire which we can understand in the light of Euro-American theoretical paradigms. In this way, the gender roles and sexual practices vary across cultures. Despite the colonial imposition of legal social institutions, it is assumed that native construction of gender, most notably masculinity, and sexuality are completely identical with western ones. But the traces of practices historically known as a 'third gender' as well as the notion of the two spirit more recently adopted, is taken into account alongside gay or queer. Politics and subjectivity bring the change into the situation of masculinity in the play.

The interpretation of *Dry Lips* lies on the interrelationship among the trickster,

the humor, and binary versus two spirited modes of gender and sexuality. Highway's version of Nanabush, the main character, has provoked the most controversy: does s/he function as an object of male desire, or as a figure for female power? The Native Canadian men treat much of the potentially empowering resistance by the women-largely offstage- as comic. While numerous critics have noticed that the various sexualities and gender roles at play in Highway's work address homophobia as well. The critics Susan Billingham has promoted a crucial but neglected scene in which Creature Nataways reveals his repressed feelings for Big Joey. According to her:

> The introduction of a gay subtext, however, truncated necessarily affects our reading of the play's inversion of conventional gender traits. Ultimately, however, I contend that even the presence of Creature Nataways and Nanabush , the gender shifter do not fully succeed in opening up a space for 'third or fourth genders. So, *Dry Lips* employs a strategy of inversion in such activities as men baking knitting or women playing hockey, at the risk of her inscribing an oppositional model of gender.(359)

Tomson Highway, in his drama, opines that women are not only doing household works and procreation but also expose their interest in hockey game. They also resisted to take part in the process of procreation, and started to take adopted child as their children. So, Highway deals with domestic surrounding, female experience, sexuality and human suffering. What is notable in his writing is the experience of femaleness, the feminine sensibility. Supporting his view, Jerry Wasserman responds that "the female characters of Highway are far more brilliant and active than his heroes. They possess special quality no matter how ugly and good his women are" (37).

Allan Filewood, a native Canadian critic, analyses the activities of Canadian men- "Hanging around , drinking beer, complaining their women- in many ways the Native men seem to optimize "Canadian hoser culture" (371).Yet the men continually blame the women for the state of their lives, as Big Joey does in act 2: "I hate them fucking bitches. Because they, our own women- took the fucking power away from us faster than the FBI ever did"(Worthen:901). Such statements in the drama are the outcome of the loss of masculine power. "In Native mythology, men are considered capable of controlling shape and gender. But the character Nanabush is presented neither explicit male nor female. In *Dry Lips*, however, Nanabush takes female shape in a number of ways- assuming outsized breast to play Gazelle Nataways"(365).

Cary Churchill was born in London, on September 3, 1938. She lived in Montreal, Canada, from 1948 to 1955, and there attended the Trafalgar school from 1957 to1960. She studied English literature at the University of Oxford and took her bachelor of arts degree from that institution in 1960. Her first dramatic works were produced at the university of Oxford, but many of her early plays remain unpublished. Although Caryl Churchill is known primarily as a playwright, her writing career actually began with radio plays in the early 1960s when *The Ants* was broadcasted in 1962. As a prolific playwright, Churchill received her professional stage production in 1972 when owner was performed at the Royal Court Theatre. From that point, she became a member of the Joint Stock Theatre Group and worked with the Monstrous Regiment, a feminist theater union.

After the 1960s, Churchill studied radical politics and returned to the theater in the 1970s with a series of striking political dramas. *Owners* (1970), *Objections to Sex and Violence* (1975), and *A Light Shining in Buckinghamshire* (1976). In the mid-1970s, Churchill began to work more closely with experimental theater companies,

collaborating with actors and directors in the writings of her plays. Working with the feminist theater company Monstrous Regiments, she wrote *Vinegar Tom* (1979), a play about witch craft and sexual politics in seventeenth century England. With the joint Stock company, she investigated the politics of sexuality more extensively in *Cloud Nine* (1979), a pastiche of melodrama, Gilbert- and- Sullvan operetta, and modern realistic theater that uses cross-dressing and role-doubling to expose the relationship between colonial and sexual oppression in the nineteenth century and today. The history of gender oppression and the options for contemporary women are the subject *Top Girls* (1982) and Churchill had British social life, including *Fen* (1983), *Serious Money* (1987), and *Three More Sleepless Nights* (1995). *Mad Force* (1990) concerns the revolution in Romania and *Skyker* (1994) was developed from Lancashire folk tales. Churchill's most recent play, *Blue Heart* (1997) was written after Churchill collaborated on several music-theater pieces, including lives of the *Great Poisoners* (1993) and Hotel (1997).

Caryl Churchill has become well known for her willingness to experiment with dramatic structure. She is a playwright of ideas, ideas that are often difficult and, despite her bold theatricality, surprisingly subtle and elusive. Her principal concern is with the issues attendant on individual's struggle to emerge from the ensnarement of culture, class, economic systems, and the imperatives of the past. Each of these impediments to the development and happiness of the individual is explored in her works. Not surprisingly for a contemporary female writer, many times she makes use of female characters to explore such themes. Thus, in this regard her innovations are sometimes so startling and compelling that reviewers tend to focuses the novelty of her works to the exclusion of her ideas.

In four of her best known works- *Cloud Nine, Top Girls, A mouthful of Birds*,

and *Vinegar Tom*, Churchill presents woman as a cultural concept and displays the power of that concept to submerge and smother the individual female. In *Cloud Nine*, a parallel is suggested between Western colonial oppression and western sexual oppression. This oppression first is seen in the family organization and then in the present. Although her characters use geographical distance and literally run away from the past, no one in *Cloud Nine* can examine the ghost of established practices and tradition.

  Top Girls is a depiction of the exploitation of women by women, teaching well learned thorough generations of women being exploited by men. The play portrays a group of friends, all successful women in the field of literature and the arts, who gather for a dinner to celebrate Marlene's promotion to an executive position in the *Top Girls* employment agency. Viewers are introduced to scenes of Marlene's workplace and her working-class sister and niece, Angie. In a painful end to *Top Girls*, Churchill reveals how one common character is willing to sacrifice her very motherhood to maintain her position in the world of business, a world that the play shows to be created by and for her lower class sister. It is also revealed that Marlene's niece is actually taking one more step into forbidden matter of gender.

  The theme of society's oppressed female is perhaps most powerfully presented in one of Churchill's earlier works, *Vinegar Tom*, a piece created specially for the Monstrous Regiment. *Vinegar Tom* is a play about witches, but there not witches in it, only four women accused of being witches. Set in seventeenth century England, the play depicts four women accused by society of vaguest crime: sorcery. Their only crime, however, has been to follow an individual impulse. Joan Nokon is simply poor and old, two conditions that are not supposed to happen simultaneously to western women. Her daughter, Alice understands sex as an individual matter and is inclined to

enjoy in a man if he suits her fancy. When Alice asserts her right to have an illegitimate children, she is labeled a 'whore'. Since, she is neither a virgin nor a wife. Betty, is called a witch for refusing to marry the man picked out for her, and Susan is seen as a witch for choosing life over death. Thus, all four women are emerging strong-willed individuals whose only crime is to be them selves in an oppressive and conservative society and can not carry out their assigned female roles.

A Mouthful of Birds represents the more idiosyncratic in structure in which the stories of seven contemporary personas are interwoven with the ancient ritualistic events. The atmosphere of the play is charged with the sexuality of accepted violence, violence intermingled with the irresistible quality of sex. One women character, for example, who is stereotypically squeamish about skinning a dead rabbit for supper, calmly tells her husband to go to the bathroom ,where he will find their baby drawn. Churchill juxtaposes this modern violence against the culminating terror of Bacchae in *The Bacchae* by Euripides.

Tomson Highway, another dramatist, is the most celebrated Native Indian writer in Canada today, and one of the most prominent Canadian playwrights. Born in 1951 on a Trapline on a Native reserve in Northern Manitoba, he grew up speaking Cree, and learned English in the residential schools to which many of the children of his generation were taken, often against the wishes of their communities. After studies at the University of Western Ontario and advanced training as a concert pianist, Highway turned to the theatre as a forum for cultural recuperation, and established his reputation quickly with two comedies set on a Native reserve in northern Ontario: *The Rez Sisters* (1986) and *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing* (1989). In *The Rez Sisters,* a group women put aside their difference and travel to Toronto to the world's biggest bingo; in *Dry Lips* the men of the reserve confront their political impotence as

first the women of the reserve, then all the aboriginal women of the world invade the man's domain and form a hockey league. In both plays the surface comedy is disrupted by images and memories of horrifying abuses of women, but whereas in *The Rez Sisters*, past abuse forms the structure of present. In *Dry Lips* the past abuse is represented in the present.

Highway has used trickster technique to remind listeners and readers of the mutability of life and the importance of adaptability for cultural and personal survival. By articulating cultural differences through trickster discourses written in the language of colonizers, Highway subverts colonial discourse. In his plays and short story, Nanabush respectively contests colonial rules of recognition and represent alternative paradigms of decolonization and cultural survival. So, in Highway's plays, Nanabush often engages in subversive mimicry and represents the effects of colonialism and of internalized colonialism to re-present alternatives; readers imagine a liberated world free from colonial oppression and cultural landscape. With these two plays and several others that have received less attention, Highway became first Native playwright to break through into the theatrical 'mainstream' and win as much celebrity as Canadian theatre accords.

These diverse critical opinions and thematic concern are oriented toward the subversiveness, openness and homogeneous on the level of these two plays. But the particular gender subject masculinity is underestimated and the critics are failed to assess critically its relationship to the femininity, its characteristics and sexuality. They also neglected the basic causes behind the formation of masculinity and femininity. Therefore, to prove the "masculinity in crisis", this work includes neglected sides, explores proper reasons with evidences and consequences. The discussion of masculinity studies and queer theory will observe the gender problems

in the plays. While going through the plays it becomes clear that the preference is given much to the masculinity at first. But, later on, the true figure of masculinity is presented as the shifting in nature and situation of identical crisis. The readers will acknowledge the gender, racial and sexual application that characterize human essence and human development.

Regarding these methodologies to study thematic concerns this thesis is divided into four chapters for the convenience of readers. The first chapter introduces the thesis and states the hypothesis with general background information of the methodologies that are applied in it. The hypothesis is extended with proper reasons and is given evidences in this very section. It also introduces the playwrights with their well-known writings, themes etc.

The second chapter is for discussing the conceptual tools with which these plays are analyzed. The thesis presents the concept of masculinity a crucial factor among feminism and gender studies. The discussion of traditional concept of masculinity, its type, features and roles are critically examined to reveal its real features in recent time. Such examination gives a clear historical development of masculinity throughout the historical era. So, the change in social, political, economic, and sexual characteristics and behavior is taken here the crisis of masculinity in terms of past roles.

The third chapter analyzes two plays and shows the masculinity of men characters in the state of crisis. It analyzes the male character's conditions before and after the crisis by applying the theoretical modality defined and developed in second chapter. The texts are taken as the primary source of this analysis where some necessary extracts are extracted to support and to justify the hypothesis. It presents several references with elaboration and their textual context. This chapter also

explains meaningfully the problems in masculinity and the true figure of their masculine identity. Therefore, the crisis of masculinity is analyzed from different angels such as masculine, feminine, gender and sexuality etc in the texts. The gender inequality is shown through the valorization of female perspective and male values.

The last chapter concludes the thesis by explaining the basic techniques, cross-references, and necessary textual evidences that are important to prove its hypothesis. It also approves these two dramas *Cloud Nine* and *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing* as the original texts of masculinity crisis which question the accepted but unexplored norms of masculinity. Thus, the traditional concept of masculinity is taken not only a gender problem but the human frailty and social misfit.

II. Masculinity: A Historical Construction

The discussion of masculinity studies observes the gender identity and gender problems. The term 'masculinity' is defined by Oxford Dictionary as such "qualities or appearance traditionally associated with men. It is the masculinity which has to do with particular traits and qualities rather with biology". The Collin's Thesaurus defines masculinity as "male, manful, manlike, manly, virile, bold, brave, butch, gallant, hardy, macho, muscular, powerful, ramboesque, red-blooded, resolute, robust, stout-hearted, strapping, strong, vigorous, well-built". These characteristics or qualities of men are considered masculine. Therefore, masculinity is a social definition given to boys and men and is social construction. "Naturally, people born as the male and female is biological definition. But it is the human society which makes people masculine and feminine. It defines how boys/men should dress, appear, behave; what attitude and qualities they should have, and how they should be treated" (Bhasin: 3). Regarding the habitual actions and inherent perfections society treats them accordingly. This tendency not only creates hierarchy among the masculinities but also brings problem in it. The history of masculinity is also not linear and there is no master line of development to which all else is subordinate. There is no simple shift from traditional to modern. Rather, in the world created by European empires, complex structures of gender relations in which dominant, subordinated and marginalized masculinities are in constant interaction, changing the conditions for each others' existence and transforming themselves as they do. Thus, the masculinity is a gender concept that developed from a long history of socio-political, economic, and cultural discourses and practices.

The history of masculinity is intimately tied to a larger gender history. According to R.W. Connell, "it has come into existence at particular times and places,

and is always subject to change" (Adams and Savran: 245). Masculinity studies, in recent era have shown that masculinities are not only plural but they are inflected by issues of race, class, sexuality and ethnicity.

It is very important to look back over the past history to understand the origin and current pattern of masculinities. "In the period from about 1450 to about 1650 the modern capitalist economy came into being around the North Atlantic, and the modern gender also began to take shape in that region" (246). Since the masculinity has existed only in the contest of a whole structure of gender relations it is easy to know the formation of masculinity in the modern gender order as a whole. So, it is a process that has taken about four centuries to come into being. There are, according to R.W. Connell "four developments seem particularly important for the making of those social historical practice that we now call "masculinity"(246).

Throughout the history the cultural change was the first one in the development of masculinity. Connell, in this sense, says:

> [T]he cultural change produced new understanding of sexuality and personhood in metropolitan Europe. When medieval Catholicism, already changing, was disrupted by the spread of Renaissance secular culture and the Protestant reformation, long-established and the powerful ideals for men's lives were also disrupted. The monastic system crumbled. The power of religion to control the intellectual world and to regulate everyday life began its slow, contested, but decisive decline. (246)

Such cultural changes enhanced a new way of social life and cultural formation (practices). More people began marriage and stated household settlement. "Marital heterosexuality displaced monastic denial as the most honored form of sexuality. The

cultural authority of compulsory heterosexuality clearly followed this shift" (246).

Then the society started to construct the nature of masculinity by taking insight from

cultural changes, men's nature, religious scriptures, and legendary characters. Men are

generally being treated in essentialist terms and the socially constructed nature of

masculinity is widely acknowledged and it is applied to a study of men's history.

