

Chapter I. Introduction

Willa Cather's novel *The Professor's House* deals with the homosexual relationship between the main characters professor Godfrey St Peter and his student Tom Outland. Similar relation can be seen in between the male characters Roddy Blake and Tom. The novel is written in the context of prevalent heterosexual culture. By providing such male spaces the novel represents notions against traditional sexual ideology.

Godfrey St Peter is Mrs Lillian's husband but their conjugal life does not remain harmonious after the arrival of student Tom Outland. Their relationship previously was a bit better, but when Outland arrives their bond disintegrates and Mrs. St Peter was finally bound to flirt with her son-in-law, Louie Marsellus. No other reasons can be seen that compels her flirtation, but the relation between Tom Outland and her husband. Till Tom is alive they spend times together and after his death the professor always recollects him. By such male relationships, the novel and the novelist provide space to homosexuality and intrudes with the prevalent norms, rules and regulations of heterosexual culture which even in the present time is condemned unnatural and unfortunate minor issue by the majority. Jeffery Weeks writes about homosexual behavior:

. . . the various possibilities of same sex behaviour are variously constructed in different cultures as an aspect of wider gender and sexual regulation. The physical acts might be similar but their social implications are often profoundly different. In our culture homosexuality has become an excoriated experience, severely socially condemned at various periods, and even today seen as a largely unfortunate, minority form by a large percentage of the population.

(42)

Homosexuality still is not an abnormal behavior for many in the context of the plurality of gender relations which want to legitimize homosexuality and other than heterosexual practices.

It must also be acknowledged that Cather's same sex couples are not figured without some ambivalence - without indeed, clear signs of homophobia. Jean Marie Latour and Joseph Valliant are, after all, priests. They take seriously their vows of celibacy and Latour works hard to rid his diocese of those who do not want to clean up the "Augean Stable" (Lyons 2) of the Church in the Southwest, as the missionary bishop who chooses him for the job puts it. Latour and Vaillant's relationship can be safely idealized because it is safely predicated upon an explicit renunciation of sex. In *The Professor's House*, when Tom Outland recalls being nursed through a bout of pneumonia by his friend Roddy Blake, he remarks, "he ought to have had boys of his own to look after. Nature's full of such substitutions, but they always seem to me sad, even in botany" (165). Tom's skittishness about Roddy's caretaking and his ultimate betrayal of their friendship suggest that Cather fought to repress signs of queerness in her characters as vigorously as she fought on other levels, to express them or merely to live them. Tom later says of his treatment of Roddy "Anyone who requites faith and friendship as I did, will have to pay for it. I am not very sanguine about good fortune for myself. I'll be called to account when I least expect it" (229).

We can extract ample examples or textual evidences that prove *The Professor's House* as a novel that freely represents homosexual culture. Strengthening romantic relationship between Professor Godfrey St Peter and Tom outland and the disintegration amidst St Peter and his wife are the main evidences by which the novel affirms male space. As a narrator of the novel, Cather explicitly says about their disintegration:

He had been almost a member of the family for two years, and she had never found fault with the boy. But after the professor began to take Tom up to the study and talk over his work with him, began to make companion of him then Mrs. St. Peter withdrew her favor. (151)

It is thus quite clear that the cause of their dismantled relationship is only the relationship between Godfrey St. Peter and Tom Outland.

It is not difficult to surmise about their queer affinity between Godfrey St Peter. The moment that Tom Outland walks into Godfrey St Peter's green door that led from the street, the professor marvels at Tom's "sandy hair", "the reddy brown of his face" and the boys "fine looking" physique (95)". Godfrey's calculated interest in Tom suggests something other than heterosexual.

The novel was written in 1925. The extreme male- male bond in the story can not be taken as a normal relationship from traditional social perspective of that time. Homosexual people were taken as others. Gay and lesbian relationship were not accepted positively.

Ken Plummer, a sociologist in his essay "Symbolic Interactionism and the forms of Homosexuality" writes about the symptom of homosexual people:

An individual may become attached to, interested in or fascinated by a number of objects –penises , bottom, football and other male oriented objects which may subsequently come to symbolize his whole being as homosexual. (70-71).

Godfrey St. Peter is so attracted to his student's blanket that he does not want to separate him from the blanket which was given by the Tom Outland. Kathleen, daughter of St. Peter, reads it as a symbol. Louie Marsellus, elder daughter of St.

Peter characteristically seizes upon the purple blanket as a costume, but the professor wraps himself in it when he is cold. "Nothing could part me from that blanket... it was like his skin" (111). Like the token that passes between friends, the blanket doubles Tom's body. This is how the professor sleeps with Tom, beneath his blanket /skin.

The novel is divided into three books of unequal length and kind. The first and longest, (taking up almost two thirds of the novel), called "The Family" that tells of Godfrey St. Peter, who is fifty two, a history professor at an unnamed college on a Great Lake, a man with a wife and daughter. By the insistence of his wife, Lillian, the money has been used to build a new house, but Godfrey is very reluctant to quit the old house, where his daughters grew up and his books were written. The professor had one shining pupil, Tom Outland, a boy who turns up mysteriously out of the west and dies young in world war.

At the end of "The Family" Lillian and the Marsellus have sailed to France for the summer, leaving the professor alone in his house except for the occasional visits by Augusta, a devout German Catholic spinster sewing-woman. Godfrey had been invited to join the trip to Europe, but had fastidiously declined. Godfrey finds himself recalling an earlier summer when with the wife and children off in Colorado, he and Outland dined often together in the garden on a fine leg of lamb well rub with garlic (Godfrey is by way of being an epicure). Professor Godfrey recalls his student instead of his wife and daughter. His relationship with his student was so intense that he forgets all other things. When it rained, they "sat inside and read Lucretius"(150). On one rainy night Tom at last told the story he had kept back. It was nothing very incriminating, nothing very remarkable, a story of youthful defeat, the sort of thing a

boy is sensitive about- until he grows older. Such stories of Tom cover a quarter of the book.

The central part of the story is Tom Outland's own story of youthful defeat. The story is about discovering of the Blue Mesa an island of New Mexico. After discovering the Blue Mesa, he goes to Washington D.C. to ask the help of an expert for research. But he was alienated and worried by the behavior of the officials who did not response well. Tom Outland and his friend Roddy Blake, Santa Fee Railroad Company fireman, discovered Blue Mesa after many efforts. They find there human skeletons, murdered women and some other relishes and turquoises that were the matter of further investigation but they can not receive help from the officials. Many critics take the irruption of this story of Tom Outland as a technical mistake because of its unsuitable link with the first and last part of the story. Alfred Kazin comment about this fragment that "the violence with which she broke the book in half to tell the long and discursive narrative of Tom's narrative of Tom's boyhood in the Southwest was a technical mistake that has damned the book" (1).

The final part of the novel "The Professor" consists largely of a meditation by Godfrey on his life and the imminence of death. How much of life, he wearily concludes is chance: his education in France, his marriage, arrival of Tom. It takes Godfrey down to the southwest. And, thus the professor made the last four volumes of *Spanish Adventure* better by steepi ng in the great dazzling South-west, a country so beloved and so often sung by Cather herself. Godfrey comes to see Tom's death as loss of close friendship to the extent that he recollects Tom and wants to forget his marriage, his wife.

Godfrey has the presence of mind to perceive that finding one's essential self in some eternal youth amounts to a desire for death. He decides to see a doctor. It is

important to note that Cather too diagnoses Godfrey's condition as pathological. The doctor finds nothing wrong and Godfrey decides to recover and admits he may indeed be alive next summer but he realizes that he can no longer live with his wife. He must stay in the old house.

In this context of the male space that has been constructed by the narrative, the work elaborates the ideas related with homosexuality into four chapters. The first chapter is on the thesis and its textual exemplification and elaboration of homosexuality, homosexual people and their roles in society.

The second chapter develops theoretical modality that is to be applied in the novel. The attempt is to give a short outline of culture and its tenets. This chapter provides some tenets of the counterculture and detail about the homosexual theory by different critics. Homosexual role, homosexual people's behavior, and social attitudes too are discussed in this chapter. Based on this novel's setting, the research also discuss about the advent of counterculture, particularly in America and western countries.

The third chapter is the textual analysis to prove it as a novel of homosexual issue and its affinity toward affirmation of male space.

II. Culture, Counterculture and Homosexuality

The word culture is derived from the Latin word "cultra," a noun which refers to the process connected to growing crops that is cultivation. Oxford dictionary defines culture as evidence of intellectual development of arts, science religions etc in human society. It has been used to refer to intellectual and artistic works or practices defining human society as socially constructed. Since every human society has its own shape its own purpose, its own meaning, cultures vary because there is no single history, religion society, and geography. Cultural critic, Peter Brooker believes:

Culture belongs to human consciousness that is developed and shaped by society. Culture refers to individual style or character, to a stage of artistic and intellectual development, to the expressive life and traditions of a social group, to a social historical moment or a broad epoch. (50)

Culture is the fabric with which human beings interpret their experiences and guide their actions. Such actions then take the forms of social structure, the actually existing network of social relations. Culture and social network are then different abstractions from the same phenomena.

