

**Searching for Suppressed Voices:
The Gaze and Its Implications in Early Cold War Plays of
Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams**

**A Dissertation
Presented to
The Graduate School of Literature
Fukuoka Women's University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**By
Hiromi OKAURA**

2015

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction	1
Part One Women and Gaze: Performance Beyond Male Objectification	
Chapter 1. Gaze and Resistance in Tennessee Williams's <i>A Streetcar Named Desire</i>	10
Chapter 2. Being Bewitched: Women's Performative Resistance in Arthur Miller's <i>The Crucible</i>	33
Part Two Men and Gaze: Suffering in the Panoptic Society and Family	
Chapter 3. Gaze and American Male Identity in Arthur Miller's <i>Death of a Salesman</i>	53
Chapter 4. Searching for the Subjective Male Gaze in Tennessee Williams's <i>The Glass Menagerie</i>	73
Part Three Hidden Desire: Male Homosexual Gaze	
Chapter 5. Gaze and Homosexual Desire in Arthur Miller's <i>A View from the Bridge</i>	92
Chapter 6. Implied Homosexuality and the Representation of the Southern Plantation in Tennessee Williams's <i>Cat on a Hot Tin Roof</i>	117
Conclusion	136
Bibliography	146

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to show my deepest gratitude to Dr. Scott Pugh, my dissertation supervisor, who read the entire draft patiently and provided carefully considered feedback and extremely helpful comments. His insightful criticism and suggestions along with sincere encouragement were of inestimable value for my study, and made my Ph.D. pursuit possible and persuasive.

I would also like to thank the professors of the Department of English at Fukuoka Women's University, especially to Emeritus Prof. Hirotoishi Baba, Prof. Kimiko Tokunaga, and Emeritus Prof. Mitsuyoshi Yamanaka, who provided enormous assistance to me during my study at the university. I also have to thank Emeritus Professor Kenichi Takada at Aoyama Gakuin University, who has stimulated my interest in American literature, and encouraged me to continue my study of American plays in Fukuoka.

Across the sea, my thanks go to Doctor Stephen Johnson, Director of the Centre for Drama, Theatre and Performance Studies at the University of Toronto, who generously gave me material and immaterial support and opportunities to advance my research. Meeting many energetic scholars and attending classes and workshops in the Centre for Drama provided great learning experiences and priceless knowledge for my future research.

As Tennessee Williams says, "Life is partly what we make it, and partly what it is made by the friends we choose", so finally, I would like to thank my friends and many talented scholars I met, not to speak of my family, whose continuous kind support and assistance enormously helped motivate me to complete my dissertation research successfully.

Hiromi Okaura (Yamaga)

July 2015

Introduction

There is no question that Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams are two of the leading playwrights in postwar American theater, and specifically their early plays written and performed during the late 1940s and the 1950s are renowned around the world as their masterpieces. In this dissertation, I will analyze six of their plays during the specific period (the late 1940s to the 1950s) known as the early Cold War period by focusing on the gaze and other visual activities (such as visual pleasure, desire, and the suffering of looking and being looked at), in searching for the hidden implications in the realistic family plays which were dominant at that time. While employing various theories which explore the implications inherent in the gaze, I develop an analysis of the thematic significance of these plays, which can be found in the characters' ways of looking, the gaze relations and the effects among the characters, and audience gaze (in other words, how the plays affect viewers in the theater). Specifically, I emphasize three aspects of the gaze: women performing their identities in opposition to their roles as passive objects of male gaze (in Part One), white middle or lower-middle class men who are suffering from being looked at, namely, men as gaze objects (in Part Two), and hidden male homosexual desire in looking at men (in Part Three). As a conclusion, I will argue that this study of gaze activities reveals invisible and suppressed voices in these early Cold War plays, expressing women's desire, subjectivity, and resistance, white middle-class men's weakening of masculinity and individuality, and prohibited male homosexual desire, all of which foreshadow irresistible voices, which emerge in the 1960s.

As evidenced by a succession of box-office hits, such as *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947), *Death of a Salesman* (1949), *The Crucible* (1953), and *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1955), postwar American theatre in the 40s and the 50s was dominated by two very different canonical male white playwrights; one is the heterosexual Arthur Miller, who

consistently explored social and political issues, and the other is the homosexual Tennessee Williams, who placed special emphasis on personal and psychological issues. Their plays have been performed and acknowledged internationally with unanimous applause, and “theatrical and critical fashion continues to champion the ostensibly universal qualities of the plays . . .” (Savran 6, 1992). However, I am concerned here with the national aspects of the United States, because as Savran explains, “theatrical production is so deeply and intricately ideological, and . . . during the postwar period, the Broadway theater was a genuinely popular art (at least for the middle classes) . . .” (6, 1992). Thus, it is clear that the early famous plays of Miller and Williams act as a mirror of postwar America in the early Cold War period.