Therefore, "masculinity is a social definition given to boys and men by societies [. . .]

nature makes us male or female, it gives us our biological definition, but it is society

which makes us masculine and feminine" (6). Thus, "whatever the characteristics and

behavior appear; what attitudes and qualities they should have, how they should be

treated etc" (6) all are associated with the socio-cultural traits.

The second factor, according to Connell, that helped to the development of

masculinity concept was the "creation of overseas empires" means the large range of

colonization. Such empire, in Connell's view:

> . . . was a gendered enterprise from the start, initially an outcome of the
>
> segregated men's occupations of soldering and sea trading. When
>
> European women went to the colonies it was mainly as wives and
>
> servants within households controlled by men. Apart from a few
>
> monarchs the imperial states created to rule the new empires were
>
> entirely staffed by men, and developed a statecraft based on the force
>
> supported by the organized bodies of men.(246)

The men who applied force at the colonial frontier were defined as a masculine

cultural type in the modern sense. They were often extremely violent in the search of

land, gold etc. The effectiveness of their controlling power started to create

hegemonic masculinity through its discourses. Those discourses were related with

their experiences and feelings which they had gathered while creating empire. They

thought themselves are robust, virile, law-makers, heads-of household, heterosexual, active sex etc and women, black are effeminate, weaker sex, submissive. So, they were sub-oriented, discriminated, and othered. In the colonial period, and after, the history of white supremacy suggested that white or ruling class masculinity was hegemonic. So, the tentative periodization of the history of masculinity in the world started from the colonial period. Robert Morrell, in an analytical writing writes:

> In the late nineteenth century imperial rule was being extended into the sub-continent, subjugating Afrikaner and Afrikan opponents alive. The imperial process was not only led by British men, at that time, many of whom had a public school upbringing. The notions of superiority and toughness taught in those schools were reflected in the way in which colonial rule was established.(616)

A willingness to resort to force and a belief in the glory of combat were features of imperial masculinity and the colonial process. Therefore, the discourse of construction of masculinity was created in relation to femininity, racial identity and ethnicity. Sanjeev Upreti, in an article writes "masculinities are not only plural but they are inflected by the issues of race, class, sexuality and ethnicity" (6). He also gives a little glimpse of history of eighteenth century British masculinity of British that- "the masculinity of the middle class British was supposed to be rational as well as physically strong"(6).

The third key development, Connell formed, was "the 'growth of the cities' that were the centers of commercial capitalism [. . .] creating a new setting for everyday life" (247). Because of the gender consequence this change became visible only in the seventeenth century. Such changed conditions of everyday life made a more thorough going individualism possible.

Connell has insisted on the independent structures or patterns of gender system. The change is always something that happens to sex-roles, that impinges on them. It comes from outside, as in discussions of how technological and economic change demand a shift to a modern male role for men. Or it comes from inside the person, from the real self that presents against the artificial restrictions of constraining roles. In this sense, "the business culture and workplaces of commercial capitalism institutionalized a form of masculinity, creating and legitimating new forms of gendered work and power in the counting-house, the warehouse and the exchange" (247).

Along with the emergence of the sexual subcultures in the early eighteenth-century London, there was the transformation of gender system. At that time "the effeminate men who met in a particular houses and taverns, and whose gender practices including cross-dressing, dancing together and sexual intercourse with each other" (247). With this evidence everyone can assume that the initiation of homosexuality was developed from the effeminate men who were in cross-dressing, and there were no clear-cut dichotomy of bodies. This practice, later on, flourished not only such big commercial centers or in stage performance but also in the socio-cultural life (bases). Because of that practice gender ideologies of British started to crumble and the concept of gender come under question. Masculinity, like gender, is not static-it is constantly reconstructed, it may keep changing in response to changes in economic patterns, natural or man-made disasters, war or migration.

The last or fourth development Connell talked was "the onset of large scale European Civil War" (248). Further, he commented "the sixteenth-and seventeenth-century wars of religion, merging into the dynastic wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did more than relocate a few kings and bishops. They distributed

the legitimacy of the gender order" (248). This was an account of the rise of modern body and mind. Dwelling into many accounts of changing concept of gender or masculinities were the claims for a change or distinctions between male and female bodies. Then, after, the boundaries between men and women were becoming clearer. The outcome of that conceptual shift was very vigorous because it established a background on which the two-sex model and sexual difference were redefined, and that redefinition inaugurated women as domesticated and sexually passive. Locating this turn, Karen Harvey cites Foyester's argument that "the change in bodies is key: only with the emergence of a two-sex model of sexual difference in which women were redefined as passive, passionless and domesticated, and wholly different from men, did patriarchy now appear more secure" (qtd. in Harvey: 305).

These transformations–in bodies, masculinity, and patriarchy-were spread throughout the world with one worldview to another, social practices to cultural practices either by people's movement or by colonialism. For example, Harvey's anticipation of Fletcher refreshes "ancient scriptural patriarchy" was replaced with "modern secular patriarchy" (305). Because of these consequences, Connell again shows the upheavals of the English civil war-"the world turned upside down by revolutionary struggle could be gender as well as the class order. In the English speaking countries it was the Quakers, a religious-cum-political sect emerging from the upheavals of English civil war who made the first public defense of equality in religion for women. They not only proclaimed the principle, but actually gave women a significant organizing role in practice" (248). Therefore, these conceptual practices and gender orders are the part of the periodization of history of masculinity, modernity and nature of human civilizing process.

With the turn-of the eighteenth century the development of masculinity was

more hegemonic. The political scenario in "the era of absolute monarchy the state provided a larger scale of institutionalization of men's power than had been possible before constituted the ground" (248). Because of the increasing issues of masculinity and nationalism the imperial ruler started more colonial occupation throughout the world. "Nationalism is associated with masculinity not with femininity" (Rayamajhi, 7). Military forces and winners were taken as the token of masculinity. Such professionals took themselves hyper-masculine and other professionals such as mine workers, female, slaves etc. were understood inferior masculinities.

From that time certain hierarchy was developed on the understanding of masculinity superior/inferior, hyper/working, masculine/feminine. Lightening these issues, Connell focuses on the understanding of masculinity as:

> [W]ith the eighteenth century, in seaboard Europe and North America at least, we can speak of a gender order in which masculinity in the modern sense gendered individual character, defined thought an opposition with femininity and institutionalized in economy and state had been produced and established. For this period we can even define a hegemonic type of masculinity and describe some of its relations to subordinated and marginalized forms. (248)

Masculinity, in Connell's words, is constructed through the discourse which was based on the economy and state institutions. That discourse created representation of gendered individual character which ultimately represented as masculine or feminine. Such representation and discourse explored the ideas acknowledging the inequality of the sexes. Thus, in one sense, we can say that the construction of masculinity, at that time was a political ideology.

The history of European/American masculinity in the nineteenth-century and

early twentieth-century were full flame. The inauguration of industrial revolution produced a working class group, the society clearly divided into classes- upper, middle, and working. Because of that, people related such class started to show their performance accordingly. That environment helped to create many types of masculinities. There developed many types of discourses of masculinities, which were based on power circulation. Robert Morrell, quoting an Australian socio-historian Bob Connell, discusses that "the categories of masculinity- "dominant, complicit, submissive, and oppositional or protest" (607), are to make sense of the relationships between groups of men. On the other hand, R.W. Connell describes three main forms of modern masculinity, those of 'hegemonic', 'complicit' and 'protest' masculinity, with three related processes of dominance, complicity or acquiescence, and subordination/protest, making up the hierarchy. According to him "complicit masculinities are 'masculinities constructed in ways that realize the patriarchal dividend, without the risks or tension of being in the frontline tropes of patriarchy. Protest masculinities, opposing other men, but not male power over women, also partake in the dividend" (338). "Hegemonic means all-encompassing leadership or dominance. It is therefore overpowering masculinity. This form of masculinity is clearly about power and asserting power others" (Bhasin:13). In an analysis of Gramsci, Mike Donaldson expresses the definition:

> Hegemony, a pivotal concept in Gramsci's *Prison Notebook* and his
> most significant contribution to Marxist thinking, is about the winning
> and holding of power and the formation (and destruction) of social
> group in that process. In this sense, it is importantly about the ways in
> which the ruling class establishes and maintains its domination. The
> ability to impose a definition of the situation, to set the terms in which

events are understood and issues discussed, to formulate ideals and

define morality is an essential part of this process. Hegemony involves

persuasion of the greater part of the population, particularly through

the media, and the organization of social institutions in ways that

appear "natural", "ordinary", "normal". (645)

Indeed, hegemony is the procedure to the formation of idea or rule to control other. It

is a slippery notion that creates a discourse through the representation or persuasion or

domination and then forms a rule. Again the rule is circulated or imposed with the

means of media, and the organization of social institutions. "It is a lived experience,

and an economic and cultural force, and dependant on social arrangements. It is

constructed through difficult negotiation over the most dangerous thing we live with"

(646). Thus, the concept of masculinity is hegemonic that operates all the aspects of

social, cultural, economic, biological, psychological and historical life.

Hegemonic masculinity forms the sexual ideology through the most influential

active agents: "priest, journalists, advertisers, politicians, psychiatrists, designers,

playwrights, film makers, actors, novelists, musicians, activists, academics, coaches

and sportsmen. They are the "weavers of hegemony" as Gramsci put it, its

"organizing intellectuals" (646). These people regulate and manage gender regimes:

articulate experiences, fantasies, and perspectives, reflects on and interpret gender

relations. Hegemonic masculinity, therefore, is not necessarily associated with what

powerful men are, but is what sustains their power. The large numbers of men are

motivated to support it because it benefits them. So, "hegemonic masculinity is

naturalized in the form of the hero and presented through forms that revolve around

heroes: sagas, ballads, westerns, thrillers, in books, films, television, and in sporting

events" (646). Thus, a particular form of masculinity is hegemonic that means its

exaltation stabilizes a structure of dominance and oppression in the gender order as a whole.

Hegemonic masculinity, the umbrella form of masculinity is dominant in society. This is a question of relations of cultural domination. In addition to oppressing women, hegemonic masculinity silences or subordinates other masculinities. It positions its value in relation to the values expressed by other masculinities, and they have no currency or legitimacy. Hegemonic masculinity, according to Mike Donaldnson is:

> exclusive, anxiety-provoking, internally and hierarchically differentiated, brutal and violent. Among its differing features are misogyny, homophobia, racism and compulsory heterosexuality. Hegemonic masculinity is not stable. It is constantly responding to challenges, accommodating or repelling rival representation of masculinity. In this process it depends less on straight coercion and more as Gramsci argued, on developing a consensus. (608)

Donaldson basically views hegemonic masculinity as a version of masculinity which demands certain traits- of men should behave and how generally considered to be "real men" do behave, as the cultural ideal. The normative or traditional masculinity should gather the defining factors of hegemonic masculinity because these are only the weapon to exercise masculinity.

Masculinities are often bound together by their domination of women but this obscures important difference between masculinities. Working class, black and gay men are excluded or subordinated to hegemonic masculinity. Thus, by these all means we can account that hegemonic masculinity is an umbrella under which all types of masculinities are formed, and all these are controlled and dominated by its physical

and institutional powers. On the other side, there are the possibilities that if the masculinities protest against the physical and institutional power of hegemonic masculinity and its defining features, it would be problematic.

In the history of America, the form of hegemonic masculinity was the gentry masculinity. The gentry masculinity, as R. W. Connell writes:

> [W]as the class of hereditary landowners, the gentry, who dominated the North Atlantic world of the eighteenth century. George Washington was a notable example of the class and its hegemonic form of masculinity. Based in land ownership, gentry masculinity was involved in capitalist economic relations but did not emphasize strict relations calculation in the manner of the merchants. (248)

The history of American masculinity as in Connell's illustration was preoccupied with the landownership and establishment of plantation. If we examine American history, we find the American people had brought black people to make their slave. But, later blacks were largely brought to work in the plantation fields. The most interesting matter was that American people not only institutionalized the business markets but also constructed their masculinity in opposition to black people. The growing literature in the United States and Britain, were locating 'black masculinity' as oppositional, discrete, and implicated in construction of white masculinity. In an analysis, citing A.S. Chen, Robert Morrell expresses the purpose of literature "is to dignify the lives and experiences of black men, an approach that can, however, degenerate into treating black men simply as 'heroic victims of racism'(611)". Thus, such purpose was a project that succeeded in undermining the stereotypes of black masculinity which had been fixed on the body, on physicality, physical strength, and it was taken as a site for European fantasies about black male sexuality. Black

masculinity was commonly pictured as a sexual and social threat in dominant white cultures.

The experiences of black people and the development of racism in the USA was outcome of white rule that was exercised by white settlers, and that exercise ultimately led them to the formation of gentry' masculinity. Gentry' masculinity, according to Connell:

> was closely integrated with the state. The gentry provided local administration and staffed the military apparatus. The gentry provided army and many officers, and often recruited the rank and file themselves. [. . .] involvement in violence and the ethic of family honor [. . .] willingness to face an opponent in a potentially lethal one-to-one combat was a key test of gentry masculinity. (249).

The nature of gentry masculinity was emphatic and violent. It involved domestic authority over women, though the women were actively involved in making and maintaining the network of alliances that tied the gentry together. Gentry masculinity also involved a much more brutal relationship with the agricultural workforce. Gentry masculinity, in this sense, formed a gender as a whole but that was not strongly regulated long since its invitation.

From the beginning of nineteenth-century "the history of European/American masculinity over the last two hundred years can broadly be understood as the splitting of gentry masculinity, its gradual displacement by new hegemonic forms, and the emergence of an array of subordinated and marginalized masculinities" (249). The reasons for these changes are immensely complex. According to Connell there are "challenges to the gender order by women, the logic of the gendered accumulation process in industrial capitalism, and the power relations of empire" (249). Thus, in the

nineteenth century, people saw a historical change in gender politics, the emergence of feminism acknowledged as a form of mass politics. It means a mobilization for women's rights and gender/sexual identity, their suffrage in public arenas. These all were the outcome of the growth of liberal state and its reliance on concept of citizenship. Evidence for the rapid spread of masculinity studies during the last decade of the Twentieth-century is everywhere in many academic conferences, topical analogies, and courses now being offered on masculinity. "As many women's studies programs move towards gender studies, masculinity may take its place alongside courses on gay/lesbian/queer topics" (Adams and Savran: 6).