Culture has been viewed differently in different periods by different thinkers. Mathew Arnold's view to culture is in terms of binary opposition in *Culture and Anarchy* (1869). Arnold established a cultural agenda which remained dominant from 1860s to 1950s. He opines about culture as "the best that has been known and thought in the world"(qtd in Storey 6). The work of men and the women of culture is to know them and then to make the best prevail. The function of culture is to produce a cultural middle class, a class with the necessary cultural authority to be hegemonic. He says the working classes are always to be on the side of anarchy, always in a

relation of binary opposition to culture. He does not like the imperfect, raw, and unkind masses. He opines:

I condemn neither way; but culture works differently it doesn't try to teach down to the inferior classes. It doesn't try to win them for that seat of its own, with readymade judgments, watchwords. It seeks to do away with classes, to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere; to make all men live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light, where they may use ideas as it uses them itself freely-nourished and not bound by them."(qtd. in Storey 8)

The ideas describe the significance of culture as the means of getting perfection in life. For Arnold the great men of culture are those who have had passion for diffusing, carrying from one end of society to other, the best knowledge, the best ideas of their time. Arnold's view of culture involved different characteristics as "beauty" "intelligence" and "perfection". For him poetry is the major storage of culture because it consists of great and lofty ideas that help us to interpret life forces.

Arnold says that culture needs to have the system of moral responsibility that reforms man, society, as well as the nation. He speaks for the authoritarianism that shows the tendency of hatred towards the emergence of popular culture. It is because the popular culture speaks against the culture based on moral, social values and standard posited by aristocrats. Arnold contrast culture with anarchy and anarchy comprised of the "self centered unruliness of working class and the hideous grotesque illusions of middle class protest" (Bretens). Arnold makes distinction between high culture and low culture. He seems human perfection only in ordered society and he suggests repressing anarchy and disorder to maintain order. He comments:

. . . for us who believe in right reason, in the duty and possibility of extricating and elevating our best self, in the progress of humanity toward perfection . . . for us the framework of society; theater on which this august drama has unroll itself, is sacred;...we steadily and with undivided heart supporting them in repressing anarchy and disorder; because without order there can be no human perfection. (Wilson 202-203)

Like Arnold, Leavisites believes that "culture has always been a minority keeping" (qtd in Storey 13). The problem however is that the cultured minority can no longer command deference for their values and judgments. It is claimed that prior to the nineteenth century and in the seventeenth, England had a vigorous common culture. However, as a result of the changes brought fractures into two cultures. On the one hand, minority culture, on the other a mass civilization. The minority culture is the embodiment of the values and standards of "the best that has been thought and said" (qtd in Storey 14). In contrast to this is the mass culture of mass civilization, commercial culture consumed unthinkably by the uneducated minority, cinema, radio, popular fiction, the popular press, advertising and so on.

For Raymond Williams culture is a "whole way of life of a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced, and explored" (55). So Williams witnesses to the fact that the dominant culture of the society may be the other, and at the same time the culture of a section of society may be different from that of other. He was basically interested in working class culture. Thus, the distinction between high and low culture almost vanishes in Williams' formation, and Arnold's culture becomes knowledge of a specific elite. Raymond Williams says that the word 'culture' come to serve against the decisions and fragmentations of industrial society. He adds culture

was made into an entity, a positive body of achievements and habits precisely to express a mode of living superior to that being brought about by the 'progress of civilization'"(254).

Hoggart's the *Uses of Literary* (1957) is also an important work to talk about culture. Through this book, he has displayed the character of working class culture as it appears to him during 1950s. He has revealed the sense of sympathy and humanity for the working class. He discusses about commercial culture. So he has focused on the important factor in the formation culture into real sense.

Edward Thomson in *The Making of the English Working Class*, following the cultural critics Hoggart and Raymond Williams, declares that "history is always from below(33)". Below refers to the common people. For him culture must be understood through the experience and contribution of losers and winners If losers are forgotten and only the winners are remembered, that is not the comprehension of culture. So the experiences, beliefs, attitude and practices and the life of working class are given priority in his own cultural system modality. He also views culture as alive and ordinary, expressing that capability of working class enhance them to form their own history. The relation of culture and power which most typically characterized modern societies are lost understood in the light of the respects in which the field of culture is now increasingly governmentally organized and constructed. This entails recognizing the changes how cultural resources function in the context of relations of power usually modifying the ways in which cultural forms and activities are governmentally deployed as a part of programs of social management.

After the elucidation of the tenets and norms of culture with the reference to different theorist and cultural critics, the chapter now focuses the analysis of counterculture movement and affinity of homosexuality with this movement.

Counterculture is a term that came to counter the idea of culture which speaks for the established norms, values identities, and materialistic world. It displays the contrast cultural values in a way as an avant-garde aesthetic discourse does. It seeks to overcome the limitations of traditional conventions by searching the new strategies for the project of describing and interpreting experiences. Counterculture articulates the issues like drug use and sexual experiences to take them in to the public arena and set them in notion. It regards the way of expression of ideas very radical that makes people in power and institution compelled to listen those voices and visions of street people rather than the so called standard language.

Counterculture refers to groups that are able to provide an intellectual justification and account of their radical and unconventional position. It speaks against the strict norms of morality and speaks for the sexual behavior including the extreme sexual conduct. It can also be understood by the anti-established and anti-traditional literary movements that speak against cultural conformity and complacency rooted in capitalistic culture.

It is a cultural term carried especially in the late 1950s and early 1960s. It came in response to the emergence of middle class youth movements such as the hippie to refer to groups that questioned the values of the dominant culture. The hippie counterculture also expressed its dissatisfaction with the values and goals of capitalism such as consumerism and dependence on technology. Those people who agree with the counterculture movement they found the white culture's way of life is unauthentic and psychologically unsatisfying. Politically both the civil rights movement and the new left of the early 1960s took their initial clues from the cold war claim of the United States to be the foremost exponent and instances of

democracy. Here is an explanation of counterculture in *Encyclopedia of American Cultural and Intellectual History*:

The black counterculturalists argued that to overcome the psychic, social, and cultural effects of centuries of enforced subordination, American blacks like their African brothers and sisters, would have to construct and maintain on opposition to the norms and practices of white society that would be as forceful as it was absolute. (252)

These people attempted to express a voice to the repressed or marginalized cultural elements and themes.

Counterculture claims the existence of others forms of realities beyond the conventional empiricism. This concept embraces the idea of heroism and focuses that self created ideas should not be controlled, denied, and exploited in the name of morality and tradition, rather they are to be acknowledged, respected, and responded norms. Counterculture attacks formal structure and formal leadership. Hence it is leaderless because all of its' participant constantly innovate and prove their ideas in new territory.

Counterculture identifies a social attitude apposes to the prevailing culture, moral and social values of the mainstream and favors unrestrained self realization and self expression. Borrowing the language of Nobel prize winner Ilya Prigogine and Ken Goffman in their book *Counterculture Through the Ages* defines counterculture in a scientific manner as "the cultural equivalent of the third thermodynamic state, the non linear region where equilibrium and symmetry have given way to complexity so intense as to appear to the eyes as chaos" (2). So it can be said that counterculture is moving crest at a wave and a zone of uncertainty.

Counterculture, an expression of a new radicalism, voiced familiar calls for American values which had been lost as a generation was maturing in complacency and demanded change. The renewal of wonder and the politics of opposition are sought with the idea of vision and action. It refers to the concerned organization, networks communes, music drug scene, and homosexuality which came in practice especially in America and spoke in opposition to the power of military industrial complex, Vietnam War, conservative morality of postwar middle class America, and concerned issues of the time in America.

Beat Movement of 1950s is an inspiration for the counterculture movement in 1960s and 1970s. Cultural theorist of the generation, the radical activists, and the gurus of different area of knowledge are the contributor for this theory. So it is a very much effective and relevant cultural theory that gives place/position to the ideas of many areas viewed as the immoral ideas by the capitalistic and conditional culture and it began in America "to take more direct aim at the oppressive social and political power of its dominant culture" (MC Quate 156).

Counterculture focuses on the folk rock and Jazz music, which once the basic expression of countercultural lifestyle. The concept of Jazz is a term for semen. Jazz music was sexually charged and desolate music played in brothels mother dubious establishment in which musical component was less important than infectious rhythm and performance gimmicks. It also altered the challenges the distinction between high and low culture, and rejects the culture of hyper-reality as approved by the capitalistic culture.

The countercultural discourse of the period is everywhere informed by the assumption that the dominant society and its conventions are both entirely distinct from and harmful to the true self they degrade and repress. The True self thus

requires to be loosened from the imprisoning grip of dominant society in order to realize itself. They viewed the existing society as a dysfunctional, alien, absurd, yet potentially lethal machine. The idea that self's link to others derives from some pool of communality lying beneath and beyond the social and seemingly outside of historical time was the fundamental axiom of counter-cultural common sense. This common sense also comes to include suspicion or hostility to all fixed institutions or organizational forms. For white counterculturalists, free speech advocates, antiwar activists, white feminists and hippie freaks alike, such suspicion ran especially deep. That desperate, spontaneous democracy beyond and outside all imprisoning social forms was left to be the only valid social forms was left to be the only valid only social engagement. These people were in favor of celebrating the excluded subjectivities. They thought that American culture was unbalanced and it focused on what is instrumental and showed insufficient concern for the values of the community expressiveness, caring and with the domain of the sacred.

Counterculture is a one kind of sub-culture. Both counterculture and sub-culture are contrasted to mainstream culture. The varying distance between subculture and institutional power center does seem to make it possible between subordinated and dominant subculture. Because of it subculture may be contrasted with mainstream culture adopted by majority of the people, dominating culture believed by elite group and counterculture practiced by middle class. Phil Cohen's opinion on the subculture is that subculture arises from the working class whereas counterculture as the product of middle class. He further adds: "I do not think the middle proceeds subculture, for subcultures are produced not by a dominant culture but by dominated culture"(14).

Between subculture and counterculture and counterculture is conceived either as a class difference between implicit partial and explicit trial critiques of society

expressed in styles. British intellectuals in 1970s studied that subcultures take part in a class related ideological struggle society. Countercultures explicitly resist dominating institutions and ideologies, but subcultures are more integrated and affirmative at least on the surface.

Johan Formas in *Cultural Theory and Late Modernity* differentiates subculture and countercultures:

The subculture of the subordinate classes dealt with problems within their parental class culture and did not formulate any general critique of the dominant cultures middle class counterculture on the parent culture, providing them to attack central institutions on social and develop alternatives that went beyond the leisure sphere.(50)

Though there are, simply differences between subculture and counterculture their mission is to attack upon the mainstream culture. Formas opines that subculture and resistance is spilt between a cultural class struggle that is based on identification with the parents but counterculture resistance can develop opposition against parents more directly in to social critique.

Countering the parental culture has its own dreams and aims. Fred P Fecil, a cultural critic crudely sorts out the countercultural dreams and practices in three ways:

...those initially developed to counter the racism of dominant culture: those formed in opposition to its democratic character; and those formed in reaction against mainstream white culture inauthentic and psychologically unsatisfying way of life. Though only the last of these currents of resistance and revolt received the curse and blessing of the label.(133)

Countercultural visionaries became the consummate system of the 1960s. Many youths especially baby boom generation business and suburban conformity.

Homosexuality is sexual interest in and attraction to members of own sex. The term gay is frequently used as synonym for homosexual; female homosexuality is often referred to as lesbianism.

At different times and in different culture homosexual behavior has been variously approved off tolerated, punished, and banned. Though, homosexuality was common in ancient Greece, but in our twentieth century it has been taken as an sinful and queer activities in different society and culture. Different societies respond differently to homosexuality. In most of Africa, Asia, and Latin America both the subject and the behavior are considered taboo, with some slight exception made in urban areas.

Many people in religious groups recognize other people's rights to choose a same sex relationship, but also believe that same-sex relationship are incompatible with their chosen religious practices. They often attempt to use other state-sanctioned punitive measures to discourage homosexuality, short of death or imprisonment. This includes attempts to rescind domestic partnership benefits through anti-gay initiatives with broad language.

Groups not influenced by the Abrahamic religions have commonly regarded homosexuality as sacred or neutral, while the negative views of homosexuality have been limited to the Abrahamic religions. In the wake of colonialism and imperialism undertaken by countries of the Abrahamic faiths some non- Abrahamic religious groups have adopted new attitudes antagonistic towards homosexuality. For example, when India became part of the British Empire, sodomy laws were introduced; while

there was no basis for them in Hindu faith, this led to persecution of their society and religion. India still retains portions of these laws due to this past foreign influence. The experience was also repeated by other Abrahamic religious nations upon their acquisitions throughout Africa, Asia, and the Americas. The Roman Catholic Church requires homosexuals to practice chastity in the understanding that homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered and contrary to natural law. It insists that all are expected to only have heterosexual relations and only in the context of a marriage, describing homosexual tendencies as "a trial," and stressing that people with such tendencies must be accepted with respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Distinguishing between deep seated homosexual tendencies and those that are only the expression of a transitory problem, the Vatican requires that any homosexual tendencies must be clearly overcome at least three years before ordination to the diaconate. In brief, Hinduism has taken various positions, ranging from positive to neutral or antagonistic. Sikhism has no written view on the matter, but Sikh society is generally ultra masculine and conservative; toleration of any homosexual behavior or orientation is bound to meet outrage or strong disapproval. Confucianism has allowed homosexual sex with the precondition of procreation. Abrahamic religions have held various views of homosexuality, depending on place, time and form of same-sex desire. Islam regards love and desire for beautiful youths as a natural temptation for all men, but sexual relations as a transgression negatory of the natural role and aim of sexual activity.

Buddhism traditionally did not concern itself with the gender of the beloved. Contemporary Western Buddhists and many Japanese and Chinese schools hold very accepting views, something that is traditionally allowed when the relationship doesn't impede the birth of a child while other Eastern Buddhists since colonial times have

adopted attitudes that scorn the practice. Christianity has traditionally condemned deliberately non-procreative sex, and while attitudes have in some sectors been liberalized, the majority of denominations still view homosexual relationships as sinful. Judaism, depending on the movement, is either liberal, conservative, or neutral on the subject. The Orthodox tradition generally views homosexual sex as sinful and homosexual attraction as out of the norm, while reform and reconstructions are fully accepting of gay attraction and sex.

In the late 20th century, gay men and lesbians proudly revealed their sexual orientation in increasing numbers. Still others, notably those in the public eye had their sexual orientation revealed in media and against their will by activists either for or against gay rights- a controversial practice known as outing.

The manifestation of sexual orientation is subject to a considerable variability. Behavior that has been seen in the society is depended on the heterosexual construction and their behavior toward homosexual people. Regarding homosexuality one article says:

...it is common for homosexual individuals in hetero-normative societies to love, marry and have children with individuals of opposite sex, a practice that may be done primarily for social reasons in societies, which rejects same sex relations as a cover for ones orientation. These adaptations are forma of situational sexual behavior. A further and extremely common manifestation of situational sexual behavior involving sexual acts is seen in prisons, where individuals can only meet member of their own sex for long periods of time.

(Wilson 2)

Many scientists and ordinary people assume that there are two kinds of people in the world, homosexual and heterosexuals. However, the problem here is all of the heterosexual peoples behaviors are not confined in the same kind. One psychiatrist discussing the definitions of homosexuality has talked that- "I do not diagnose patients as homosexual unless they have engaged in overt homosexual behavior. Those who also engage in heterosexual activities are diagnosed as bisexual ... repetitive behavior in adulthood whether sporadic or continuous designates a homosexual"(qtd. in McIntosh 33).

In some society, there are some techniques to differentiate homosexual people from heterosexual. In the Mojave Indians of California and Arizona, there, male homosexuals were taken as 'alyha' and female homosexuals were to be said 'hawne'. People were believed to be born as alyha or hwane, hints of their mothers' dreams during pregnancy. If a young boy began to behave like a girl and take an interest in women's things instead of men's, there was an initiation ceremony in which he would become an alhya. After that, he dresses and acts like a woman would be referred to as 'she' and could take 'husbands'.

In England, homosexuality was there in seventeenth century but those people, who were attracted with the same sex, were not dared to expose them publicly. But they have done their activities somehow different than in present time American and western community. In *The Homosexual Role*, *Mary McIntosh* has written about their appointment and exposing that "it would be a pretty scene to behold them in their clubs and cables, how they assume the air and affect the name of Madam of Miss, betty or Molly, with a chuck under the chin and "oh bold pullet, I'll break your eggs"(qtd.in McIntosh 39).

With the beginning of the twentieth century, homosexuality was taken as ineradicable issue of human sexual possibilities. In each and every society, homosexuality was felt in different ways but it was apparent that homosexuality was there. Attitudes toward homosexual behavior are culturally specific, and have varied enormously across different culture in various historical periods. *Jeffery Weeks* has written in the 'Construction of Homosexuality' that homosexual behaviors are different in the context of social construction: "Physical acts might be similar, but their social implications are often profoundly different. In our culture homosexuality has become an excoriated experience, severely socially condemned at various periods and even today seen as a largely unfortunate minority form by a large percentage of the population"(42). Because of the degraded attitude toward homosexuals, it was taken as minor issue and sinful act in the western society even in the middle of the twentieth century. In the United States the first major male organization, founded in 1950-51, was the Mattachine society to represent the public masking of homosexuality. On the other hand, militant gay activism was also existed in America during 1960s. Britannica comments: "Militant gay activism can be dated to the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, when the Stonewall Inn, a gay bar in New York City's Greenwich Village, was raided by the police. Nearly 400 people were joined in a riot that lasted 45 minutes and resumed on succeeding nights"(155).

In the 1920s because of the ban on homosexuality, male prostitution was taken place in the United States. A small number of gay men also began to hire other gay men. Gay men regularly purchased sex from each other. As *Journal of Homosexuality* mentioned about male prostitution that "In New York city "well dressed" and "mannered" gay identified prostitutes worked in the Times Square as the rougher

looking straight man who offered themselves as "trade" but he suggests that the two groups had very little contrast with each other"(10).

According to this journal from the expanding numbers of heterosexual adolescent male prostitutes, a wave of antihomosexual law, in several European countries and the United States, was come in to existence. Concerned with the prevalence of youth prostitution, advocates in the United States successfully raised the legal age of sexual consent during these years, commonly pushing it from 10 to as low as 7 to an average about 14. Then, additional police scrutiny against homosexuality more generally followed during the First World War and a full fledged police crackdown was initiated from 1916 to 1920.

In the 1930s and 40s anti-gay wave of hysteria was across the United States. At that time media, police, and administration had done anti gay and homosexual activity with the assumption of homosexuality is a fiend activity. Kaye Kerwin writes:

Media and police focused tremendous national attention upon the sex fiends and "sexual psychopaths" who allegedly threatened both boy and girl children across the country. Pamphlets distributed in schools during the McCarthy period warned children to "keep together" and play alone, while boys in particular were told to never wait around in "toilets". While the sexual psychopath was not exclusively a gay figure, gay men as a group were identified as violent child molesters. ...most of the newly created 'peg houses' were shut down by the police and police roundups of gay men cruising the street became common, particularly after any child, anywhere, was indeed found to be murdered.(11)

From different document and law, there can be seen fiend activities toward homosexuality was diminished. But even on the half of the twentieth century and then after it as well homosexual activity was not exclusive and there was not freedom as they wanted. Police brutality, social boycott toward them was causes for the confinement in open sexual activity. They are bound to repress their desire because of the fear of the accusation of criminality and police brutality. On the other hand, social stigma was there more than legal situation for spreading of gay or lesbian sexual activity.