By the early 1970s, the women's and gay liberation movements had fashioned elaborated social concepts of homosexuality that not only sought to normalize homoerotic desire and identities but also criticized the institutions of heterosexuality, marriage and the family, and conventional gender roles. This was an era directed changes in the organization of domestic life. The emergence of feminist movement, gay and lesbian sexuality, wide discussion about masculinity and femininity and gender roles started work against the traditional, normative and hegemonic practices. At the heart of it, especially in the late 1970s, was an understanding of the difference between men and women anchored in a spiritualized concept of female sexuality and an eroticization of the male that imagined male desire as revealing a logic of misogyny and domination. Being a woman and a lesbian meant exhibiting one's desires, fantasies, and behaviors as lesbian-feminist sexual and social identity. "As gay historians have shown, the nineteenth-century was the time when "the homosexual" as social type became clearly defined. This involved both a medical and a legal demarcation" (Harvey, 252). Homosexual desire was now considered as a particular type of men.

The most striking feature of the present moment gender order, mostly in the rich countries, is the open challenge to men's privileges made by feminism and this challenge is circulating globally as soon as it was made. Here is also the challenge to hegemonic sexuality from lesbian and gay sexuality. The oppositional movements have opened which is also historically new. The emergence of transgender subjects and transsexual male/female, from the twentieth-century to till now, are creating their masculinity in deliberately ambiguous body. These transgender subjects, according to Judith Halberstam, are not attempting to slide seamlessly into manhood, and their retention of the FTM (female to male) suggests the emergence of new gender position. However, another strand of male transsexualism has produced a new discourse of masculinity. Thus, the construction of masculinity in recent years is on the process of reconstruction of multiple identities. It is all, because masculinity and femininity are not biologically determined rather socially constructed and thought. Unlike sex, which is biological, the masculinity of men are psychologically and socially constructed which means historically and culturally determined.

Masculinity in Crisis: A Study of Masculinity

Over the past few decades increasing attention has been paid on men, masculinity and the male sex-role, particularly in the United States and Britain. It has provided a socio-historical overview of the rise of the crisis of masculinity from 1960s and 1970s. The underlying assumptions of crises are critically examined, and questions asked about its validity and relevance in patriarchal society. In the past, the institutionalization of masculinity was the dominant mode of patriarchy, and the previous views of dichotomous categories for masculinity and femininity had treated generic man as the norm of what is human(mankind). Such views consequently failed explicitly to recognize masculinity as problematic. However, during the 1960s and

1970s a number of books and articles were published which argue that men are experiencing a contemporary crisis of masculinity.

"From the early literature it is apparent that the rebirth of feminism and the women's movement, in the 1960s and 1970s, and the subsequent rise of the gay liberation movement, eroded the silences surrounding masculinity" (Lemon, 61). The contemporary crisis of masculinity is, however, clearly described by Joseph Pleck in his book *The Myth of Masculinity* (1981). According to Pleck, men in modern societies are subjected to an unprecedented number of pressures due to social, economic, historical and political change. This has resulted in a serious crisis of identity as men attempted to meet many conflicting and contradictory demands made of them by the male sex-role. In this sense, due to social, historical, economic and political change many of the requirements of the male sex role have been rendered absolute. The male sex-role has thus become as "invisible straitjacket" (62) which keeps a man bound to antiquated patriarchal notions of what he must do or be in order to prove himself a man.

The study of masculinity, perhaps the most important development of feminist criticism was the shift from 'woman' to 'gender' as a primary object of study. A term that applies to men and women, like gender would enable scholars to approach masculinity as a social role that like masculinity needed to be understood and interrogated. It is here necessary to discuss the crucial distinction between sex and gender role. Almost all human being are born with more or less clearly definable sex as male or female. But, in same cases, infants with constant sex characteristics can be misunderstood at birth due to distortions of the genitals. Raised as members of the other sex, they find it difficult if not impossible to function like other members of their own sex. Thus, "gender role is an order of phenomenon than sex, and the

relevant terms are not "male" or "female", which are sex terms, but "masculine" and "feminine"(Chafetz, 3). The formation of gender category, as Chafetz writes in his book is:

> It does not require a very astute social observer to notice [gender role] from very early childhood to death, people act differently according to sex. Most female display, to a greater extent, a set of behavioral, temperamental, emotional, intellectual, and attitudinal characteristics identified, in a given culture at a given time, as feminine. Similarly, most males display, to a greater or lesser extent, a set of different characteristics can be conceptualized together under the general rubric of 'gender roles'. (3)

Chafetz defines the gender roles in terms of a cluster of socially or culturally defined expectations that every individuals are expected to fulfill. At any given time infant born into culture, starts perform gender roles, but the roles are given in the sense that they exist outside of that individual. If s/he is confronted by a set of socially and culturally prescribed roles, s/he will be pressured, rewarded, and punished to accept and internalize certain roles and others during the process of socialization.

Through Chafetz, what we acknowledge here is that it is sufficient to understand that the concept 'role' centers on two fundamental phenomena. First, roles are defined more or less precisely by society and presumed to apply to all individuals in a given category; and second, roles are more or less well-learned responses by individuals. The main implications of these two aspects of the definition are always subject to change over time and place. However, the traditional gender stereotypes in males tended to choose only male jobs or perform masculine roles and female do same. Therefore, the exercise of 'gender roles' is used to convey the socio-cultural

components that are typically associated with each sex. But the male gender role

practices have been denounced as a male tool to dissipate women's power whereby

women became viable subjects only when placed alongside men, and reinforcing their

position as 'other'. "As Judith Bennet cautioned a history of gender as meaning

intellectualizes and abstracts the inequality of the sexes" (qtd. in Harvey: 296). In

Harvey's analysis-the gender inequality for women and feminist historians- is a

political problem. Such gender problem can be disciplined because it allows them to

forget the material working of power in the past. In this sense, gender history or

gender inequality often explores ideas about and meaning of femininity and

masculinity; such ideas emphatically speak about power. Judith Bennet's manifesto

piece on women's history [talked] "the oppression and subordination of women

through a reinvigoration of the concept of patriarchy" (296-97). The concept of

patriarchy, as Bhasin defines: "is a social and ideological system in which men have

more control over resources and decision-making. Patriarchy is historically

constructed and its form, content and extent can be different in different contexts and

at different time" (8). Patriarchal ideology undertakes masculinism as the notion that

men and masculinity are superior to women and femininity. Like all societal system,

patriarchy too has an ideology and structure which together ensure that men are head

of households, inheritors of family name and property, by which all societal

institutions are male dominated. In course of time, its nature is always subject to

change.

Sangita Rayamajhi in the first masculinity studies seminar (jointly organized

by Social Science Baha, the Central Department of English, CNAS, and Aakar, New

Delhi) says-"Because of a patriarchal ideology and system, gender relations

everywhere are unequal and hierarchical; women are subjected and discriminated

against. What holds good for men and boys holds true for women and girls as well".

Such views are apparent all over the social and cultural institutions and practices-education, health, economic sectors, sports, marriage, household, festivals etc. The essentialist concept of men is centrally reinforced by these societal or cultural institutions and, by media. All the conceptualization of gender and sexuality are, thus, the patriarchal product in correspond to biological, societal and cultural attributes. In this sense, the gender of men is particularly masculine; the sexuality of men is explicitly heterosexual. If a man is not performing masculine traits he is considered either feminine or transvestite. And if a man is participating in homosexual activities or sharing homosexual attributes that is not masculine. These homosexuals are considered opposite to masculine traits. It is all because patriarchy assumes the masculinity is only associated with men, and what man is strictly defined by patriarchal ideology. Kamala Bhasin, in her book *Exploring Masculinity* expresses the attributes of patriarchy-"in a patriarchal ideology, masculinity is the notion that men and masculinity are superior to women and femininity. Masculinism believes in, and justifies male superiority and male dominations. It naturalizes masculinity, thus making it inevitable and non-negotiable" (13). Masculinity, thus a form of patriarchy, clearly talks about power and assertion of power over others; and different from femininity because it gives command and controls.

If we look past "in the seventeenth-century, the key to male power in the household was thought to be sexual control of women as well as the self" (Harvey, 298). This gender history in the past was the relations between men and women and the ways in which their lives were interwined. According to Harvey, it is also very much about power.

The importance that power over women had in the formation of men's

identity. Without the core of a worthy sexual representation and power, all other contributing facets to male reputation could be meaningless. The system, in which manhood relied in part on maintaining household order, expressed and constituted by the sexual behavior of women, was an inherently unstable one. (299)

In this way, citing the statement of the sociologist Robert W. Connell, Harvey writes that "the ideal of household patriarch was a form of "hegemonic masculinity", one that "culturally exalted" and that embodies the legitimacy of patriarchy" (299). If the women in household earned money on which that economy depended could lend them considerable power. Therefore, many men did not occupy the position of household patriarch. "Moreover, as women were deemed the lusty sex never entirely in control of themselves, female sexuality was a precarious basis for male ideology" (299).

Through these arguments, we find the model of masculinity carried out by the mechanism of patriarchy is fragile in front of women's economic and sexual freedom. It is also because the ground of patriarchy under which it was formed is crumbling. Therefore, now men have faced a series of anxieties about women's sexuality and about men's inability to fulfill patriarchal model of the household by which a revised and reinvigorated patriarchy developed, which had at its core new ideas about sexual difference.

Since men's gendered practices, the hegemonic masculinity is so deeply implicated through the use, generation, threat and reproduction of violence. This attention and reproduction of violence to women has provided one test of social and political significance of men's different discursive practices. From the late nineteenth-century, what emerged as a prominent topic was a sense that theories of gender were not fully adequate to address sexuality, either as a social practice or as a vector of

oppression. It is essential to separate gender and sexuality analytically to more accurately reflect their separate social existence. By the late 1980s and early 1990, the call to develop theories of sexuality was being answered by an expanding body of literature that addressed the political and cultural positions of gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transsexuals, sex-workers, sadomasochists, and others- diverse conglomeration of 'sexual minorities' who were increasingly identified as queer. "The dominant, hegemonic man is no longer defined by his house-holding status and his good domestic and Christian order but by the fact that he desires and has sex only with women" (301). If we cast a short view upon the final two decades of the eighteenth century, according to Harvey, "a growing emphasis on domesticity seemed to threaten masculinity with too close a relationship with women and led on to an imperative to prove masculinity through male-only encounters"(304).

The feminist movement broke out in the 1950s and in the late 1960s and 1970s, a rich outpouring like a released dam of comment, polemic, and search for explanations began. There were some wonderful writings that slammed into men and social relations between men and women. A most influential critique, at that time, was feminist theory and the feminist naming of men as men. Although feminist theory and practice had addressed the problem of men through its development, the major emphasis had been on the analysis of women's experiences of the consequences of men's domination rather than the focused theorization of men. To support this argument, Michael S. Kimmel puts his view as:

> The rise of feminism in late nineteenth-and early twentieth-century
> United States provoked a variety of responses among American men
> and promoted what we might call a crisis of masculinity, because the
> meaning that had constituted traditional gender definitions were

challenged. (262)

Kimmel's argument was the articulation of the new claims made by women derived from these macro- and micro-structural changes that promoted re-evaluation of traditional gender relations by men and constituted the structural origins of the crisis of masculinity. "In the public sphere, the rise of the women's college, women's increased literacy, delayed marriage, an ideology of upward mobility, and capitalist development gave rise to the New woman" (265). Such, highly educated and economically autonomous woman challenged existing gender relations and the distribution of power.

The rise of the women's movement is direct outcome of the structural changes, arising during the times of general socioeconomic and cultural changes that include transformed gender relations, men and women struggled to redefine the meanings of masculinity and femininity. "But the burden of structural change may have fallen even more heavily on men, since men view even small losses of difference, advantages, or opportunities as large threats" (266). Even more, men felt themselves besieged by social break down and crisis on the familiar route to manhood. In an analysis, Kimmel quotes Hartman's remark as: "men were jolted by changes in the economic social order which made them perceive that this superior position in the gender order and this supposedly "natural" male roles, and prerogatives were not somehow rooted in the human relationships subject to change and decay" (266).

Hartman, here, responses to the late nineteenth-century crisis of masculinity, and such crisis resulted because of the complex set of relationship of gender categories and of economic and social order. In Douglas's words such subject change and decay initiates sexual tension and hatred of women by men and the reverse. "A

strongly misogynist current runs through a number of social and religious tracts, medical treatises, and political pamphlet" (266). The women's increasing power, thus was symptomatic of cultural changes that had reduced the importance and visibility of masculinity. Masculinist sentiments countered feminization as a cultural process, rather than opposing advancement of women as a group or as individuals.

The equality was searched within the growing labor movement. According to Kimmell, in his updated pamphlet, "Women-Comrade and Equal", Eugene V. Debs proclaimed himself-"glad to align myself with a party that declares for absolute equality between the sexes. Anything less than this is too narrow for twentieth-century civilization and too small for a man who has a right conception of manhood" (qtd. in Kimmel, 275). The social emancipation of women to the end of violence against women and transformation of masculinity was the commitment of feminists. Debs concludes his pamphlet:

> Under our brutal forms of existence, beating womanhood to dust, we have raised in passion for the individual women, for use only. Some day we shall develop the social passion for womanhood, and then the gross will disappear in service and justice and companionship. Then we shall left woman from the mire where our fist have struck her, and set her by our side as our comrade and equal, and that will be shown, not in the fact that he had enslaved his wife, but in that he has made her force.(275)

Debs' conclusion suggests that the feminist movement did not lead masculinity on the verge of crisis rather it developed a new form of man called pro-feminist, who participated in women's right movement, and supported them to be free from social injustices and inequality. "The pro-feminist men sought to resolve the crisis

of masculinity by supporting women's claims for autonomy in marriage and in their demands for sexual freedom" (295).

Beside the social and economic equality, in the first two decades of the twentieth century, the 'sex radical feminist' sought women's sexual equality and autonomy in their own lives. They behaved that sexual repression was on their critiques on socialist politics and scientific advances, both of which posited an equality of sexual desire between women and men. "Feminist anthropologist placed greater emphasis beginning in the 1970s on women and so-called 'women's world'. In good measure this was a question of "discovery" the women so notoriously absent in earlier ethnographies" (Guttman, 400). In their research, gender is an area in which the classical sociological question of power, institutionalized inequality, and dynamics of social change do apply seeing gender as a structure of social power has immediate implications on men, s/he can understand the system of inequality. So, the study of men is as vital for gender analysis as the study of ruling classes and elites. In a full range of ways, in which men's practices shape the gender order including economic relations, institutions, and sexuality. Understanding the background of gender formation, feminist felt "it is necessary to develop an understanding of gender power relations and this involves establishing against other things, the nature and form and purchase of hegemonic masculinity imperialism in global terms destroyed "indigenous gender regime" (Morrell, 612). Along with imperialism, colonialism undermined the position of women. It brought a system which "carried rigid gender ideologies which aided and supported the exclusion of women from the power hierarchy"(612). Thus, indigenous gender systems are evident.

The new wave of feminism and the sexual revolution placed a number of stresses and strains on men (Lemon: 62). The crisis of masculinity theory suggests

that men today, more than ever are confused about what it means to be a man, and are attempting to push beyond the rigid role prescriptions of traditional concept of masculinity. Jennifer Lemon, in her analysis of Brod observes:

> To be a man is to have a particular psychological identity, social role, place in the labor force, and sense of self. In industrial societies, 'real men' defined themselves in three ways: Firstly, they earned money in the public work force and supported their families through that effort (the man as provider and breadwinner), secondly, they (should) have had formal power over women and children in these families (the man as head of house). And finally, "real men" were unquestionably heterosexual (62).

Lemon's assertion of traditional concept of masculinity features some images or roles of men. To be a masculine figure one should have all these qualities. However, post-industrial societies disrupted such a definition of masculinity. They were heedlessly destructive of the individual jobs that men traditionally filled, and tended to generate lower-paying filled, service jobs that women frequently occupy. Moreover, post-industrial culture are extremely heterogeneous and tend to adopt the values of egalitarianism and the ideology of liberal individualism more readily. They are making space for greater freedom for women and offering a wider range of options regarding sexual preference and expression for both sexes. "A contradiction thus existed between the hegemonic male image (patriarchal ideology) and the real conditions of men's lives"(62).

Along with the 'sex radical feminist' as early as 1957, "the flight from masculinity" as seen in the alleged increase in homosexuality was a reflection of male sex-role conflict, and an index of the burdens of masculinity" (64). Indeed,

homosexuality has always been regarded as an indicator of insufficient or inadequate masculinity. According to R.W. Connell, "to many people, homosexuality is a negation of masculinity, and homosexual men must be effeminate" (736). Given that assumption, antagonism toward homosexual men may be used to define masculinity. The proposition that 'to be a man' in contemporary American society is to be homophobic–that is, to be hostile toward homosexual persons in general and gay men in particular. The resulting oppression of gay men provides symbol for all cases of hierarchy among men. "Homosexuality is not the sexual act itself but rather 'the homosexual mode of life' (641)". "Sedgwick, in the spirit of subversion, conceives of homosexuality as an open challenge to the normative sexual and gender order. Because the sexuality of homosexuals is marginal, their erotic practices are disruptive to the social order" (qtd in Green: 531). According to Green, hence, Bronski conceives of gay men as sexual outlaws: "Gay men have learned how to use our sexuality as a social marker, as a disruption of the social and sexual status quo, and as a way to make our presence felt in the world" (531). "Their homosexual masculinity simultaneously depends on and disrupts the existing gender order in ways that illuminate long-term possibilities of change in the structure of gender relations" (Connell: 735). In these cases, subversion of heterosexuality, gender identity and other regimes of the normal sexuality is thought to derived from homosexuality, with far reaching consequences for the social order. While some queer theorists make an effort to distinguish gay and queer, queer theorists more often treat queer as a subversive subject position that all homosexuals may claim for them-selves. For instance, "in the introduction to the seminal queer text, *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, Michael Warner equates "queer" with "homosexual" and situates lesbian and gay identities in opposition to "regimes of the normal" (qtd. in

Green: 533). Warner then goes on to argue that queer, by definition, implies an articulated, self conscious challenge to "regimes of the normal". "Warner's queer not only defies sexological classifications, but also exhibits an extraordinarily radical self-concept and a sweeping, synthetic political sensibility" (533). Thus, being queer means being able, more or less articulately, to challenge the common understanding of what gender difference means, or what the state is for, or what "health" entails, or what would define fairness, or what a good relation to the planet's environment would be. In effect, queer theorists scratch a homosexual and find a disruptive queer. While queer theorists are certainly right to suggest that homosexuals occupy a marginal location in the social order, social cleavages can hardly be captured by sexual dimensions alone. "Queer theory wishes to challenge the regime of sexuality itself-that is the knowledge that constructs the self as sexual and that assume heterosexuality and homosexuality as categories marking the truth of sexual selves"(533). Because of queer the normative form of masculinity was further put into crisis by challenging to its foundational concept of sexuality and sexual and gender ethics.

The study of gender and sexuality, in the later years, is more vibrant to the formation of masculinity. It examined the historical ideology of sex and gender and put some new consequences that are developed along with the passage of time. More assaults on dominant gender regimes came from gender butch art and performance, which might include drag kings, butch theatrical roles, or art featuring gender variant subjects. In an introduction of *Female Masculinity* (1998), Judith Halberstam suggests that "female masculinity to explore a queer subject position that can successfully challenge the hegemonic models of gender conformity" (9). Female masculinity has been situated as the place where patriarchy goes to work on the female psyche and

reproduced misogyny with femaleness. Halberstam coincides female masculinity with the excesses of male supremacy and a unique form of social rebellion and says that "female masculinity is the sign of sexual alterity, but occasionally it marks heterosexual variation: sometimes [. . .] the place of pathology" (9). Halberstam's such affirmations begins not by subverting masculine power or taking up a position against power but by turning a blind eye to conventional masculinities and refusing to engage. Gender ambiguous or gender deviant configurations are constantly challenged about their gender identity, and always producing alternative masculinities. Making a critique of "You are Just Like My Father", by Peggy Shaw (1995), Halberstam writes:

> Shaw constructs her own masculinity by reworking and improving the masculinities (and) observes all around her. Shaw moves easily back and forth between various personal: she is the fighter, the crooner, the soldier, the breadwinner, the Romeo, the patriarch. In each of these roles, she makes it clean that she is feminist bodied person inhabiting each role and that each role is part of her gender identity. (32)

Halberstam's analysis exposes a variety of masculine identifications that woman can acquire and become father and appropriate to maleness, therefore female masculinity is equivalent or exists parallel to male masculinity. Performing these roles, Shaw crossed the gender bound roles. Such crossing-gender performance is the contemporary modes of gender that tend to perform continuity between lesbian or transsexuality and cross-gender identification.

The types of gender variance are differentiated through the clothing. Clothing, indeed, becomes the means by which transsexual women/men cover their queerness and find a comfortable gender expression. "Clothing is [. . .] the way of making masculinity both real and potent, convincing and is either outward (in women's

clothes) or inadequate next to the "real" embodied masculinity of a man" (100).

Cross-dressing is a technique to abandon traditional stylistic acting conventions and gradually to liberate themselves from the convention of as well as the traditional ideology of gender difference encoded in its gestures and costuming. "The image of cross-dressed men in Hollywood-the standard plot of the transvestite man genre features a moral lesson in which we learn that men make better women than women do. However, when women appear crossed as men [. . .] are coded as flawed women rather than perfect men" (205). The genre of the transvestite woman demands careful attention because the various themes of gender theatricality, gender dysphoria, androgyny, and butch masquerade all produce very different narratives. Sometimes, cross-dressing produces an image of essential androgyny, and constructs the transvestite woman as a meeting of the sexes. In other, the male drag has become more than a costume, and the butch inside it has an erotic relation to her clothes and uses masculine clothing to complete her gender presentation. "Cross-dressing assumed female masculinity in relation to the notion of disguise" (206-7). The conventions of the cross-dressing genres is to place the female transvestite within it is the relation of the butch character to the cross-dressing narrative, which gives way to the hand realities of masculine identification. Caryl Churchill, for instance, has used the cross-dressing as a technique in her drama *Cloud Nine*(1970) to project the constructions of the "natural" order of things, and subverted the traditional masculine concept by asserting the female masculinity. Thus female masculinity is to explore a queer subject position through the cross-dressing technique that can successfully challenges hegemonic modes of gender conformity. "Whereas male masculinity all too often depends on the functionality of the penis and its ability literally to be phallic" (104), the masculine woman, on the other hand, "is not limited to the

unpredictable movements of phallic desire; she can "bear the subject's desire in a masculine mode" through an artificial phallus, in her fingers, through tribalism and so on." (104).

Feminism has complicated the multiple relations-biological and cultural, fleshly and abstract-between sex and gender and generally agreed that there is nothing "natural" about sex or gender, or body. The politics of using cross-dressing is, thus, to subvert the previous conceptions about sex gender and body. Expressing the modernist view, Halberstam says:

> Far from holding on to the notion that sex refers to one's biology, and gender to one's articulation, feminist theorist have tended to refer to the mutual construction of both biology and social construct does not in any way relieve the effects of that construction to the point where we can manipulate at will the terms of our gendering. (119)

"The construction between sex and gender serves the argument that whatever biologically intractability sex apparatus to have, gender is culturally constructed: hence neither the causal result of sex nor an seemingly fixed as sex" (Butler:1990, 9-10). But the feminist theorists claim that gender is the unity of the subject, and is cultural interpretation of gender and a multiple interpretation of sex. Thus, there is the existence of 'third gender' categories, or other confusing/ problematic genders. This gender is theorized in comparison to their sexuality and cultural practices, and binary opposition. According to Butler, "the lesbian" emerges as a third gender that promises to transcend the binary restriction on sex imposed by the system of compulsory heterosexuality" (26), and always on the way to sexual liberation. In this sense, the gender categories: gay/lesbian, homosexual, butch-femme, transvestite, transsexual, bisexual-all practice categorical sexuality. Therefore, the concept of "compulsory

heterosexuality" initiated by patriarchal normative masculinity is declining. Butler, in her *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the subversion of Identity*, believes that "a construction is not 'a kind of manipulable artifice' because the subject of gender neither produces nor follows the process of this gendering but emerges only within as the matrix of gender relations themselves" (qtd. in Halberstam: 119).

By these all means, the stereotypical version of gender, and sexuality, race and ethnicity defined by traditional masculinity is under elimination. The recently existed alternative masculinities developed a visible sense that the "white manhood has been marked as an unmarked location of power can be resignified with subversive and ever potentially revolutionary results" (181). They hint at an 'align logic of gender within which masculinity is as much a production of ethnicity as it is of gender and sexuality, is attaching its unorthodox gender performance with a pervasively alien identity.

III. Masculinity in Crisis: A Textual Interpretation of *Cloud Nine* and *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*

One of the most striking aspects of *Cloud Nine* is the pattern with which Clive, the colonial administrator, feels the crisis in his masculinity. Moreover, he is the colonial agent always on the way to extend the colonial occupation through which he constructs the hegemonic masculinity and dominates other masculinities. In course of time, as drama moves, more energy comes from the gay and lesbian subcultures, nuclearization of family structures as well as the affirmation of independency, and the decolonization that push the traditional concept of an essential masculinity fall away and new constructions of gender and sexuality replace them. Thus, to form the new gender and sexual identity, Churchill dismantles the already established orders of the hegemonic discourses through her characters and strikes the ideals of the normative masculinity that relies heavily on them.

Cloud Nine is especially concerned with sexual identity- how culturally imposed role definitions can easily be mistaken as, or replace actual personality. Giving a historical view to these issues, Churchill sets the first act in an English colony in Africa in 1880, and presents the serene life of a Victorian English family who consider duty to their queen and the reason for living. Through the song sung by all family members including a black servant, Joshua announces their presence.

> Come gather, sons of England, come gather in your Pride.
>
> Now meet the world united, now face it side by side;
>
> From bush and jungle muster all who call old England "home".
>
> Then gather round for England,
>
> Rally to the flag,
>
> From North and South and East and West

Come gather and all for England! (Worthen: I.I.1-9)

This anthem is about the white supremacy that places the idea that only the "Sons" or men can join in their colonial mission that is spreading throughout the earth from East to West and North to South. The phrase "Sons of England" clearly exposes the patriarchy and the notion of nationalization related to it. What they call "pride" is the British Masculinity through which they established imperialism by which gender, sexual and racial domination became possible. Thus, this song initiates the constructions of masculinity of British people. Being a colonial administrator, Clive controls all family members and imposes the ideals of British masculinity on them. In his opening statement, Clive introduces his family members and clarifies his position. "This is my family. Though far from home/ We serve the Queen wherever we may roam/ I am a father to the natives here, / And father to my family so dear" (I.I.10-13).

This statement expresses not only a multiple oppressive structure, but also the interrelation between the colonization of Africa and that of white woman and children within the patriarchal structure. The social order constructed at that time reveals itself White in its dominant racial ideology; masculinist in its dominant gender ideology, and heterosexual in its dominant sexual ideology. Clive's introduction to his family members- Betty, his wife (played by a man); Joshua, a black servant (played by a white man); and Edward, his young son (played by a young woman) exposes his dominant position. Clive says "My wife is all I dreamt a wife should be/ And everything she is she owes to me" (I.I.13-14). In response Betty says "I live for Clive. The whole aim of my life/ Is to what he looks for in a wife/ I am a man's creation as you see/ And what men want is what I want to be" (I.I.15-18). Betty's subordination of female identity as well as sexuality reinforces the construction of hegemonic masculinity. The oppressed identity also shows that women are normalized in a

colonial setting. Betty is not what she wants to be but what men desire. The attributes of wife is also controlled by patriarchy. She is a man's creation means man is god like and she is "Eve", always sinner.

`   The introduction of Joshua presents the political as well as racial construction of masculinity. It means the construction is done always in association with other. Clive's portrayal of Joshua as, "My boy's a jewel. Really has the knack. / You hardly notice that the fellow's black" (I.I.19-20), means fully controlled by white. The racially black is anglicized and it is very hard to notice that. Joshua is shown psychophant of Clive and expresses his opinion about himself and his tribe- "My skin is black but oh my soul is white./ I hate my tribe. My master is my light. / I only live for him. As you can see./ what white men want is what I want to be" (I.I.21-2). Joshua's expression exposes an oppressive structure as well as the influence of hegemonic masculinity upon him. He hates his own tribe because of aggressive masculinity of white man who hated black and other tribe at the colonial period. Whatever Joshua acknowledged is the representation of white's discourse that white is master and black is slave. So, being a slave, Joshua agrees with his working / slave masculinity and performs according to his masculine roles.

The introduction of Edward presents the final facts of social construction portrayed in the play- the colonization of children by a patriarchal family structure that seeks to script onto their bodies a "natural" bipolar gender identity and a natural heterosexual disposition. As a figure of patriarchy Clive wants his son to be as his choice. In his understanding "My son is young. I'm doing all I can/ To teach him to grow up to be a man" (I.I.25-6). Therefore, the colonial occupation functions as a space for the cultivation of the white/men ideal subject. It is the responsibility of Clive to accumulate all masculine traits onto Edward and inherit it through. For that

Clive marks some demarcation lines- such as "dolls are for girls", "don't be like a baby" (I.2.93) etc.

All these evidences account that the construction of masculinity is the historical, cultural and social phenomena. Historically what the demarcation put as the guiding principles among the social groups initiate an ideological practice. The beginning of new of practices associated to sex and the play of sex role is considered as gender. Thus, gender is the sexual performance.

Masculinity is associated only with the male gender and its features. The masculinity is constructed always in opposition. It always under estimates or devalues by othering. Clive, in his introduction Victoria (who is dummy), Maud and Ellen says- "No need for any speeches by the rest/My daughter, mother-in-law, and governess" (I.I.29-30).