By the end of the nineteenth century, it is clear that modern male homosexual identity was beginning to emerge but it would be another generation before female sexuality reached a corresponding level of articulacy. The lesbian identity was much less clearly defined, and the lesbian subculture was minimal in comparison with the male and even more overwhelmingly upper class or literary. As Jeffery Weeks commented in *The Construction of Homosexuality* that "Berlin and Paris might have had their meeting places by the turn of the nineteenth century and there is clear evidence of coterie of literary lesbians such as those associated with the Paris Salon of Natalie Clifford Barney"(56).

Different writers of homosexuality write about the lesbian homosexuality. They wrote that the lesbian women were not so active but they made meeting in different place secretly. Lesbian women were met in the different night clubs and other restaurant. According to one chronicler who wrote about the lesbians says that most of them were shown defiantly "masculine appearance and manner"(Weeks 57). However lesbian activity was shown in the public place, there was not expansion of lesbian activities in the comparison of gay men we assume it from the absence of any legal regulation of lesbian behavior and a consequent absence of public pillorying and

scandal. The literature of that time also was affected by the lesbianism but the behavior what they have presented in the text was ambiguous. In the Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness*, the lesbian female character with masculine name Stephen, also presented in masculine behavior but another woman lesbian Mary in the end of the novel has choose heterosexual married life.

Because of the ideologies that were, prevailing in the society, women could not come publicly in a lesbian identity. From that, most women with lesbian inclinations fitted inconspicuously in to the general world of women. Though, the lesbianism is taken as sinful and unlawful activity even in the present context in different place some of the evidence shows that even in eighteenth and nineteenth century same sex relationship amidst women was there. Weeks comments:

... Relationships ranged from a close supportive of love of eternal sisters through adolescent enthusiasms to mature avowals of eternal affection. Many of the early writers on lesbianism spoke of the greater emphasis on cuddling on physical warmth and comforting, of kissing and holding hand between homosexuals at the expense of exclusively sexual activity. ... Deep and passionate declarations of love recur without any obvious sign of sexual expressions. (58)

There is no automatic relationship between social categorization and individual sense of self or identity. The meanings given to homosexual activities can vary enormously. They depend on a variety of factors: social class, geographical location, gender differentiation. But it is vital to keep in mind when exploring homosexuality, which has always been defined in our culture as a deviant form, that what matters is not the inherent nature of the act but the social construction of the meanings around that activity and the individual response to that. The striking feature of the 'history of

homosexuality' over the past hundred years or so is that the oppressive definition and the defensive identities and structures have marched together.

It is not debating issue that homosexual people are attracted toward same sexual people are erotic, emotional, and abnormal if we compare it with the heterosexual people. But regarding the prevailing heterosexual culture these people can not expose them as what they are. However, some of the elements are beneficial to identify them, as they are conspicuous of homosexuality. A number of potential sources for homosexual identification are readily discernable because they lie in the spheres of genitality and emotionality which are so closely identified with sexuality in this culture. Ken Plummer give an example as a response to be more clear on homosexuality that "... any actor who commits a genital act with eg masturbation with a member of the same sex, who develops a strong attachment to a member of same sex, or spends time daydreaming of his own sex in fictional encounters develops an apparent source for subsequent pondering over potential homosexuality"(70).

Sexologist also talked about the behavior of the homosexual people what they have presented toward the other people and their response with the object of same sex people. Different researches and studies show that if one is attracted toward the object of same sex his/her affinity toward homosexual might be more clear. If the person is male homosexual, he is attracted by the male sexual oriented things or objects. Plummer says: "An individual may become attached to, interested in or fascinated by a number of objects – penises, bottoms, football boots, and other male oriented objects which may subsequently come to symbolize his whole being as homosexual"(11).

If we talk about the symptom of the homosexual people from their childhood, they felt and variously. A child coming to see his bodily self as in some ways

inappropriate to the cultural definitions of his genders: a small frail, fragile boy may come to perceive himself as "not like other men," and go on from this belief to build up a definition of being homosexual. One can assume the symptom of homosexuality if one prefers to be alone, or the boy whose interest in the arts and literature finds himself distinguished marked from his football crazy, peers. Plummer has said about the symptom of homosexual male:

... four working class homosexuals interview revealed a highly sensitive childhood playing violins, visiting art museums, developing taste in threats, literature, and music, taking an interest in fashion and clothes, to an extent that seems strangely at odds with the traditional working class male culture in which they were brought up. They were all incidentally characterized by very slender and frail physical frame. (71)

Each source reinforces the abnormality of homosexuality and the normality of heterosexuality. By evasion or devaluation, the homosexual experience is always shown to be inferior. Barnes (1962: 166-7), by no means atypical defines homosexual act as abnormal sexual acts between two persons of the same sex, usually thought of as immoral. Homosexual must be regarded as compassionately. Many of them are suffering from a psychological disturbance and none of them can ever find the happiness of raising their own family. There are evidences that homosexuals have not, from a very early age, been able to accept their own sexuality. Consequently, they can not love a member of the opposite sex.

By the degradation and devaluation from the heterosexual society, homosexual people have isolations. There is isolation on the one hand from the lack of contact with other homosexual people, on the other hand from the lack of support from heterosexual companies. Lack of contact there is because homosexual people think

they are only themselves in the world and they (neophyte) feel that they many people are not so engaged in homosexuality. Devaluation of homosexuality and privatization of sexuality make extremely for the neophyte to find legitimate sexual expressions. Ken Plummer has brought a reference of a homosexual people in an interview in his essay that was taken by Westwood. In that interview, respondent commented, "I daren't mention it to anyone. It was very difficult in those days, until quite recently, I would not talk to anyone about it" (76).

By different evidences, it is not difficult to say that homosexuality is really a complex issue in the society not only in the past hut also in the present time. Yet there has been great changes occurred in our culture, many few people only dare to expose it to the society. Recently, of course, there has been an increase in organization developed to help homosexuals and to provide forums for discussion but in the past such sort of organization were not existed. In addition to the unavailability of others with whom one can talk about homosexual experiences there may also arise over time a gradual exclusion from homosexual contacts. Westwood's interview with homosexual people discloses that -"As his friends start to go out with girls and eventually marry, he finds other interests and gradually drifts away from their company. Not only then he is cut off from homosexual experiences and contact, he is slowly pushed from heterosexual ones" (qtd 76).

Law and psychiatry have continued to share the social control of homosexuality in the twentieth century. Until quite recently, the criminal law in almost all states continued to classify homosexual acts as felonies. According to the essay 'Capitalism Bureaucracy, Homosexuality', written by *David F Greenberg* and *Marcia c Bystryn* men convicted in the Boise, Idaho scandal in the mid -1950s were sent to prison for long periods, in one case with maximum sentence of life (100). At the same time

California have served sentences that were, on the average longer than sentences served for rape with serious injury to the victim just a few years ago, a survey of homosexuals conducted in a large American city found that 37 percent had been arrested at least once on sex related charges. In England, a major police drive against homosexuals was carried out in the 1950s, and decriminalization came only in 1967.

Even though homosexuality may not really be a threat to the female homosexuality is seen as symbolically standing for extra-marital relations, promiscuity precocious sexuality, and a rejection stereotypical gender roles. At a time when the conventional nuclear family is being destroyed by economic pressures that force the women to enter the paid labor force, the destruction of neighborhoods, feminism and the loss of parental authority, these broader associations that homosexuality evokes have become threatening, to middle aged middle-class women who can not easily take advantage of the career opportunities opening up for young college educated women.

In this 21st century homosexuality, has been arose as a normal issue rather than abnormal. However, some of Muslim and other religious organization have an attempt to resist it as a deviant form of human being and try to resist it. But with the flow organization of homosexuality and liberation movements advocate the homosexuality as a part of normal sexuality.

III. Male Homo Friendship in *The Professor's House*

Willa Cather's *The Professor's House* deals with the issue of homosexuality. By the distraction toward his family, his marital life and reminiscences of male friend Tom Outland, Professor St. Peter has spent his old age. By showing indifferent toward marital life and close relationship of male characters Willa Cather wants to give space of same sexual relationship. Though there are few female characters, they are not seemingly close but the male characters have so close affinity in each other. In the absence of Tom Outland Professor St. Peter feels sick like homosexual people and goes for diagnosis but doctor has found no sickness..

In *The Professor's House* Godfrey St Peter, and Mrs. Lillian are husband and wife, their conjugal life is disturbed by the arrival of student Tom Outland. When Tom Outland has entered in the Professor's family disintegration in the family has been started. It grows day by day and at last, Professor has spent his old age in the old house which is left by his family. At the same time his wife with her son- in-law are enjoying in the summer tour of France. When his wife Lillian and son-in- law ask him to join the tour St. Peter has refused without any suitable reason. On the one hand there is a Professor's recollection of Tom Outland, a male friend and on the other hand wife's flirtation with son in law has been explicitly given in the third section of the novel. In the same section professor says his whole married life, his family relation are all consequently happened and these all are mundane. Third section begins and ends in the reminiscent of Tom Outland and his affection toward him after his arrival. Here it can be felt that his desire is to stay alone in the old house and wants far away from his married life. By giving this male affection toward male, Willa Cather gives the space of same sex relationship or homosexuality in the novel.