With controlling voice, Clive forms a contemporary kind of male identity. He embodies patriarchal attitudes that oppress both women and black. His call for Betty "my little dove", "you are so delicate and sensitive", "madam does not like that kind of joke" (but poetry), and his questions about Betty's situation "so today has been all right? No fainting? No hysteria?" explicitly indicates the suppression of female identity and sexuality. In an analysis, Kimberly Gordon exposes the portrayal of Betty as:

> Churchill employs the character Betty to illustrate the subordinate role of the woman in a male dominated world. This 'subordination' is addressed by the character's desire for something more, her views on marriage, her ingrained, warped perception that a woman must be "bad" in order to be happy, and the punishment she faces if she dares to disobey men's guidelines. (Worthen, 952)

Gordon's words suggest that "Churchill portrays women as 'stuck' and unsatisfied" (952). To be happy a woman should give adherence to these man-made molds that force her own desires into a trap. A woman can not do whatever she likes because women and their position have been predefined by their male counterparts. On the other hand, men can not easily understand woman through their cocked eye. Clive's saying of Mrs. Saunders as an "amazing spirit" (I.I.261) signifies what is woman for him. In a discussion between Clive and Harry, both agree that there is "not a word to alarm the women" (I.I.322) and "they are affectionate people. They can be very cruel of course" (I.I.326) and "They are savages" (I.I.328). Therefore, in men's understanding women are 'spirit', 'dull', 'emotional' and 'savages'. These traits are only associated with femininity; and what masculinity is to opposite to or different to femininity.

A man always understands the manly features in terms of other men's practices. "Caryl Churchill introduces [. . .] the concept that men "understand" their role as men and their individual responsibility to manliness through a vague sense of learned or patterned behavior established by another male views as "successfully" masculine" (Barber, 242). On the textual level, for example, Clive explains the manly duty of his son Edward as: "You should always respect and love me, Edward, not for myself, I may not deserve it, but as I respected and loved my father, because he was my father. Through our father we love our queen and our God, Edward, do you understand? It is something men understand" (I.3.115-20).

The concept of 'it is something men understand' is a symbolic representation of manliness. Clive is proposing that Edward should respect his father because of their blood relationship and the historic notion created by previous notion. However, his focus is on the power hidden beneath this litany of masculine values, which supports

any instructed position. "It is something men understand" is, on the other hand, associated with the rationality, intellectuality, activeness of men.

The masculine sensibility is affirmed by understanding something. "If a male does not understand, he is not a man" (242). In this sense, understanding is the masculine code that should be acknowledged. According to Barber "to the male, the masculine is an area as undiscovered as any other wilderness, yet every traveler must display a façade indicating that he knows the terrain in" (242). Every child is the traveler should explore the masculine traits to accompany maleness. Understanding this Clive envelops masculinity in a traditional sense of duty. It is the rigidity of duty and his ability to function within duty's confinement that gives him security in his own manliness. "Let me handle this" (I.I.135), "Let me tell you something first" (I.II.15), "It was my duty to love them flogged, for you and Edward and Victoria, to keep you safe". The assertion of this dialogue typifies Clive's emotional and physical strength of the privileged maleness and manifests his dominance over any other who does not understand maleness. For him, masculinity is the responsibility of a male that one should perform in his family/household.

Offering repeated maxims to his son, Clive provides a framework that enables the boy to reconcile his own understood notions and validate his own masculinity within the vague parameter established by his father. To form a masculine attribute, Clive tells Edward –"A boy has no business having feelings, you spend too much time with the women. You may spend more time with me and Uncle Harry, little man; and there is a disease more dangerous than diphtheria. Effeminacy is contagious" (564). Such regular teaching must practise Edward to acquire masculinity in him or little is necessarily understood by the son. But the maxims provide a feeble boundary system within which he can practice and gain conference in his manliness. By this effect,

Edward accuses Joshua, the Black native, of stealing his mother's necklace when he

has actually taken (not stolen) it from his mother in order to give it to Harry Bagley.

The formation of masculinity is not only developed in Edward but Joshua is also

practising it. It is because both are continually associated with the master-narrative of

white masculinity.

> BETTY. Joshua, fetch me some blue thread from my swing box. It is
>
>   on the piano.
>
> JOSHUA. You have got legs under that skirt.
>
> BETTY. Joshua.
>
> JOSHUA. And more than legs.
>
> BETTY. Edward, are you going to stand there and let a servant insult
>
>   your mother?
>
> EDWARD. Joshua, get my mother's thread.
>
> JOSHUA. Oh little Eddy, playing at master. It is only a joke.
>
> EDWARD. Don't speak to my mother like that again.
>
> JOSHUA. Ladies have no sense of humor. You like a joke with
>
>   Joshua.
>
> EDWARD. You fetch the sewing at once, do you hear me? You move
>
>   when I speak to you, boy.
>
> JOSHUA. Yes sir. Master Edward sir. (1.3.180-94)

Here, Joshua seeks to disrupt the fundamental assumptions of hierarchical racial

orders. He, on the other hand, underestimates women saying "ladies have no sense of

humor", and "oh little Eddy" to Edward in order to construct black/slave masculinity.

In this sense, black masculinity does exist by circulating power over women and small

children. Though the normative masculinity of Edward instantly suppresses such

minor masculinity. "You move when I speak to you, boy" denotes the violent reaction against the Joshua's word politics 'joke'. By this incident, it is very clear that "there are different kinds of masculinity are manifest; working-class, bourgeois or intellectual masculinity may be quite different to cow boy-masculinity; Japanese masculinity may be different to European or Indian masculinity; hegemonic masculinity to marginalized masculinity" (Bhasin, 6).

Cloud Nine, "a play set substantially in colonial Africa, to represent the plight of all women in a manner comparative to the way men were historically generalized to represent all humanity" (Amoko, 46). The portrayal of Harry Bagley, called an "explorer" but what he had explored and what adventurous he did is not quite that like. But he claims that he can acknowledge psyche of women. He said "they (women) are affectionate people. They can be very cruel of course" (562), "very beautiful people many of them" (562). The explorer finds the double standard of women that affectionate and cruel. As a colonial agent, what knowledge Harry gathered is out of his experiences of expedition. "Built a raft and went up the river. Stayed with some people. The king is always very good to me. They have a lot of skulls around the place but not white men's I think. I made up a poem one night. If I should die in this forsaken spot, there is a loving heart without a blot, where I will live and so on" (1.1.353-58).

The short narrative of Bagley to Betty reinforces the physical attributes as well as masculine attitude of Victorian men. When he went to voyage, he tackled with different tribal people and also met king who became very good to him because he was a white colonial agent. The king had a lot of skulls means he got victory over other, and "But not white men's" initiates that the king had not conquered white men's territory. Harry's statement reserves white hegemonic masculinity is something

extraordinary type. If he had to die that sort of forsaken land, this may not saturate the land, but the land where he or his kinship will live. In short, masculinity is formed throughout the history by acquiring the qualities like strength, assertiveness, fearlessness, independence, authoritarianism and ambition. Power controls over others and leadership are considered important.

Caryl Churchill in first act of *Cloud Nine* institutionalizes masculinity as the dominant mode of patriarchy, developed in colonial period, and the traditional male has treated it as the norm of mankind and consequently failed to recognize masculinity as problematic. However, the gradually developed mode of sexuality, employment opportunity, post-industrial societies and culture, and institutions in the second act disrupt such a definition of masculinity. Clive's understanding of sexuality is compulsorily heterosexuality. Despite that Clive's ideal/Victorian ideal of male/female sexuality was different. Men can have sex with many women but women are counted as prostitute or something effeminate.

On the level of sexuality, Clive exposes he is masculine, can play active sexual role and controls female through it. His affair with the local widow indicates his sexuality.

> CLIVE. Since you came to the house I have had an erection twenty-
>   four hours a day except for ten minutes after the time we had
>   intercourse.
> MRS. SAUNDERS. I don't think that's physically possible
> CLIVE. You are causing me appalling physical suffering. Is this the
>   way to treat a benefactor? (I.2.15-20)

Within this dialogue, Clive wants to expose his virility to Mrs. Saunders but she does not believe it. It is also unbelievable that such virile man can have only ten minutes

sex. Mrs. Saunders' independent answer highlights the impotent sex role of Clive. Clive again proves his submissiveness:

> Caroline, if you were shot with poisoned arrows do you know what I do? I'd fuck your dead body and poison myself. Caroline, you smell amazing. You terrify me .You are dark like this continent. Mysterious. Treacherous. When you ride to me through the night. When you fainted in my arms. When I came to you in your bed, when I lifted the mosquito netting, when I said let me in.
>
> Oh don't shut me out, Caroline, let me in. (I.2.37-44)

Through this saying Clive is willing to prove his virile masculinity. His emotional and sensational view upon Mrs. Caroline indicates that he is emotional and sexually submissive. His violent effort to persuade her to participate in sensational enjoyment 'terrifies him'. "You will be raped by cannibals" (I.2.9) somehow lead her to accompany Clive. Displaying insecure life Clive is manipulating Mrs. Saunders. Her double dimensional views upon Clive terrify him. Showing his aggressive masculinity Clive scolds "you are dark like this continent", "mysterious", "treacherous". This means he has to explore the inner reality of Mrs. Saunders, or captures her geography. The mystery should be revealed and teach her to make civilized, straightforward and clear. But he is unable to do what she is intending. Indeed, what Saunders likes to say to Clive that "I want to go home. I wish I didn't enjoy the sensation because I don't like you, Clive. I do like living in your house where there's plenty of guns. But I don't like you at all. But I do like the sensation" (I.2.45-49). The reality of Mrs. Saunders is that she wants either some security in Clive's house or she wants to have sex with men. The articulation "gun" symbolizes both security, and penis. But she does not like Clive because he does not use gun. Once, "he has been caressing her feet and

legs. He disappears completely under her skirt". After sometimes he comes out from under her skirt and says "I am all sticky", "Caroline, you are voracious. Do let go. Tidy yourself up. There's hair in my mouth" (I.2.56-57). Being so hot and humid, Clive wants to leave Mrs. Saunders –"do let go"-that signifies the impotency in his sexuality. So, with the weaknesses in sexuality his masculinity is problematic.

The masculine role of husband for Clive is also affirmed through his understanding of duty. The duty is one of authority over the wife and overseer of the service to her husband. He speaks his wife as "all I dreamt a wife should be" and has selected a woman who serves his desires and ignores her own. Clive is repeatedly lecherous, yet he condemns his wife for kissing for another man, explaining to her:

> CLIVE: Women can be treacherous and evil. They are darker and more dangerous than men. The family protects us from that. You protect me from that. You are not that sort of woman. [. . .] If Harry Bagley was not my friend I would shoot him. If I shot him you every British man and woman would applaud me. But no. It was a moment of passion such as women are too weak to resist [. . .] we must resist this dark female lust. Betty, or it will swallow us up. (I.3.154-70)

Clive has little genuine affection for his wife. For him, the duty that binds the woman to the man does not similarly apply to the man in relation to the woman. Among the responsibilities to govern, to seek adventures, and to pursue intellectual growth, sexual release is another privilege of a man's life. "Clive is mesmerized by the nobility of man. The blatant hypocrisy of his life is not visible to him because he is following the pattern he learned and understood" (243). Now he can not fight against because he fears from female sexuality. His emphasis must resist this dark female lust is the greatest enemy of his masculinity. If he could not resist against it will swallow

up or destroy his traditional notion of masculinity.

To fight against 'dark female lust', Clive goes and offers an insight to his friend Harry, the recipient of Clive's wife's kiss. Clive does not undertake Harry as gay male but only his affair with his wife, and thinks him as his friend.

> CLIVE: I know the friendship between us, Harry, is not something that could be spoiled by the weaker sex. Friendship between men is a fine thing. It is the noblest form of relationship [Although] there is the necessity of reproduction. The family is all important. And there is the pleasure. But what we put ourselves through to get the pleasure. Harry, when I heard about our fine fellows last night fighting those savages to protect us I thought yes, that is what I aspire to. I tell you Harry, in confidence, I suddenly got out of Mrs. Saunders's bed and came out here on the verandah and looked at the stars. (I.4.95-107)

Clive hopes it is very important to keep the friendship alive. For that Harry must have his own family where he can get pleasure and there is no need of kisses from Betty. Applying this idea he can save his family. "But it is Harry Bagley, the explorer, who, on hearing Clive's speech about the noble nature of manly friendship, attempts to embrace Clive in a gesture of homosexual attraction" (243-44). His own understanding of Clive's masculinity seems remarkably clear, but Harry's action destroys Clive's respect for Harry and leaves him shattered.

> CLIVE. What are you doing?
>
> HARRY. Well. You said-
>
> CLIVE. I said what?
>
> HARRY. Between men. I'm sorry. I misunderstood. I would never
>
>   have dreamt, I thought-

CLIVE. My God, Harry. How disgusting.

HARRY. You will not betray my confidence. (I.4.117-124)

Harry, the family friend and virile explorer who has already enjoyed relations with Clive's effeminate young son, Edward, as well as with the servant, Joshua [. . .] even makes a pass at Clive" (Soloman: 117). Within this dialogue, Harry admits to another man his own misunderstanding of his masculine duty. He does no more than act out of his own understanding, yet his judgment was incorrect, and deprivation of his male sex-role results because Harry has deviated from the elusive norm. Harry's response to Clive's reaction is to ask for secrecy in hiding the truth. He does not understand Clive's satisfaction, what it is to be a man. Clive notices Harry's gay sexuality as a threat to hegemonic masculinity. He wants to prevent Harry from the homosexual acting because his act may save his ideals of manliness. He has convinced Harry to marry to avoid scandal. His choices for Harry's suit Ellen (the lesbian governess) and the wedding party is the victory of masculinity. In this wedding party, Clive says "Dangers are past, our enemies are killed- put your arm around her, Harry, have a kiss- all murmuring of discontent is stilled" (I.5.78-81). Here, Clive is initiating heterosexuality upon Harry's homosexuality. "Clive's toast is consistent with his understanding of masculinity. By securing Harry in a hand of marriage, Clive believes that dangers are past because a weakness in Harry's masculinity has been repaired" (244). For Clive it is perfectly acceptable to practice a masculinity that stems from shared understanding and patterned examples.

Toward the end of the first act of *Cloud Nine*, Clive gets some attack upon his conception of masculinity. Edward's involvement in the homosexual activities and his wife Betty's secret relationship with Ellen pushes Clive near to the cradle of the crisis of masculinity. Moreover, his servant Joshua raises his gun to shoot Clive also

threatens the colonial occupation of the white hegemonic masculinity.

The second act of the play is set in London in 1979. Some dramatic techniques have been applying to project the vibrant development of crisis tendency. It is the time of changing sexuality. Betty is middle-aged; Edward and Victoria have grown up. A hundred years have passed, but the characters only twenty-five years. It is because the first act would be stronger set in Victorian times, at the height of colonialism, rather than in Africa during the 1950s. At that time people talked about their childhoods and the attitudes to sex and marriage that they had been given when they were young, every one felt that had recovered very conventional, almost Victorian expectation and then they had made great changes and discoveries in their lifetime.

The first act is male dominated and firmly structured. But "in the second act, more energy comes from the women and the gays. The uncertainties and changes of society, and a more feminine and less authoritarian feeling (of men) are reflected in the looser structure of the act" (537). Betty, Edward and Victoria all change from the rigid position. They had been left in the first act partly because of their encounters with Garry and Lin. "In this dramatically liberated social and psychological environment, sexual roles have become more flexible; homosexuality is accepted" (118). But, homosexuality has always been regarded as an indicator of insufficient or inadequate masculinity. Many heterosexual men regarded the increasing visibility of homosexuality as a threat to hegemonic masculinity. The increasing homosexuality or lesbianism of Lin, Victoria, Betty, Edward, and Gerry search the sexual identity and blur the hegemonic conception of masculinity. The intimacy between Betty and Ellen, in act one was unacceptable. As the dramatic situation develops, Betty asks Ellen to get another place, and get married. But in response Ellen says:

I don't want a husband, I want you. [. . .] I don't want children. I just

want to be alone with you, Betty, and sing for you and kiss you

because I love you, Betty.[. . .] I love you so much. I want to stay with

you forever, my love for you is eternal, stronger than death. I'd rather

die than leave you Betty. (I.4.72-81)

Ellen does not agree with Betty because she is a lesbian. She can love Betty "stronger than death" and her love is eternal. Ellen believes that her living will be very problematic if she got married. It is because whatever she wants in her life will be controlled, and she does not want a husband. The ultimate enjoyment Ellen finds only in lesbianism, with Betty. "Betty has been taught to understand the protection she receives by conforming to society's ideals, and reproduces those ideals in her own relationships with other woman" (Gordon: 954). It was explicitly Betty's politics to remain unstigmatized in the patriarchal society. But later Betty reminds her friends that "she is not getting married to enjoy herself" rather to Clive. Actually she gets enjoyment when Ellen is near to her and without hegitation or ambiguity embrace and kisses her. Betty neither questions nor directly addresses the potential meaning behind the kiss. Thus, Ellen's unwillingness to get husband and Betty's silence at Ellen's lesbian activities suggests they are willing something without men's presence. This is the initial progress in the formation of female subjectivity and identity.

The portrayal of Cathy, the small child of lesbian Lin, sings bawdy version of nursery rhymes. She is shown so tactful and played by a man because she is learning proper male behavior. For example, Cathy carries in with gun, shoots them saying kiou kiou kiou, and runs off. Lin practise her "Don't hit him, Cathy, kill him. Point the gun, kiou, kiou, kiou. That's the way" (II.1.75-76). Lin's "kill him" clarifies her anger toward male and intimacy toward female partner. Lin identifies herself saying "I'm a

lesbian"(II.1.87) and "I hate men" (II.1.105). Thus, Cathy is upbringing as a tomboy with a natural desire for greater freedom and mobility. Though Betty has left her husband two years ago she is very grateful to her husband because he left her Cathy. Although, Victoria, Lin's lesbian friend, has not left her husband. Victoria says "he helps with the washing up and everything". Now, it is very clear that male characters are not performing the conventional masculine roles. Such crisis of male roles began when homosexual lifestyle is initiated by feminist and that of gay people. It created a psychological imbalance and that developed many consequences through which men led their way of life. Because of that men neglect the masculine roles or they could not debate over the gender and sexual roles of human being. No any fundamental principles of hegemonic masculinity are applicable because of the rebirth of feminism and women's liberation movement. Victoria's husband Martin, as a pro-feminist, supports women's liberation movement in order to acquire his eliminating masculine power.

> MARTIN: I do know that women have to learn to get their pleasure
> despite our clumsy attempts at expressing undying devotion and
> ecstasy, and that what we spent our adolescence thinking was an
> animal urge we had to suppress is in fact a fine art we have to acquire.
> I'm not like whatever percentages of American men have become
> impotent as a direct result of women's liberation, which I am totally in
> favor of, more I sometimes think than you are yourself. (2.2.148-55)

Martin's analysis worth that despite all his efforts Lin is still feeling dominated by him. And he thinks she is not able to take job because women have to learn something means the society's norms and values to get their pleasure. Martin is not like the category of American men who have became impotent as a direct result of women's

liberation. But, Victoria's inner intention of taking a job and going to Manchester to get individual freedom quakes the masculine empire of Martin. Martin's response exposes his attitude:

> MARTIN : You are the one who's talked about freedom. You are the one who's experimenting with bisexuality, and I don't stop you, I think women have something to give each other. You seem to need the mutual support. You find me too overwhelming. So follow it through, go away, leave me and Tommy I'm not putting any pressure on you but I don't think you're being whole person. God knows I do everything I can to make you on your own two feet. Just be yourself. You don't seem to realize how insulting it is to me that you can't get yourself together. (2.2.164-75)

As a pro-feminist, Martin supports Victoria's desire for her individual freedom, sexual identity; and now he can not impose the myth of masculinity upon her and can not control her. So, he let her to go wherever she wants to go and whatever she likes to do. "God knows", not Martin, what the situation will develop in the future, means Martin can not understand the situation because some attributes of his masculinity is under crisis.

Throughout the colonial occupation, heterosexism was considered as a safeguarding form of sexuality deemed noble white marginalizing and stigmatizing homosexuality. The operation of heterosexism lead people to believe that the expression of heterosexuality is right, just, and natural while all other forms of sexuality are immoral, unhealthy or inferior. The perpetual frameworks of gay/lesbian identities or homosexuality were considered as notions of social deviance. But now

these are taken as the mode of lifestyle. Victoria, Lin, Edward are such type.

With the continuous reinforcement of masculine traits upon Edward and his spending of more time with Uncle Harry ultimately led him to the way of homosexual lifestyle. "In act I, Edward continues to play the "effeminate" part by playing the role of the "wife" in the live-in relationship with first, his lover Garry (who occasionally prefers anonymous sex) and then with his sister Victoria and Lin" (Herrmann: 151). Now Edward behaves like a woman in the household. He fully involves in household activities, performs like 'wife' of Gerry.

> EDWARD. I have got some fish for dinner. I thought I'd make a
>
> cheese sauce. [. . .] What time will you be back? We'll eat then.
>
> GERRY. You are getting like a wife.
>
> EDWARD. I don't mind that.
>
> GERRY. Why don't I do the cooking sometimes?
>
> EDWARD. You can if you like. You're just not so good at it that's all.
>
> Do it tonight. (2.2.348-59)

Edward is performing as an active feminine role. Gerry's saying "you are getting like a wife" and his response "I don't mind that" clarifies that he earnestly wants to act as the wife-cooking, eating together etc. He is doing such job because he does like to do. "Everyone's always tried to stop me being feminine and now you are too" (II.2.365-66), he blames Gerry for not supporting him. So, Edward assumes Gerry as a husband and he is his wife.

> EDWARD: I like doing the cooking. I like being fucked.
>
> GERRY: I'm bored, Eddy.
>
> EDWARD: Go to the sauna.
>
> GERRY: And you'll stay home and wait up for me

> EDWARD: No. I'll go to bed and read a book.
>
> GERRY: Or knit, you could knit me a pair of socks.
>
> EDWARD: I might knit. I like knitting.
>
> GERRY: I don't mind if you knit. I don't want to be married. [. . .]
>
>   well I'd divorcing you.
>
> EDWARD: I do.[. . .] I wouldn't want to keep a man who wants his
>
>   freedom. (II.2.368-80)

A man's like to do cooking, knitting, and being fucked explicitly accounts the crisis of his masculinity. Bearing all these attributes Edward is playing feminine roles. More than that, his indulgence into the homosexual activities shows that he is an effeminate man. Whatever the masculine traits were taught in act one completely under erasure. It means the hegemonic masculinity that emerged from the colonial Victorian era has been under elimination. Now Edward is forming his own sexual identity is shattered when Gerry does not agree to marry him. Unlike the gay lifestyle, Edward also gives the possibility of lesbianism because he does not want to keep a man who wants his freedom. Gerry also escapes from Edward because he is a gay man, and such feminine roles of Edward would give him the presence of a female. Therefore, Gerry requests Edward "do stop playing the injured wife, it's not funny" (II.2.381) and "I'm not the husband so you can't be the wife" (II.2.383). Though his gay-male sex act, Gerry does not like to be a husband because he can not perform the masculine role of a husband. But, he likes to participate in gay sexuality. 'Husband' and 'wife' involves a role that necessarily must be performed within the family unit.

     After Gerry's leave Edward enters into the world of lesbianism. This means the gender identity is not stable.

> EDWARD. I like a woman.

VICTORIA. That should please mother.

EDWARD. No listen Vicky, I'd rather be a woman. I wish I had breast

   like that, I think they're beautiful. Can I touch them?

VICTORIA. What pretending they're yours?

EDWARD. No, I know it's you.

VICTORIA. I think I should warn you I'm enjoying this.

EDWARD. I'm sick of men.

VICTORIA. I'm sick of men.

EDWARD. I think I'm a lesbian. (II.3.395-405)

The acceptance of gay male and lesbian desire perpetuates illusionary notion of gender and sexuality. "I'm a lesbian" projects Edward's biological presence, on the other side, his acceptance as a gay in first scene of Act II "don't go around saying that- I might loss my job" indicates his presence as a transvestite as Harry. He says "I am born crippled". Such transvestite type of gender and its inauguration of sexuality according to Butler is gender trouble. Butler explores the real gender script as:

> [. . .] gender is in no way a stale identity of locos of agency from which
>
> various acts proceed; rather it is an identity tenuously instituted
>
> through time- an identity instituted through a stylized repetition of acts.
>
> Further, gender is instituted through the stylization of the body and,
>
> hence must be understand as the mundane way in which bodily
>
> gestures, movements, and enactments of various kinds constitutes the
>
> allusion of an abiding gendered self. (qtd. in Amoko: 50)

Butler's conception of gender affirms cultural as well as societal practices. It is the practice of bodily gestures, movements and enactments of various kinds that constitutes with the cultural fictions whose reproduction gives its identity. So, there

may have different kind of gender identity. "Butler makes a firm distinction between "sex as biological facticity and gender as the cultural interpretation or signification of that facticity", even as she contests the given-ness of sex as a natural fact" (50). Thus, in Butler's argument the system of compulsory heterosexuality, that Clive asserts as the notion of hegemonic masculinity and controls other through it, is based on a notion of opposing "natural" sexes with "natural" attraction of each other.

As a natural order, anyone can play with dolls, act as bodily comportment, flagging, speaking etc. Such pressure gender conformity onto all boys/girls upholds the notion that male femininity/female masculinity presents a greater threat to social and familial stability. Edward's male femininity as well as his gay and lesbian sexuality represents the gender ambiguity. Edward is not that gender as Clive thinks but a different one. His feminine and ambiguous gender and sexual roles crumbles the masculine empire of Clive. Churchill's portrayal of Edward as a male character is not performing as he should have to do, and be. Edward could not set himself into the framework of conventional masculinity; therefore there are the crises of manhood and the male dominated society.

After Edward's involvement into the lesbian community, Betty, the wife of the primary patriarchal figure, leaves her husband, seeks and finds employment and starts to define herself as her own person. As she begins to disregard her conventional definitions of the role of wife and mother, she is able to escape her self implemented boundaries. Betty comes to realization. "You appreciate the weekend when you are working. [. . .] And the money, I feel like a child with the money, Clive always paid everything but I so understand it perfectly well" (II.4.28-33). She enjoys work and the strength derived from the ability to support her. Therefore, no women characters economically depending upon other. Betty needs no economic or sexual support of

Clive. Her new self possession is complemented by her discovery of her sexuality at the end of the performance she confides:

> BETTY: I used to think Clive was this one who liked sex. I used to touch myself when I was very little.[. . .] I touched my face, it was there, my arm, my breast, and my hand went where I thought it shouldn't. It felt very sweet, it was a feeling from very long ago, it was very soft, just barely touching, [. . .] I felt angry with Clive and angry with my mother and I went on and on defying them.[. . .] Afterwards I thought I'd betrayed Clive. My mother would kill me. And I cried because I didn't want to be. But I don't cry any more. Sometimes I do it three times in one night and it really is great fun. (II.4.115-40)

As a financially independent, Betty defies support from Clive because she realized that she can console herself with masturbation. There is no need of masculine and virile men to console her sexual desire. So, she says "I live by myself just now" (II.4.216).

Betty, on the other hand, knows that Edward is gay and he also does sleep with women. At the end, Betty says "Well people always say it's the mother's fault but I don't intend to start blaming myself. He seems perfectly happy" (II.4.255-56). It seems that Betty is perfectly a postmodern mother- she does not bother the distinct identity and lifestyle of other. She does not impose her ideals upon them as Clive used to do. Thus, in her opinion everyone can get optimism, freedom and happiness on the lap of femininity, therefore, Betty from act one comes and Betty and Betty embrace.

The subversion of traditional concept of masculinity is apparent through the cross-dressing and role-doubling technique of Churchill. One of the most important aspects of cross-dressing is to challenge the categories of gender, race, and sexuality

whether they are considered or constructed, biological or cultural. Cross-dressing is about gender and sex confusion because it is commonly an act of wearing clothing associated with another gender. Cross-dressing not only subverts the traditional categories of gender and sexuality but also creates the possibility of other gender identity. The gay/lesbian, homosexual, drag king/queen, transgender/transsexual / transvestite and other types are the possible gender identity that can be performed through this technique.

Masculinity is one category of gender. Throughout the history, it is considered one single, coherent, and unique category associated with men, or it is manly attribute. But, the use of cross-dressing hides such gender/masculine identity in this drama. Thus, the concept of masculinity is under crisis through the technical perspectives of the drama.

Another drama that explores the challenges to the notion of normative masculinity, as Churchill's *Cloud Nine* has done, is Tomson Highway's *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*. The configuration of masculinity and homo-social relationships in Highway's drama gives a particular attention to the homosexual subtext and the extent to which this subtext subverts conventional gender/masculine roles. The main consideration of this rereading is to understand shifting gender roles and same sex-desire of Native American (Canadian) people. "Gender roles and sexual practices vary across cultures" (Billingham: 358). Despite the colonial imposition of legal and social institution, it is inadvisable to assume that Native constructs of gender and sexuality are completely identical with western ones. Thus, the "traces of practices known as berdache [historically, roughly, people inhabiting a "third gender"], as well as the notion of the two-spirit more recently adopted, must be taken into account alongside gay or queer politics and subjectivity" (359).