A lot of textual evidences can be taken to prove *The Professor's House* is a novel that endorses the homosexuality. On the one hand, deep relationship between Professor Godfrey St Peter and Tom outland and on the other hand the breakdown between St Peter and his wife is the main evidence that novel affirms homo friendship between male character. Willa Cather, as a narrator says about the breakdown of their relationship:

He had been almost a member of the family for two years, and she had never found fault with the boy. But after the professor began to take Tom up to the study and talk over his work with him, began to make companion of him then Mrs. St. Peter withdrew her favor. (151)

By her own narration, she wants to raise homosexuality or male spaces in the novel.

The queerness of Cather's text is manifest in at least three primary ways: first in their massive resistance to compulsory heterosexuality as a social institution; second in their deployment of model of character that destabilizes the connection between biological sex and sociological gender; and third, in their persistent, if quiet celebration of same sex relationships. These three points are overlapped and complexly connected.

From her first novel *Alexander's Bridge*, (1912) to her last *Sapphira* and the *Slave Girl*, (1940), marriage –the most visible sign of compulsory heterosexuality as a social institution- is depicted in Cather's fiction as coercive and corrosive, a structure erected primarily to regulate desire by ensuring that focus through proper channels. Marriage generally succeeds, however, not in regulating desire but in cruising it, twisting it or forcing it into improper channels outside of marriage. In *Alexander's Bridge*, *O Pioneers!*, and *A Lost Lady* infidelity is the result of disappointment in

marriage, and in the first two cases adultery leads directly to death. In *My Antonia*, *One of Ours*, and *The Professor's House*, such disappointment leads to estrangement, but it is also tied to the profound anguish that marks the three male protagonists of these tales. Godfrey St. Peter, of *The Professor's House*, seems to speak for the whole miserable gang when he remarks shortly before nearly dying of asphyxiation, that his whole adult life "his career, his wife, his family were not his life at all, but a chain of events which had happened to him. All these things had nothing to do with the person, he was in the beginning" (240).

We can say that the dissatisfaction of Cather's middle aged characters and their tendency to reject their tendency to reject their adults selves as inauthentic in comparison to their childhood selves. Rather than reading these characters as represented homosexuals, it is better to see them as vehicles for Cather's relentless critique of the regime of heterosexuality, a regime maintained, as St. Peter notes, through strong enforcement of the penalties and responsibilities one incurred in becoming a lover- St Peters term for the "secondary social man" (240), he became by participating in the rituals of courtship, marriage and family making. St. Peter's longing to reconnect with "Kansas boy" he describes as the original unmodified Godfrey St. Peter" also ties him to point about the queerness of Cather's texts, for his longing for a fluidity and freedom from constraint typically associated with gender instability in her fiction .*The Professor's House*, a novel tracking the triangulations between an elder male, his young pupil and that pupil's lost friendship with an intimate cowboy is "sensually whitemanesque"(105) far from hidden from history, cather's male centered appear to voice an urban homosexual cultural idiom.

It is no doubt that novel focuses too much on manly heterosociability as a narrative goal, and emphasizes too little the gorgeous homofriendship that Tom

Outland renounces on the Blue Mesa after his traveling companion, Roddy Blake, leaves him in the Southwestern lurch. Tom has internalized the national sexuality as heterosexual and prolifically productive. Likewise St. Peter exemplifies little more than heterosexual manhood.

The codes of gay friendship in Cather are all too transparent. Homosexuality manifests itself repeatedly through her male bonds and the novels themselves become something of an insider's tour guide to early twentieth-century gay and lesbian life and language. The Professor and his pupil instead sign a Faustian pact with national manhood that enables both men to relish the cultural and economic privileges of heterosociability.

A closer inspection of *The Professor's House*, however, reveals that the professor and his pupil insistently refuse to choose between friendly urban gay subcultures and an increasingly national heterosexual society, but not for lack of historical imagination. To tweak one of Cather's more famous phrases, they reconstruct a queer friendship after the sexual world broke into two. The moment that Tom Outland walks into Godfrey St. Peter Midwestern life "came in at the green door that led from the street" the professor marvels at the Tom's "sandy hair", the "reddish brown of his face" and the boys' "fine looking" physique (95).

Given that he had observed women so closely all his life, it is quite clear that Godfrey's calculated interest in Tom suggests something other than heterosexual manhood. But it is also apparent that their quick bond doesn't register as the homosexual lining of the heterosexual as well as the homosexual irritant to the heterosexual. It is instead something more and something less than an identitarian riposte. It is as Godfrey puts it years later "a stroke coming, his strange coming, his story, his devotion, his early death and posthumous fame- it as fantastic"(233).

This male- male relation proves to be fantastically beyond sexual coherence, it paradoxically begins as utter cliché, a brilliantly uncultivated student-a diamond from the southwestern rough looks to an accomplished scholar for intellectual guidance, a chance to study at university. The boy's talents with Latin immediately impress Godfrey, and the professor commits his encourages to Outland to ensure him a place at Hamilton's university. But what starts off as a rather staid teacher-student relationship becomes something vaguely more, something that Godfrey's wife almost notes almost despite herself after she first sets eyes on Tom "well, he is something new in students, Godfrey. We ask a poor perspiring tramp boy to lunch to save pennies, ... and he departs leaving princely gifts"(121).

Here, the nature of these "princely gifts"- the nature of Outland's legacy in a moment will be disused. How this initial pedagogical relationship operates as an irritant not only heteronormativity, but also to a discernable hetero or homosexual identity and now it radically disrupts the cultivated stability of the modern middle class family. After Tom leaves the St. Peter household and dies in the First World War, Godfrey notes without self reproach the unique nature of their improbable friendship. The Professor recalls: "He had had two romances, one of the heart which had filled his life for many years and a second of the mind – of the imaginations. Just when the morning brightness of the world was wearing off for him, along came Outland, and bought him a second youth" (234). Though, Outland's studies, long after they had ceased to be pupil and master, he had been able to experience afresh things that had grown dull with use

As Godfrey reminds himself, the student – teacher dynamic that initially structured their relationship eventually waned and what remained long after was a

passionate friendship that was anything but an open homosexual secret, especially since it occurred within the domain of the family.

While this new alliances between two men are structured perhaps even facilitated by the heterosexual family, it also disrupts this developing institution. As Lillian later tells her husband "it was not the children who come between us" (94). It can be saying that Outland is the mysterious stranger who once appeared bearing lavish gifts for the family and who then estranged the St. Peter daughters, as well as parents from each other. It's how these gifts are interpreted or misinterpreted that so disrupts the bonds of heterosexual domesticity in *The Professor's House* for Lillian and her two daughters who are each invested in materialism and who delight in shopping Speers, Tom brings then precious turquoise stones, gifts of jewellery that appear to signify the potential for heteronormative courtship, especially since Outland is single, sun-kissed, and well-hot. For these women, Tom's gifts are unabashedly read as a part of what Godfrey denounces in a history lecture as the new commercialism or what previously described as the new historical entity known as leisurely heterosexuality. Thus while Tom treasures the stone because jewellers have not tampered with them and made them look green". Mrs. St. Peter remarks: "They are worth a lot of money"(120). For Lillian the worth metonymically symbolizes what she hopes to be Tom's future worth within the family.

Tom's gifts to St. Peter, however is more preciously abstract, so much so that it adamantly remains outside the new commercialism of heterosexuality. Despites Lillian's commands, the boy sees his gifts as foreign to the socioeconomic heterosexual culture or as he tells the St. Peter family, "I never sell them. They were given to me by a friend Roddy Blake" (103).

As Tom hints another, lavish gift that the tramp boy bears another reading of the stones, is what they come to symbolize for Godfrey: the pleasure of a male friendship beyond the lackluster reality of his material life. As St. Peter informs his daughter Rosamond when the two reminisce about Tom, "bond with him was social, and it follows the laws of society and they are based on property. Mine wasn't and there is not material clause in it"(63).

Godfrey's firm announcement against the heterosocial imperatives appear to confirm that the novel's great argument is heterosexual relations is purely economic. Yet St. Peter's and Tom's strange relations are a perfectly mystified counterpoint to the unrelenting economics of compulsory heterosexual marriage. It is hesitation to read Godfrey's alternative bond with Tom as crystal clear homosexual yearnings. In place of investments of heterosexual marriage which elsewhere Godfrey terms a "picturesque shipwreck" (79) we find the Professor and his student embrace what appear to be a remarkably indefinable and quite leisurely friendship. Over the course of several years, the two embark on this unlikely companionship, one that fails to confirm to either homosexual subculture or nationalized heterosexual domesticity. Under one roof they study, eat, and banter together. They also swim together daily, and eventually become traveling companion much like Cather and Edith Lewis, (life-long female friend of the novelist) did on their trip on the Southwest in 1912 and 1915. Two years after Tom's graduation, we are told, "they took the copy of Graces' manuscript that the professor had made from the original in Spain and went down into the southwest together. The next summer Tom went to the professor to Old Mexico. They had planned third together, in Paris, but it never came off"(235). What the two manage to carve out in early 1980s: "a way of life that can be shared among individuals of different age, status, and social activity. It can yield intense relations

not resembling those that are institutionalized" (139) that are according to Godfrey uninformed by "the laws of society" (138).

St. Peter finds that "had had no friends in Hamilton of whom Lillian could possibly be jealous. Until Tom Outland came along, so well fitted by nature and early environment to help him with his work "on the Spanish Adventure" (50). To his dismay, Godfrey also finds that, unlike Tom "friendship was not a matter of habit with Lillian"(151).She is instead deeply invested in heterosexuality, on that she repeatedly performs with her son in laws." yes, with her son-in law she had had begun the game of being a woman all over again", Godfrey surmises "she dressed for them planned for them, schemed in their interests. She had begun to entertain more than for years past- the new house made a plausible pretext and use to use her influence and charm in the little anxious social world of Hamilton" (79).