The opening scene of *Dry Lips* projects the passive life of male characters. The set is shabby and messy living room/kitchen of the reserve house Big Joy and Nataways currently sharing. A lifestyle pin up poster of Marilyn Monroe is displayed on the wall. "Monroe was marked as the archetype of white, blonde femininity, synonymous with sensuality and available sexuality" (369). Zachary Jeremiah Keechigeesik, a very handsome Indian man, is shown naked and watching television. The background sound of hockey game on the television makes it musical. Nanabush as the spirit of Gazalle Nataways is dressing to leave for hockey. Other men characters- Big Joey, Creature Nataways enter carrying a case of beer, and Dickie Bird Halked also comes together. The setting projects the play is going to dramatize the Native Canadian issues from the colonial era to the post-colonial time. Women are preparing for hockey league but men characters are hanging around by drinking beer and condemning their women for adopting masculine game 'hockey'. Creature, banging the beer case down, exposes his distress. "Batman oughta move to Kapuskasing [. . .] the way he went to and crossed the blue line with the puck [. . .] in front of that blick shit house of a Whiteman to be there . . ."(1.6-16). Zachary, on the other hand says "women playing hockey . . . damn silliest thing I heard in my life" (1.25-26).

The distress of these Native men emphasizes two way of meaning. At first, Creature condemns Batman Manitowabi for 'crossing the blue line with the puck' means he is mimicking white cultures, and neglecting Native one. It emphasizes Creature's a far cry for his Nativity. On the other hand, Zachary's distress upon women indicates their possible strength of playing hockey as white men did. White men, therefore, not only formed the white masculinity through their military power but through language, cultures, game, religion and economy. Women's participation

in hockey league, in Zachary's view, is the colonized notion.

The participation of women and girls in sport challenges gender and sexual stereotypes and discrimination, and can therefore be a vehicle to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls. "The sport arena provides an opportunity to reach out to men and boys on issues related to stereotypical attitudes and gender based discrimination and violence" (United Nations: 6).

A common social construct is the stereotyping of sport as "masculine" or "feminine", which affects both male and female participation, and can be difficult to overcome. Men can be branded as 'effeminate' if they abstain from sporting activities and women are often challenged into "aesthetic" sports, such as gymnastic, and ice-skating where traits perceived as "female" are exhibited. Accepted norms and behavior that expect women to be "lady like" and demure excludes women in some context from participation in sporting activities that exhibit traditional male characteristics, especially contract sport (rugby) and painful sport (boxing) .When women and girls do engage with negative traits, such as being 'manly' or 'unfeminine'. For example, a recent film, *Thin Ice* documents the efforts of women and girls in the Himalayas to play Ice Hockey.

> Since Ice hockey was a traditionally a male sport, women and girls were not encouraged to participate. Women created their own women's Ice Hockey team which brings together the girls from different group and backgrounds. The women and girls make their own ice court and skate. They have successfully challenged many stereotypes around their sport. (qtd. in United Nations:16)

Some leading sport figures are challenging such traditional notions of what it means to be a women athlete. A woman who can box is a woman who can fight at once

capable of giving life and of defending it in the true sense of the world. The theme of women playing hockey represents the most obvious instance of cross-gendering in the play. Generally viewed as the national Canadian sport, professional hockey has also been an overwhelmingly (white) male sport. Thus, "hockey functions as an icon, simultaneously, of white Canadian culture and masculinity, evoking associations of toughness, speed, violence, skill, status and so on" (370). The perceived destabilization of gender norms and power caused by the news that Native women are playing hockey, can be deduced from the men's reactions. Big Joey and Creature "laugh themselves into prolonged historical fits. After a while, they calm down and come to a dead stop. [. . .] They look at the hockey game on the television. Then, dead serious, they turn to each other" (1.45-47) Joey and Creature become pale after the women's hitting off board. They got nice slap on the understanding of masculinity and instantly they become thoughtless and dead serious. The women team did what they had believed since ever. Pierre refers to the phenomena as a "revolution".

The dialogue between Pierre and Spoky refers to the enquiring whether women are going to revolt against the Chief or Priest.

> PIERRE : The women. I'm gonna be right smack dab in the middle of
>   it all. the revolution. Right here in Wasaychigana Hill.
>
> SPOOKY: The chief or priest. Which one are they gonna revolution?
>
> PIERRE: No, no, no. Sominique Ladouche, Black Lady Halked . . . all
>   twenty-seven of 'em. Even my wife, Veronique St. Pierre, she'll be
>   right smack dab in the middle of it all. Defense.
>
> SPOOKY: Defense? The Americans. We're being attacked. Is the
>   situation that serious?
>
> PIERRE: No, no, no for chris'sake. They're playing hockey. Then

women are playin' hockey. Dead serious they are too.

SPOOKY: Thank the Lord this is the last year! (1.717-34).

A great victory in hockey game made Pierre frighten. He felt it is similar to revolution; so hard, energetic and lively are they. The revolution may either in against to the Chief, or to the priest. This means against to the colonial regime or to the Christianity. All the women are leading this, so that Christian Spooky exclaims "thank the Lord this is the last year". No one can defense the Native American women because the masculinity is threatened by the new female masculinity. And no one easily can distinguish either men or women what are playing. Therefore, female can acquire the masculine traits.

Through the consequently developed incidents, men characters acknowledged the inherent power of women, and could assume if they can cope with or not. A similar masculine attribute can be detected in the juxtaposition of images that are associated to the materiality of women's bodies, and their carrying of more masculine metaphors. In the aftermath of the first hockey game, Pierre describes Black Lady's slap shot as "like a bullet, like a killer shark. Unbelievable"(2.15). Pierre also reports that the women decided to suspend play until a 'particular puck' has been found 'on principle, no holds barred" (2.52-53). Whatever other shortcoming viewers may find in Highway's portrayal of Native women, he certainly can not be accused of reproducing the stereotype of a co-operative, non-violent sisterhood. The team spirit breaks down, as Gazalle body checks Black Lady, who, in turn deliberately aims a slap shot at her own team-mate, with intent to injure. These images are accompanied by a simultaneous emphasis on the physicality of the female body. For instance, Gazalle's huge eyes, after being hit with the puck, exhibit "mascara stretch marks [. . .] perfectly frightful thing to behold" (2.21-23). Similarly, the puck disappears down

the "horrendous, scarifyin' Nataways bosom crack" [. . .]sliding "deep, deep into the folds of her fleshy, womanly juices [. . .] and it's lost" (2.29-37). This scene evokes the male fear and horror of the female body, the fear of being swallowed up by the mother, her power to give or withhold human life, and so on.

In dry lips, women characters feel themselves strong and feminine, vulnerable and active. They not only challenged the native stereotype of masculinity but also ended the white colonial regimes in Native America.

Highway's women characters are bold, masculine and leading whereas men feeble. When, Hera, Zachary's wife left him, he feels almost castrating himself. The male characters have on any innovative and creative power. As Zachary wants pie-making business, he brings the idea when "(Gazalle) brought me over here to give me the recipe for her bannock apple pie cuz" (1.61-62). Big Joey wants to establish a radio station but he knows "this radio idea . . . does not have as much long-term significance to the future of this community as this fancy bakery idea" (1.94-96). Instead, "I'm to prove this broadcasting of games among the folks is one sure way to get some pride" (1.144-45). Therefore, Big Joey is on the process to recover his degrading state of masculinity but that is not possible for a long time.

In the opening scene of *Dry Lips*, Pierre rushes in with his news by addressing the case of beer directly. Throughout the scene he grabs and drinks beer one after another. Among the men, "Pierre is the one character in the play whose function consists almost entirely of comic relief; unlike the other, he does not directly face a personal crisis point" (366).

Highway infuses some misogynist tendency into the men characters. Such tendency developed when their women crossed the social boundaries and left them to play hockey. In drama Zachary says his wife left him while he was sleeping. But

Creature's wife Gazalle left him after the violent quarrel. Creature describes that moment to Big Joey as:

> The night she threw the toaster at me and just about broke my skull, she tole me: "I had enough, Creature Nataways, I had enough from you. I had your kids and had your disease and that's all I ever want from you, I'm leaving", and then she grabbed her suitcase and she grabbed the kids, no, she didn't grab the kids, she grabbed the TV and she just sashayed herself overhere. She left me. (1.183-90)

Gazalle got nothing except Creature's kids and his disease. What sort of disease it was is not told but that should be like something more dangerous and that kept her within the household. So, she left those two things. But, Creature is unable to handle. "[. . .] I thought it over for about a year [. . .] then one day I swallowed my pride and got up off that chesterfield and as I walked over here, I opened your door and I shook your hand" (1.192-95). Creature could not perform the paternal role and flees from his responsibility. He seeks homo-sociality and goes to live with Big Joey as he was friend since their childhood.

Pierre also feels the experience of alienation when his wife Veronique St. Pierre left him to play hockey. Pierre describes what his wife told to him among Big Joey, Creature: "Pierre St. Pierre, you'll eat your shorts but I'm playing hockey and I don't care what you say. Or think". And she left. No, first, she cleaned out my wallet . . . I grabbed her big brown rosaries from off the wall. Then, she left. Just slammed the door and left" (1.283-89). Such alienated effect helps the men character to develop misogynist attitude toward women, and homosexual or homo-social relationships. The feelings of 'self help' and sociality fade far away because of confusing situation. "While Big Joey hates and fears women's power, he turns out be not only misogynist

but also homophobic. This emerges explicitly as Big Joey and Creature watch from a distance while Dicky Bird Halked rapes Nanabush/Patsy with a cruxifix" (373). For once, Creature wants to take the initiates and intervene, but Joey physically prevents Creature from going to Patsy's aid. Big Joey's homophobia irrupts overtly into his speech at this point. "(Big Joey suddenly grabs Creature violently by the collar) Get out. Get the fuck out of here. You're nothin' but a fuckin' fruit. Fuck out" (II.361-63). Creature flees, and Joey continues to watch, and becomes paralyzed. "While Big Joey's actions are potentially misogynist, they may also contain an element of homosexual panic. Because he is insecure and uncertain about his masculinity, Joey must "prove" his manhood over and over, with heterosexual conquests and physical violence. He is afraid to risk being perceived as anything other" (373). Billingham quotes Peter Dickinson while critiquing *Dry Lips* and writes, "Big Joey, perhaps the one character most associated by this way with normative patriarchal attitudes, becomes an object of desire for two-spirited characters" (373). He fails to comfort directly the implications of eroticizing the hyper-masculinity of a homophobe. Therefore, such counter productive self-hatred is the part of the two-spirit.

A few scenes later, Spooky Lacroix, the Christianized native asks Creature "why didn't you do something?" (II.408). Why he failed to prevent the rape? Lacroix, who assumes Creature is afraid of Big Joey, does not get quite response he expects, when Creature replies "I love him. Spooky"(II.413). Creature's response projects the homosexual relationship between Joey and himself or it means creature has developed homosexuality. By listening that, Spooky exclaims "Lord have mercy on Wasaychigan Hill" (II.419) and his earlier reaction to the news of the women's "revolution": "Thank the Lord this is the last year!". Spooky's such exclamation signifies the pessimistic view of the world. He feels the masculinity of the Native

American is under crisis and hopes there will be no one to save the nation from the degrading situation. Creature's confession of love directly expresses his object of desire:

> I love the way he stands. I love the way walks. The way he laughs. The way he wears his cowboy boots.[. . .] the way his tight blue jeans fall over his ass. The way he talks so smart and tough. The way women fall at his feet. I wanna be like him. I always wanted to be like him. William. I always wanted to have a dick as big as his. (II.420-27)

Creature's object of desire is confusing. In initial talk he seems to be a homosexual, or a man of gay community. But, the next speech reveals his confusion of sexuality. Creature, here, shifts from desire to identification: a wish to emulate specifically directed toward traits conventionally associated with heterosexual construct of masculinity- toughness, sexual potency, irresistibility to women etc. Creature's advocacy of love to Big Joey is very ironical. He assumes Big Joey is so masculine and virile but no spectators or readers can see or feel the masculine role of Big Joey. He is like a berdache, having masculine body and feminine quality.

Creature seeks the recovery to his masculinity. Spooky expresses his response toward creature's sexuality "shut up, you are making me nervous. Real nervous" (II.433). Spooky is persuaded of his own feelings, or the man Creature admires may allow such an "inconceivable act" (II.632-35). It remains unclear whether his intention is to impose him to go to Big Joey, as well, since he never gets the opportunity. By listening Spooky's response Creature confronts Spooky with his own past and appeals to the blood-brotherhood sworn twenty-one years earlier by five young men. This evokes the broader homosocial bonds that have been rupturing. As they stare into each other's eyes, Creature insists, "William. Think of your father.

Remember the words of Nicotine Lacroix". Men who do not worship the Christian way do not automatically go to hell. There are many, many other ways of communicating with the Great Spirit [. . .] respect us. Respect all people"(2.459-603). Reminding of his dead father's role as medicine men, the Christianized Spooky finally breaks down and swears for the first time in the play. Creature's moment of truth thus transmits itself to Spooky, forcing him to confront the damage done by his denial of his father's spiritual belief. Taken together with Dicky Bird's quest for a father figure by violently raping Patsy and Big Joey's refusal of paternal responsibility, this crucial scene can be read as a part of the broader examination of masculinities throughout the play.

Through the dialogue among Big Joey, Zachary, Spooky and Creature we can examine the masculinity of Native Indian men.

> ZACHARY: . . . South Dekota [. . .] same place you (to Joey) went and
>
>   made a total asshole of yourself seventeenth years ago. . .
>
> SPOOKY: . . . the past. . .
>
> CREATURE: . . . chris'sakes. . .
>
> ZACHARY: What happened to all those dreams you were so full of
>
>   your people, the same dreams this young man just died for? (II.646-
>
> 55)

What is here revealed is that Big Joey had gone to south Dekota in order to learn something that might be very helpful for his people. Ultimately, he became a gay man. He made a small community of gay people. Creature is the member of that also. But all these matters are concealed by involving into that community. Native men are doing nothing for their community and nothing against the colonialism of white men. Creature seems inclined to continue and says "you little cocksucker" (II.666), and

Dicky Bird knocks Creature unconscious with Joey's gun. So, it is revealed that Native men are involving homosexuality and developing mysogynist attitude. The violent silencing of the one member of that community, who expressed a formerly repressed homosexual desire, at the very moment of Joey's big confession of misogyny, reminds us of the continuing difficulty of speaking two desires. Such two dimensional gender roles is the problem of his masculinity.