The professor however has little desire to participate within the professional rituals of a domesticated heterosexual culture that Lillian and her family earnestly cultivate." Lillian's coquetry with her son in law amused him," he finds later: "with Louie, Lillian seems to be lunging into a new career, and Godfrey began to think that he to under his own wife very little" (63). Neither does Tom care for these social games: "he enjoyed the prettiness and freshness and gaiety of the little girls as if they were flowers," rather than erotic bodies" (106). Under the auspices of intense studies, the two instead hole themselves up in an attic, take supreme delight in their new alliances and cultivate an intellectual world of alternative domesticities well beyond the proper protocols of a national manhood or a marriage plot.

Though Lillian tacitly disapproves of this relationship for several years, it is only when Tom's and Godfrey's relationship exceeds the boundaries of teacher-student. When the two men become more than study buddies that she announces her

puzzled disdain for this romance and "becomes positively cruel in her contempt" (164). While Godfrey comes to understand his wife very little, that is to say, Lillian comes to understand her husband and his relations with Tom even less. The narrator notes:

It was not until Outland was a senior that Lillian began to be jealous of him. He had been almost a member of the family for two years and she had never fault with the boy. But after the professor began Tom up to the study of talk over his work with him, began to make a companion of him, then Mrs. St. Peter withdrew her favor. She could change like that; friendship was not a matter of habit with her. (151)

Unlike son-in-law Louie Marsellus and McGregor, Tom Outland appears to have little investment in the increasingly entrenched rituals bourgeois heterosociability, even though he is already almost part of the family. In fact the narrative refusal to mention Tom's courtship of Rosamond, even though Outland's will incite years of conflict between the two daughters. The ongoing marriage plot effectively becomes nothing hared for two men in *The Professor's House* or better like the male protagonists, Cather has no interest in marriage. In lieu of narrative that starts with a walk down the aisle and then enfolds through the mini-dramas of everyday life, we are instead presented with a productively antisocial male space admittedly devoid of women, but also indifferent to the social imperatives of heterosexual production.

And it is Godfrey's and Tom's capacity to move beyond commonplace institutional parameters and modern sexual posts and into a historically anachronistic friendship that so chafes Lillian. Though she cannot raise her finger on why, she finds that she "began to be jealous of Tom Outland"(150). Both Outland and St. Peter sense this and intuitively recognize their queer novelty as well as Lillian's disdain:

The young man must have felt the change in her for, for he began the winter to make his work a pretext for coming to the house less often. He and St. Peter now met in the alcove behind the Professor's lecture room at the university. (152)

What the two clandestine men relish in an attic and in a room Lillian almost unconsciously senses, is a sanctioned intimacy that historically was fast becoming impermissible for middle class males and females at the turn of the century and throughout the 1920s. But thanks to her growing displeasure with their relation (withdrew her favor) the two males are forced to withdraw as well and what begins as a move within the middle class family soon peoples both the boy and the older man outside its parameters: away from the domestic homestead, into the romanticized regional spaces of the southwest and Midwest.

The unpredictable dip into unspeakable pleasure a romance of the male minds- is not, however, the only way to outland as a tramp boy when Tom first makes his appearance to the St. Peter household. This indescribably special relationship a friendship that St. Peter "will not have translated into the vulgar tongue" (50) – so distresses his wife because it also ruptures middle class ideals of sexuality recuperates cross class, cross generational contact between an American youth and his elder with minor alterations it reintroduces previous modes of male relationally foreign to the modern Anglo- American bourgeois homestead

Godfrey and Tom Outland, both of them disdain for the commercialism of middle class heterosociability, and its important to see how the professor romantically links it back to what he perceives to be lost tradition of male contact prior to the historical advent of a hetero/homo binary. Tom is after all a tramp boy, who promotes a classical ideology of remarkable friendship initially foreign to the St. Peter

household. Hence Tom's embedded story in *The Professor's House* one that divides "The Family" from "The Professor" in the novel fractured narratives triptych about his broken bond on the Blue Mesa.

Meeting in Pardee, New Mexico, the two working-class railroad workers immediately forge a passionate bond that foreshadows the Outland-St. Peter dyad:

From that night, Blake and me were fast friends. He was the sort of fellow who can do anything for somebody else and nothing for himself. There are lots like that among working. They are not trained by success to a sort of systematic selfishness He surely got to think a lot of me and I did of him. He ought to have had boys of his own to look after.

(164)

Such selfless regional fellowship, Tom also finds, radically opposes the heterosocial middle class bonds that seems so petty and so slavish and that the boy finds "all wrong for me"(175).

As the symbolic side of the unspoken relationship between Tom and Roddy it is the Blue Mesa that make gorgeous their homo-romance. This is not to say that in itself that traces of romance cannot be read in Tom and Roddy's relationship. It can be seen in the way in which Tom reports himself entranced by this surely stranger in their midst: "I had been interested in this fellow ever since he came on our division; he was closed mouth and unfriendly"(169) drawn back in fascination to rescue him from a poker game threatening to turn nasty or in the scene in which he follows him from behind to his room where he strips him of the gold pouring out of his pocket and lying around his hips. Finally seeing to the money being safely deposited in a bank that this friendship is reciprocated is evident in the reversal that follows, as Roddy

quits his job for Tom, does his work for him, finally selling the curious and setting up an account in Tom's name so that he will be afford to go to college. It shows that their deep intimacy that transcends the simple friendship between male and male. They become a pair of boys, age difference erased by fraternity and friendship in an all male family in which Henry Atkins does their cooking, cleaning, and interior decoration. From the start, Tom is drawn to Roddy by his strong silence, and they bond together over the unspoken mystery of the Mesa. When Roddy turns it in to cash, making the vulgar translation, the rift is opened cash the Mesa a social site and one couched in terms of property and possession.

It must be remarked how transitory that exultant moment of possession is; Tom remains haunted by the need to make restitution to Roddy; indeed this sense of guilt has been passed on to the professor and to the family who keep up the search for Roddy. When Rossie and Kathleen Play Tom and Roddy they play a version o relationship, in which Roddy was "noble. He was always noble, noble Roddy!"(106). It is of course the Roddy that Tom has depicted for them. His betrayal of Roddy is perhaps a deeper betrayal than Roddy's for Roddy had treated the relics as things to be sold for the sake of friend insisted on a penalty of symbolic meanings many of them, as he admits invented on the spot to place the mesa and the ruins above their relationship.

This excruciating moment in the story anything but adequately described as "nothing very incriminating, nothing very remarkable; a story of youthful defeat, the sort of thing a boy is sensitive about until he grows older"(155,) suggests the double life of this text, divided between the gorgeous Mesa romance and the relations between characters. The cue to this double ness is explicit into the "two lives"(19) of the professor, the division between his teaching and writing that only begins to name

the divides between his upstairs and his downstairs life, between Tom and his family, between past and present with its strong homo and hetero cleavages. But even more to the point is the function of the double life as a recognizable term for gay life in the opening decades of the twentieth century.

Having lives a 'rough life' outside the confines of the metropolis, Tom wants instead to remain one of the roughs, to inhabit a lifeless institutionalized " a free life where he can breath free air" (136) . Given his second infatuation with Outland, Godfrey wholeheartedly agrees. He is delighted that Tom has imported an alternative mode of friendship in to the suffocating middle class spaces of Hamilton. St. Peter romantically imagines:

This logical result of Tom's strange bringing –up and his early associations that there is he knew, this dream of self sacrificing friendship and disinterested love down among the day laborers, the men who run the railroad trains and boats and reapers and thrashers and mine-drills of the world. And Tom had brought it along to the university. (151)

In Godfrey's fantasy, what Tom brings to the university and into the professor's life is a friendship between dissimilar comrades that fails to gel into a recognizable sub-cultural idiom.

Since Godfrey casts Tom early male-male associations as a dreamy salvation from sexual institutions, it might help explain why we find the professor lifting his heavy sharply up twisted eyebrows when his son-in-law Louie announces his plan to turn Outland into a publicized ideal by naming his new house after the tramp boy.

When pressed to translate Tom's value into something whose worth can be understood in terms of middle class ideals, St. Peter can only reiterate:

And there can be no question one money between me and Tom Outland. I cannot explain just how I feel about it, but it would somehow damage my recollection of him, would make that episode in my life commonplace like everything else. And that would be a great loss to me. I'm purely selfish in refusing your offer; my friendship with Outland is the one thing I will not have translated in to vulgar tongue.

(50)

Instead of sexual legibility, Godfrey refuses to institutionalize to properly name the relational gifts that the boy has brought. He cannot and he firmly refuses to explain a bond that is utterly unlike everything else that he knows since his friendship with Tom fits no contemporary pattern. Refusing translation in to a recognizable sub cultural idiom the professor desires only "this dazzling, this beautiful, this utterly impossible thing"(25) that nevertheless thrived for several years.

To everyone's surprise (Godfrey's included), "this passionate thing continues well after Tom's death, Godfrey further draws himself away from his family and shuts himself away from everybody"(162). He exacts himself from the rituals of one heterosexual homestead, and refuses to move into house that he begrudgingly brought with the prize money won for his Spanish Adventures in North America. Refusing intimate interaction with his wife and daughters, He now thinks himself "a bachelor again" and "settled down to a leisurely bachelor life"(150). "Insulted from the engaging drama of domestic life" he then brings his work out of the attic and into the garden, where he is reminded of his friendship with Tom. "And it was there", Godfrey reminisces, "he and Tom Outland used to sit and talk half through the warm soft

night"(15). What should be clear by now is that Godfrey has never incorporated Tom into a homosexual awakening; he is anything but stereotypical gay husband who realizes his true calling only after the wedding bells have rung.