Toward the end of the play, there are series of incidents that project the crises of masculinity. Among them the issue of suicide is most important. Dickie Bird attempts suicide by placing Big Joey's hunting rifle in his mouth and pulls the trigger. The gun fails to fire; chance kept him alive. While, in the next scene, Simon dies accidentally from a self-inflicted gun shot though he was in search of Dickie Bird, who raped violently Nanabush/Patsy. It may be a suicide because he was out to kill Dickie Bird but unable to kill, or thought he would not keep his words. He felt himself a weak and feminine. "In the final scene of the play-when Zachary wakes upon his couch, the poster has been covered by Nanabush's large powwow bustle. In this gesture, one of the play's key Native icons symbolically conceals, and by implication supercedes, Monroe as icon" (370). Susan Billingham critiques that "if the pin-up Marilyn represents the feminine norm against which Native women are being measured, then the theme of women playing hockey represents the most obvious instance of cross-gendering in the play" (370). Thus, the Native women playing hockey becomes symbol of female empowerment, masculine and subversive. They not only push the masculinity of Native men into the cradle but also threatened the white colonial masculinity by playing masculine game of white men.

The configuration of masculinity, in Highway's *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*, through the trickster technique is also subversive. Applying this

technique, Highway creates a two-spirited model of gender and sexuality. In the play, "Highway version of Nanabush has provoked the most controversy: does s/he function as an object of (male) desire, or as a figure for (female) power? (359). As a mimic man trickster can play any role, goes by any names and many guises. In the play the Nanabush "is theoretically neither exclusively male nor exclusively female, or both simultaneously" (Worthen: 878-79). Such figure not only subverts the norms of gender and sexuality but also questions the ideology of race, class, and ethnicity. Nanabush can associate with one and more culture, religion and society or can deviate from them.

In *Dry Lips* Nanabush play three roles- as the spirit of Gazalle Nataways, Patsy Pegahmagahbow, and Dicky Bird Halked. Gazalle is subversive, commanding, active and playful in her role. Her playing of hockey projects the masculine attributes in her. In the play, Nanabush appears "sitting on a toilet having a good shit. He/she is dressed in an old man's white beard and wig, but wearing sexy, elegant women's high-healed pumps.[. . .] he/she with her legs crossed, nonchalantly filing his/her fingernails" (qtd. in Billingham, 365). Such drag king like performance exposes the gender confusion, or the more possibilities of gender and sexual identity. "Minority masculinities emerge from the drag king performance as multiple articulations of various relations between racial and gendered embodiment and theater" (Halberstam: 226). The existence of subordinate/minority masculinities reserved power and worked against the normative masculinity. Such localized masculinities destroyed the hegemonic notions of traditional masculinity and established local or diverse ideals of masculinities. So, there is not a hegemonic normative white masculinity but also black masculinity, female masculinity, working class masculinity, gay/lesbian masculinity, homosexual and transsexual masculinity.

In conclusion, from the thematic as well as technical perspectives both plays deal with the traditional male subject (masculinity) at the problematic stage. Caryl Churchill associates the male subject with colonialism whereas Tomson Highway associates it with colonialism and Christianity. In *Cloud Nine* the concept of masculinity is dominant one in first act but it is submissive or feeble in the second act. Similarly, *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing* exposes the crisis of masculinity from the starting of the play where male characters are shown passive and powerless in front of women, and the recently developed cultural phenomena. On the technical level, Churchill hires the cross-dressing and role doubling technique to subvert the traditional notions of gender and sexuality. It also creates gender and sexual confusion and brings the possibilities of more new gender and sexual identity. Highway, on the other hand, uses the trickster as the dramatic technique to project the gender confusion; and shows the more possibilities of formation of sexual identities. Masculinity, thus, a traditional gender category is under the crisis because none of its norms are working properly on these plays.

IV. Conclusion

After the detailed discussion and analysis of Churchill's *Cloud Nine* and Highway's *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*, this research concludes that the masculinity is a collective gender identity and not a natural attribute. It is socially constructed and fluid. There is not one universal masculinity, but more masculinities. These are not fixed character types but configuration of practice generated in particular situations in a changing structure of relationships.

Class and race factors are constitutive of the formation of masculinity. This means that in any society there are many masculinities. Each with a characteristic shape and set of features. There is neither such masculine attributes as Clive gathers in Churchill's *Cloud Nine*, nor any hegemonic masculine power of white Christian or Christianized people portrayed in Highway's *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*. The masculinity was considered as a gender as well as sexual identity which was a single, unified and associated only with the masculine men. It was understood always in opposition to femininity and other social and minority groups. Except hegemonic form of masculinity there was no any presence of masculinity. Whatever the roles people used to perform in their community were the social and cultural demands of the contemporary period. Thus, the norms and values of masculinity was explicitly the patriarchal discourse. And the norms and roles of the sexuality were explicitly heterosexual. If there were any opposition to these norms or the practice of homosexuality and gay/lesbianism, that would be presented or called effeminate. Such effeminacy was the stigma of unmanly man; humiliation and symbol of femininity. In this light masculinity was understood as a form of power only associated with white European man. But the conception of masculinity is changed over time. Being affected by changes elsewhere in society, themselves are affecting society itself.

There is emergence of more masculinities and all are not equally powerful as social forces. Subordinate and subversive masculinities exist among marginal or dominated groups and these may be oppositional to the dominant masculinity. Churchill's portrayal of Clive as a colonial agent of Victorian Africa is also the icon of that dominant white European masculinity. As an icon, he circulates his hegemonic masculine power over his family members, over the racial black servant Joshua and others. He teaches morals and controls them through it. Clive constructs the gender and sexual identity of these people.

Churchill's time passage of one hundred years gives significant changes in identity formation. The time of 1970s itself is the era of movements. More energy comes from gay and lesbian, and homosexual people against the unitary, single and coherent hegemonic notion of masculinity. Gay/lesbian struggled for their sexual identity as a political ideology. Homosexual acted against the social construction of gender and heterosexual discourse of patriarchy. The lesbian and homosexual relationships enacted by Ellen, Victoria, Edward, Harry, Gerry and Betty radically challenged the compulsory heterosexual notion of Clive; as a result he becomes lecherous, weak and threatened. His colonial empire of gender and sexuality seems to crumbled. He feels himself so powerless. The indulgence of men into homosexual activities, in *Dry Lips* also gives the symptom of crisis in their manhood.

The women empowerment through economic freedom, legal appropriation, and involvement on sports give the insight to challenge the traditional notions about masculinity. Betty, Ellen, Victoria and Mrs. Saunders go to work, become economically independent and divorce their husband. They are consoling their sexual desire as their own wish. They made their own community excluding men. In Highway's play, women are playing hockey as it was considered the masculine sports

of white men. By playing such masculine game, they are challenging not only white masculinity, but also creating their own female masculinity. Because of the women's power, the male characters are dwelling by knitting and cooking, and watching the game in TV. Women are so active in role where as male are passive.

The male characters' acceptance of power crisis is very important aspect of these two plays. No ideals of masculinity are applicable against female or other masculinities. As a social and cultural attributes other masculinities reserve the power and always threaten the hegemonic notions of masculinity. The power stems from the knowledge about the gender systems and their nonsensical prescriptions. The regular imposition of masculine features upon Edward could not make him a representative of Clive's masculinity. Edward ultimately accepts both gay and lesbian lifestyle.

As a colonial administrator or inheritor of hegemonic British masculine figure, Clive should control all family members. If the masculinity is controlling power, boldness, and fearlessness, Clive and other men characters should bear these traits and perform role accordingly, but no one did as such. The colonial presence is shown failed. Now Africa is a communist and independent country. "The bitter end of colonialism is apparent in Lin's brother, who dies in Northern Ireland" (Worthen: 557). Clive's absence in the second act of *Cloud Nine* clarifies the crisis of manly features. Women are reached at the cloud nine, getting economic, cultural, and social freedom and power whereas men character are dwelling doing household work such as cooking, knitting, washing etc. Thus, women are dismantling the social, cultural, racial, gender and sexual codes previously created by male ideologies.

To meet the goal, I have taken some methodological insight from Judith Halberstam's *Female Masculinity* (1998), Rachel Adams and David Savran's *the masculinity studies reader* (2002) and Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble: Feminism*

and the Subversion of Identity(1990). Helberstam gives proper evidences to the formation of female masculinity that attacks the hegemonic notions of traditional concept of gender, sexuality, and masculinity. She presents some women who says "we're fighting a society that says women should be in the house . . . we have our father's genes as men have their mother's. Men can work on feminine side, so why shouldn't we box?"(270-71). The implication is that men can work on their feminine side, and therefore, women should be able to work on their masculinity. The portrayal of femininity is shown bold in both plays. Edward, in *Cloud Nine*, is played by woman, partly because the size and presence of man on stage seemed appropriate to the emotional force of young children, and partly to show more clearly the issues involved in learning what is considered correct behavior for a girl.

The portrayals of women characters in Highway's *Dry Lips* are very powerful and masculine. They are shown succeeded to destroy the platforms of white Christian masculinity by asserting their Native culture and thought. The Native men characters are shown very powerless in front of white cultural oppression and Native women's process to subversion. Therefore, Native women are the main leader to end the bitter impact of colonialism but men are passive about that matter. So, women are shown very progressive and active, remaining out of their house. They are participating in social, political and economic fronts. They have replaced male freedom by denying the household activities. Thus, women are revolutionary, subversive, open and heterogeneous.

Adams and Savran's text helped to extend the theoretical modality which applied to examine the plays. They have given the clear concept of masculinity and its historical development. According to them, masculinity is the important development of feminist criticism and gender criticism. Gender identity is thought to be determined

by one's sexual behavior. Masculinity, therefore, is the part of gender; culturally and socially constructed. Butler's ideas of gender performivity and heterosexual matrix are related to the sexed body that means gender and sexuality was previously associated with men. Butler has subverted the gender and sexual identity and reconstructs new identities. Such subversion and reformation of gender and sexuality is very applicable in this research work.

On the textual level, the hegemonic masculinity is shown under the identical crisis. According to Mike Donaldson "hegemonic masculinity is exclusive, anxiety provoking, internally and hierarchically differentiated, brutal, and violent. Among its defining features are misogyny, homophobia, racism and compulsory heterosexuality" (qtd. in Kimmel: 608). In *Cloud Nine* Clive's role is more hegemonic. He imposes British ideals, suppresses Joshua and creates racial violence, and sexually he initiates compulsory heterosexuality and always homophobic. On the similar ground, in Highway's *Dry Lips*, the male character develop misogynist attitude toward their women. Big Joey links the blood and Violence of the military conflict with the blood of Black Lady's labour and Dicky Bird's traumatic birth. Joey goes on to confess that he permitted the rape of Patsy "[b]ecause I hate them! I hate them fuckin' bitches. Because they- our women – took the fuckin' power away from us as faster than the FBI ever did" (II.684-86). Creature fears from Joey so save Patsy of being raped. But Joey fears from women's power and hates them because they made him crippled, feeble. Thus, men characters are taking last gasp of air to survive. They are living being feminine men. So, the norms of hegemonic masculinity are under crisis.

To sum up, the crisis of masculinity in both plays is shown through the male character who involve in household activities- baking, knitting, washing; and women playing hockey. The presence of third gender or the homosexual and gay/lesbian

subcultures work to invert traditional concept of gender and sexual roles. The presence of hegemonic masculinity through the colonial and white Christian regime is also challenged. The use of cross-dressing, and trickster as dramatic technique have developed the gender and sexual confusion at the performative level to explore a real meaning of masculinity. The rises of economic power, individual freedom, and changing socio-cultural values have created an environment where the traditional notion of hegemonic masculinity is castrated.

Works Cited

Adams, Rachel and David Savran. *the masculinity studies reader*. Blackwell: USA & UK, 2002.

Amoko, Apollo. "Casting Aside Colonial occupation: Intersection of Race, Sex, and Gender in *Cloud Nine* and *Cloud Nine* criticism". *Modern Drama* 42.1 (Spring 99): 45-58.

Barber, Jeffery A. "Churchill's *Cloud Nine*". *Explicator* 57.4 (Summer 99): 242-44.

Bhasin, Kamala. *Exploring Masculinity*. Women Unlimited: New Delhi, 2004.

Billingham, Susan. "The Configuration of Gender in Tomson Highway's *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing*". *Modern Drama* 46.3 (Fall 2003): 358-80.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. Routledge: New york and london, 1990.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. *Masculine Feminine and Human*? F.E. Peacock: USA, 1978.

Churchill, Caryl. "Cloud Nine". *The Harcort Anthology of Drama*. Brief ed. Ed W.B. Worthen. Fort worth: Harcourt, 2002.

Connell, R.W. "A Very Straight: Masculinity, Homosexual Experience and the Dynamic of Gender". *American Sociological Review* 57 (Dec., 1992): 735-75.

- - -. "Masculinities". *Acta Sociologica* 39.3 (1999): 337-41.

Green, Adam Isaiah. "Gay and not Queer: Toward a Post-Queer Study of Sexuality". *Theory and Society* 31.4 (Aug., 2002): 521-45.

Gunter, Scott. "Alors, Are we 'Queer' Yet?". *The Gay and Lesbian Review* (May-June 2005): 23-25.

Guttman, Matthew C. "Trafficking of Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26 (1997): 385-409.

Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Duke University Press:Dhuram, 1998.

Harding, James M. "(Re) Dressing Desire and Comfortable Subversion in Caryl

Churchill's *Cloud Nine*". *MLA* 113.2 (Mar.,1998): 258-72.

Harvey, Karen. "The History of Masculinity, Circa 1650-1800". *The Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005): 290-311.

Herrmann, Anne. "Transvesty and Transgerssion in Shakespeare, Brecht, and Churchill". *Theatre Journal* 41.2 (May, 1989): 133-54.

Highway, Tomson. "Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing". *The Harcort Anthology of Drama.* Brief ed. Ed W.B. Worthen. Fort Worth: Harcourt (2002): 876-904.

Johnson, Robert A. *Femininity Lost and Regained.* Harper and Row: New york, 1990.

Kimmel, S. Michael. "Men's Response to Feminism at the turn of the Century". *Gender and Society* 1.3 (Sept. 1987): 261-83.

Morrell, Robert. "Of Boys and Men: Masculinity and Gender Criticism in Southern African Studies". *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24.4 (Dec. 1998): 605-30.

Rayamajhi, Sangita. "Who Speaks for Masculinity?" *The Kathmandu Post*: 7, 19 March, 2008.

United Nations. "Women, gender, equality and sport". *Women 2000 and Beyond*. New York: United Nations, Dec. 2007.

Upreti, Sanjeev. "Masculinity or masculinities?". *The Kathmandu Post*: 6, 25 March, 2008.

Wasserman, Jerry. "Tomson Highway and Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing: The Ultimate Source of it". *Journal of Canadian Stu*dies 39.1 (Winter 2005): 23-48.

Worthen, W.B. *The Harcourt Anthology of Drama*. Fort Worth: Harcourt. 2002.