Near the novel close, the professor's unexpected romance of the imagination propels him toward an even queerer of the comradeship. With his family in absentia, a solitary Godfrey begins to take up another fantastic alliance between another boy and an elder male himself. It can be read this odd alliance as part and parcel of a deep, perhaps suicidal depression or as a failure of imagination. St. Peter loses his place in the human family, because finally all he can love is a dead boy. However, it is more productive to view Godfrey's half awake state insight of his previous sexual rejections:

He had no twilight stage. But now this half awake loafing with his brain as if it were a new sense, arriving late like wisdom teeth. He found he could like on his sand-spit by the lake for hours and watch the seven motionless pines drink up the sun. In the evening after dinner, he could sit idle and watch the stars. With the same immobility. He was cultivating a novel mental dissipation and enjoying a new friendship. Tom Outland had not come back again through the garden door (As he had so often done in dreams!), but another boy had: the boy the professor had long ago left behind in Kansas, in the Solomon Valley- the original unmodified Godfrey St. Peter.(239)

This boy and he had meant, back on those on far away days, to live some sort of life together and to share good and bad fortune. ... After he met Lillian Ornsley, St Peter forgets that boy had ever lived:

But now that the vivid consciousness of an earlier state had come back to him, the professor felt that that life with Kansas boy, little as there had been of it, was the result of his lives, and that all the years in between had been accidental and ordered from the outside. His career, his wife, his family were not his life at all, but chain of events which had happened to him. (240)

Though Godfrey had previously wondered if there was no way but Medea's, he here finds an escape from the social imperatives of a historicized sexual identity. Daydreaming by the lake he sings a song of his self ("I lean and loaf at my ease"), and he loses his present life with Lillian and his daughters. But on this sand-pit he also recuperates a regional friendship with his young Kansas self, one filled with "more space and mystery" than modern Anglo-American sex-gender systems typically permit (69). Like his grandfather and namesake Napoleon Godfrey, St. Peter too goes about lost in profound, continuous meditation, though he never leaves his house. Cheating on his wife not with a person but with an idea, enraptured by this imaginative, unproductive immobility, and he throws himself outside his domesticated self. Though distanced from Outland by death, he ventures yet again into another regional space to cultivate queer cross-generational alliance with a young boy. Like his bond with Tom, this companionship one recalled from those faraway days- again pitches him past the marriage plot and into an earlier state prior to the dawning of sexual binary.

By renouncing his current life, he turns his back on the design of the historical present, as well as his sense of historical awareness, which he finds was a result of the high pressure of young manhood. Books he now notes with dismay were born as well as daughters. Like the warped narrative structure of *The Professor's House*, Godfrey

consequently abandons the teleological advancements of both a progressive career and progressive sexual identity to recuperate a love that dose lose his sexual identity. As a result, he punctures this temporal moment to paradoxically arrive late like wisdom teeth in order to go back to a phantasmagoric earlier time. Thrust beyond the present waste of his life, he gives himself another chance outside of a historicized sexual identity, one where chance "swept away ... time itself and returned with friendly male contact" (236).

Refusing any discernable identity that might all under the rubric of "the lover" Godfrey instead relishes within himself the historical outmoded romances that Tom brought from the Southwest and enjoys the comradeship of the Midwestern queer youth who was forgotten over the years. Which is also to say that Godfrey new founded friendship with his lad cultivates an indifference to the claim of events that currently surrounded him. "He did not regret his life but he was indifferent to it"(243) such historical falling out, the narrator narrates notes without judgement, quickly takes on national and even global repercussions. It seemed, we are told to "to mean falling out of his place in the human family, indeed" (250). Absenting himself from "the world of men and women", he tells himself that "he had never married never been a father"(241). In a moment often misread as a failure of imagination, Godfrey diversifies himself from the present and recommends some sort of life with the boy he once was, rather than the married man he forced himself to become (240).

This slow space of self recovery, the professor stresses, has no desire for "a name in the world"(243). It means to participate in an early century national manhood and instead enables him to surpass the plots of sexual maturity in order to drop out of the social much like a lost Roddy Blake. Thus Godfrey once a public spirited citizen, of Hamilton imagines that he, like his friend Tom, sidesteps the imperatives of "the

town and the state" (244). For Tom St. Peter notes with pride, "had escaped all that he had made, something new in the world and the rewards, the meaningless conventional gestures, he had made left to others"(237). As Godfrey patterns himself from after Outland from after Outland in direct reversal of the teacher student dynamic, he too finds that he has made something new from something old and something borrowed: a novel mental dissipation and a new friendship" with another Midwestern male.

When Tom designates Blake's care for him as a sad substitution he is pointing up the novels self contradictory spasmodic tendency, for substitutions are everywhere as models for desire and relation between Blake and Outland, between the professor, for who Tom replaces his wife in the happy family of the Mesa, where Henry substitutes happily for female domestic functions. There is a further series of hetero-social substitutions whereby, for example Louie is Rosamond's substitute for Tom, and Scott is Kathleen while Louie substitutes for the professor for his wife, but it is only homosocial register that these substitutions are uneasy enough for disavowal, death and erasure to be necessary. Desire in the heterosexual world becomes apparently inevitably a debased form of commodification and thus can be regretted but need not be disavowed. But desire for Tom on the part of the professor is both valuable and dangerous precisely because as the professor says "it is not material but outside the laws of society" (240).

Homosexuality was taken as a sickness in the society when this novel was published in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Those people who have homosexual symptoms they were gone to the doctor and check about their sickness. But the doctor response was that they were not inflicted by any disease. Some case has happened in the case of *The Professor's House's* main character Godfrey St.

Peter. When he was alone in his old house he has felt like a disease affect him and called the family Doctor Dudley:

The family doctor knows all about St. Peter. It was summer moreover, and he had plenty of time. He devoted several mornings to the Professor and made tests of the most searching kind. In the end he of course told St Peter was nothing matter wit him.

What made you come to me any discomfort or pain?

"None. I simply feel tired all the time". (244)

From doctor's checking, he has no any diseases. But he has felt discomfort in the absence of his homosexual friend. As homosexual people's loneliness and tiredness St. Peter feel that but doctor, response is he has not affected by any disease. In the response, doctor said "enjoy doing nothing"(244) suggest that he has not affected by any disease, there is only necessity of enjoying and making companion. In further paragraph, it clearly seems that he has affected by the diseases which he cannot disclose with doctor. St. Peter says after the doctor absence "he did not mention to Dr Dudley the real reason for his asking for a medical examination" (245). By this of St. Peter we can find that he has a disease which he cannot disclose with Dr Dudley might be homosexual desire. Because of his homosexual desire, he has not a feeling of married life and a father of his children. He doesn't have courage of being a father and husband of his wife.

He seemed to be at the root of the matter; Desire under all desires, truth under all truths. He seemed to know, among other things, that he was solitary and must always be so' he had never married never been a father. He was earth and would return to earth. (241)

Professor St. Peter is worried about his present life. He doesn't have a feeling of he has a life. He wants to be died soon or mixed to the earth. When he was alone in his old house, he felt about his life and came in to conclusion that this heterosexual world can not be beneficial to him.

In the third section of the novel 'The Professor's House' professor St. Peter most of the time was alone in his old house and think about his total life. When Mr. Louie Marsellus and his wife were in the summer vacation of France, he has lived there with the Tom Outland diary which was written in the Blue Mesa, in discovery period. At that time, he has thought about his relation and life to his family but found nothing. He has not confession in the inability of visiting France with wife but confessed on the death of Tom Outland in the First World War and they will not able to visit France in the next summer what they have committed in the past:

To this day St. Peter regretted that he had never got that vacation in Paris with Tom Outland. He wanted to have revisited certain spots with him: to go with some autumn morning to the Luxemburg Gardens ... had not chance, in one great catastrophe, sweat away all youth and all palms, and almost time itself. (236)

In his old house only he thinks about his pastimes with Tom Outland and wants to forget his wife and relation with his family. He is so fuss with his wife, he said that he does not want to live together even after their death life.

He used to feel that if his wife could but lie in the same coffin with him, his body would not be so insensible that the nearness of hers would not give it comfort. ... Just now, he could not live with them. He could not

live with his family again not even with Lillian. Especially not with Lillian. (248)

He doesn't want to live with his wife after coming back from their vacation tour. He wants to be alone. By his wife's, accompany he feels disturbance in his life. This sort of behavior is related to homosexual people who can not enjoy with their wife and are not attracted from opposite sex.

On the one hand, he wants to forget his marital life with Lillian and on the other hand, he doesn't forget his friend Tom Outland and his physical beauty: "What would have come in his blue eye, in his fine long hand with back springing thumb ..." (139).

Before St. Peter's contact with Tom Outland their life is a bit better than his present. But when they meet and become closer, Professor St. Peter forgets all of his heterosexual life. He engages with him and forgets his marital life. And in his later part of life he was fully conscious about his life and his inner desire and feels that his relation with his life is meaningless. His heterosexual life which he has adopted is totally mistake: he sat at his desk with bent head, reviewing his life, trying to see where he had mistake, to account for the fact that he now wanted to run away from everything"(251).

St. Peter has forgotten his friends even in his dreams. He remembers his friend Tom Outland so much that in the dreams he has entered his house through the garden door. He recalls: "Tom Outland had not come back again through the garden door [as he has so often done in dreams!]" (239).

People's sexuality is determined in the period of adolescence what their sexual interest in their life is. From 10 to 15 age is a period that determined what will their

sexual interest in the future. Professor St. Peter was conscious about his sexual desire in his adolescence that can be glimpsed through the narration of Cather: "the Professor knew of course that adolescence grafted a new creature in to the original one, and that the complexion of a man's life was largely determined by how well or ill his original self and his nature as modified sex rubbed on together"(242).

When he is recalling about his past in the old house, with suspicion that his grandfather also had the symptom of homosexuality. It is tacitly said by narrator in the novel. "... he how it had happened to him, and he suspected it had happened to his grandfather. He did not regret his life but he was indifferent to it. It seemed to him like the life of another person" (243).

Homosexual theory talks about the heterosexual people's conception toward homosexual is always unnatural and toward heterosexual is natural. That case has been happened in the case of Professor St. Peter as well in the novel. Lillian accused his husband as unnatural and her son-in-law is natural. Narrator notes:

Many people admired her but Louie more than most. That worldliness, that willingness to get the most out of occasions and people, which had developed so strongly in Lillian in the last few years, seemed to Louie as natural and proper as it unnatural to Godfrey. ... St. Peter had liked it too. (140)

By the strange behavior of St. Peter Godfrey Lillian has flirted with her son-in-law and accused him as unnatural. Because of his inability to maintain their conjugal relationship she accused him as unnatural and St. Peter also agrees her wife's accusation. By the close affinity between Tom Outland and St. Peter Godfrey, the latter has forgotten his wife. He doesn't care Lillian. Once when they are in their

apparent Louie kisses her wife but the Professor is indifferent about this scene:

"Louie kissed both the ladies (Rosamond, his wife, and Lillian mother-in-law) to express his satisfaction. ... He [professor] was very glad to have windows on the lake". He doesn't care about the kisses but enjoy with the beauty of lake.

Professor is attracted so much in the physical beauty of Tom Outland. When Tom gives turquoises, a blue green precious stone to the daughters of St. Peter he hold them and described the beauty of hand in following way:

[...] looking down not at the hand that hold them; the muscular many lined palm that hold them: the straight little finger, the flexible beautifully shaped thumb that curved back from the rest of the hand as if it were its own matter. What a hand! He could see it yet with the blue stones ling in it. (103)

From these lines anyone explain that the Professor is not attracted by the precious stone but by the hand of Tom Outland what held them as homosexual people who like to appreciate the physical beauty of same sex people. Novelist also in her narration shows some clue of their homosexual behavior in the story. According to homosexual theorist in the threats of the heterosexual culture, homosexual people are taken as stranger: "in a moment the stranger was gone and the St. Peter family sat down and looked at one another"(103). By this question narrator addressed him as an abnormal or stranger not a normal people.

"Stranger" and "gay" like words are repeated regularly in the novel. When Tom Outland has told about the enjoying of moment between he and his friend, Roddy Blake, to the daughters of St. Peter they say their friendship like gay adventure: "Kathleen and Rosamond regarded his freelance childhood as a gay adventure they

would gladly have shared"(105). And the other hand narrator says "gay dresses hanging in his study room"(107). Gay word can be applying as well as in joyful moment where the people are happy but here she might speak this word because of their close friendship. They sleep together on the same bed, Roddy Blake has left his good job to give accompany to his friend and they are always together in cattle gazing and riding of Blue Mesa. Kathleen says," he (Roddy Blake) gave up a fine job firing on the Santa Fe and went off with Tom to ride after cattle for hardly any wages just to be with Tom and Take care of him . . (105).

Considering with these textual evidences of the novel no one can put it, distance from homosexuality.

IV. Conclusion: Affirmation of Gay Space

Willa Cather's *The Professor's House* deals with the issue of homosexuality. The work explores homosexuality by illustrating human relations. The male characters have homosexual bonds. Especially the protagonist, Godfrey St. Peter and his student are so closed that the marital life of the Godfrey disintegrates. In the absence of his male partner, St. Peter feels sick, and finally, calls the doctor for diagnosis, but no disease is found.

Homosexuality was taken as a sinful and criminal act in the twentieth century as well. Heterosexual people were taken as natural, usual, straight, and social, and on the other side, homosexual activity was taken as unnatural, deviant, and unusual. So, since the novel deals with homosexuality it affirms unusual, unnatural male spaces from the traditional perspectives.

Attraction of male's body toward male body, physique, and male's attraction toward male's object, and disintegration in the previous heterosexual life are some evidences that reflect the world of homosexuality in the novel.

Before the advent of Tom Outland in the family there is bit good relation, but after that it does not remain in same condition. When Tom Outland entered in their family disintegration in their marital life begins. Earlier Lillian wanted to find out why the professor has not cared of family but later on, she herself becomes frustrated and begins to flirt with the son- in -law Louie Marsellus. In the later part of the novel, Louie Marsellus and his mother-in-law go to France to mark the summer vacation but St. Peter spends his time remembering his student Tom Outland and annotates his diary. He feels lonely in the absence of Tom Outland and vows that he will not feel comfort to live with his wife even after the death. On the other hand, Tom outland,

his friend Roddy Blake and their cook Henry's relation is also not distanced from queer affinity. On the course of discovery of Blue Mesa, Henry plays the role of female of cooking and as domestic workers they used to sleep in a single bed.

Since the novel presents homosexuality, it disavows the prevalent norms, values, and tenets of heterosexual culture or it counterattacks to the prevalent heterosexual society. This novel has been written in the 1920s. Even in the middle of the twentieth century, McCarthy period, there was propaganda in America to abolish the homosexuals. Beside it with the beginning of the twentieth century was more complex to the homosexual people. Prosecution for sodomy was increased from 1880s to the 1920s; wave of new homosexual laws in several European countries and United States marked the final quarter of the nineteenth and first quarter of the twentieth century. Additional police scrutiny against homosexuality more generally followed during First World War and a full fledged police crackdown was initiated from 1916 to 1920. Since homosexuality was explicitly banned in the western countries, Willa Cather had dared to raise her finger in the favor of homosexuality implicitly.

By raising the homosexuality in her novel, she counterattacks the heterosexual culture or mainstream culture of America. Counterculture was an American movement of 1960s and 1970s which was against the mainstream or McCarthyism of twentieth century. McCarthyism opposed homosexuality, drug addiction, hippies, and other minority groups' culture. It shunned the sexual activities done almost openly, and overt drug cultures that influenced the youth.

The issues raised in the novel are deviant cultures of her time. By giving male-male extreme closeness, her intention here is to affirm same sex relationship in the society in the sense that she represents the counterculture instead of avoiding it.

Textual representations are literary affirmations. Such representations are manifesting ideologies of all kinds instead of hiding them. Affirmation thus should not be taken from the point of view of value. The work affirms in the textual modes.

Works Cited

- Adam, Barrey D. *Structural Foundations of the Gay World*: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Amborse, Jamie. *Willa Cather writing at the Frontier* Berg Publication. New York: Oxford. 1985.
- Arnold, Mathew. *Culture and Anarchy*. London: Cambridge U Press, 1932.
- Bennett, Tony. *Putting Policy into Cultural Studies*. Ed. Lawrence Grossberg ,et el NewYork: Routededge, 1992: 21-37
- Bretens, Hans. *Literary Theory: The Basic*. London: Saga, 2000
- Coetz, Philip W. *The New Encyclopedia*. Britannica, Vol. 6. 15th ed. Chicago: 1990
- Campbell, Neil and Alasdair Kean. *American Cultural Studies: An Introduction to American Culture* New York: Routeledge, 1997.
- Chauncey, George. *From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualization of Female Deviance*. Salmagundi, 1982.
- Edgar, Andrew and Peter Sedgwick, eds. *Key Concepts in Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Evans, Harold. *The American Century: People, Power, and Politics: An Illustrate History*. London: Pimolico, 1998.
- Formas, Johan. *Cultural Theory and Late Modernists*. London : Sage Publications, 1995
- Greenberg, David f. and Marcia H. Bystryn. *Capitalism Bureaucracy and Male Homosexuality*. Blackwell, 1996.

- Gupta , Akhil. *Post colonial developments*. London: Duke University, 2000.
- Kaye, Kerwin. *Journal of Homosexuality*. Vol. 46 New York: Dec. 2003.
- Lewis, Edith. *Willa Cather Living: A Personal Record* U of Ohio P.1953.
- Lyons, Donald. *Willa Cather's The Professor's House*. New Criterion, Vol. 18, 2000.
- McIntosh , Mary. *The Homosexual Role*. Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Pfeil, Fred. "Countercultural Visions". *Encyclopedia of American Cultural and Intellectual History*. Ed. Mary Kupic Keyton et.al. Vol. II New York: Charles Scribner's, 2001. (133-40).
- Plummer, Ken. *Symbolic Interactionism and the Forms of Homosexuality*. Blackwell Publishers,1996.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Seidman, Steven. ed. *Queer Theory /Sociology*. Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Storey, John. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture, A Reader*. 2nd ed. Georgia, VGP, 1998.
- Tylor, E. B. *Primitive Culture*. London: J. Murray, 1871.
- Wilson, G. ands Rahman. *Born Gay*. London: Peter Owen. <[http://www en. wikipedia org/wiki:/ homosexuality](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki:/homosexuality)> <URL>
- Weeks, Jeffery. *The Construction of Homosexuality*. Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. (1780-1950) New York: Harper, 1958.
- Wilson, Anna. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*. Vol. 47, Austin: Spring 2005.
- Wilson, G. and Rahman. *Born Gay*. London: Peter Owen Publishers, 2005.