During the 40s and the 50s (specifically after WWII and before the era of Civil Rights and other liberation movements), a particular notable change could be seen in American society and American family: conservatism. Historical and social events such as women’s suffrage in the 1920s, the Depression in the 1930s, and WWII encouraged women’s self-reliance and their participation in work and society. However, at the war’s end, the men returning from war took women’s jobs, and these changes gave rise to conservatism and a return to “family values”, whether women wanted such a regression or not. The G. I. Bill and booming postwar economy also contributed to these values and an increase in middle-class nuclear families based on a male breadwinner and a housewife. In addition, as historian Elaine Tyler May indicates, various anxieties including the threat from the Soviet Union and nuclear war also promoted such conservatism, leading to “the domestic confinement” in the American ideal family, as a refuge or shelter from the dangerous Cold War world.

Moreover, within the conservatism of the 40s and the 50s, “Sexual nonconformity [homosexuality] was now defined as a national security threat . . .” (Nicolay). Senator Joseph McCarthy charged that “the State Department had reinstated a homosexual despite the growing crisis over national security. [And] Suddenly, homosexuals were

said to pose as great threat to the government as members of the Communist party” (Corber 62, 1993). Such homophobic tendencies were evidently enhanced by “the publication in 1948 of the first Kinsey report, which challenged the stereotype of the effeminate homosexual with statistical evidence that gay men did not differ significantly from straight men” (Cober 63, 1997). In other words, since “gay men could not be easily identified and were present in all walks of American life, then they resembled the Communists, who had allegedly infiltrated the nation’s political and cultural institutions and threatened to subvert them from within” (Cober 64, 1997).

Such a conservative social background and ideological bias during the Cold War period greatly encouraged the rise of the nuclear family based on heterosexual marriage. In particular, the white middle-class suburban family based on binary gender distinctions was emphasized in popular TV dramas in the 50s such as “The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet”, and “Leave It to Beaver”, and as historian Stephanie Coontz indicates, such a visual template was ideologically imposed on people as the only acceptable American traditional family. The stereotypical family is also reflected in the early well-known family plays of Miller and Williams, even though they managed to include the dark hidden aspects in some ways too, in contrast to simply optimistic happy families on TV. When considering the implied “dark hidden aspects” in these plays, which cannot be directly represented in the dialogues, theories of the gaze (in the broad sense of looking activities) must be very effective tools for examining implications of non-verbal communication¹, such as power relations, gender inequality, problems of identity, unrestrained desire and resistance to social norms and ideology.

Theoretical consideration of the gaze has been increasingly active since the 1970s. Jeremy Hawthorn succinctly summarizes the basic point that “looking is far from being a neutral process of information gathering: our looking activities are saturated with the residues of our social and cultural existence—for example, those relating to class, sexuality, economics” (508), suggesting the critical potential of gaze analysis. In fact,

however, theories of the gaze “build on and incorporate a number of traditional literary-critical concerns, along with ideas and concepts . . . such as psychoanalysis, discourse studies, and film studies”, and “cannot be traced back to a single place of origin or time of birth. . . (Hawthorn 509). In this dissertation, I use several theories regarding looking activities specifically based on psychoanalysis, film studies, feminist criticism, performance research, and performativity theory, etc., and include all these theories as “theories of the gaze” in a broad sense.

According to Clifford T. Manlove, gaze theory has been used in “literary and cultural studies, queer theory, postcolonial studies. . . . In most cases, the gaze is used to help explain the hierarchical power relations between two or more groups or, alternatively, between a group and an ‘object’” (84). Famously, feminist Laura Mulvey uses this concept to analyze gender inequality in looking at Hollywood films, and points out the “male gaze”, which objectifies women as male desirable objects. The original purpose of Mulvey’s theory was “to use psychoanalysis to unmask the power of patriarchy in Hollywood cinema. . .” (Manlove 83), but I would argue that her concept of male gaze can be extremely helpful in this dissertation, for example, in analyzing performances of the socially-oppressed women such as Blanche DuBois and Abigail Williams in Part One. We may also assume that the inverted gaze relations between men and women suggest women’s subversive power and provisional resistance, while implying the weakening of male domination and masculinity. Moreover, Mulvey’s psychological analysis of the male lustful gaze at women must be expanded into the hypothesis of male homosexual gaze at men, as suggested by some film critics such as Steve Neale and Paul Willemen, leading to the analysis of hidden homosexual desire inherent in the male gaze in Part Three.

Michel Foucault’s concept of the Panopticon focuses on power relationships through the complex gaze in confined spaces under surveillance (such as jails, schools, and asylums), and it is also valuable in considering the characters ideologically confined in

the Cold War family and society. Specifically, since Foucault's concept does not put emphasis on gender difference in looking, it can be effectively applied in Part One to reconsider the oppressed women's performance beyond their passive roles as the object of male gaze. The concept of the Panopticon is also helpful in considering male main characters in Part Two, who are suffering from being looked at. Male breadwinners Willy and Tom always worry about other people's gazes, and desperately try to match expected gender roles such as responsible breadwinner, husband, and father. Thus, the conservative society and family, which confine Willy and Tom, are analogous to the "Panopticon," mentally controlling them and constraining their visual pleasure and desire. Specifically, the male confinement in the nuclear family and subsequent suffering of men as gaze objects becomes prominent in the plays of the Cold War period, suggesting the weakening of American masculinity and individuality indirectly.

As for more psychoanalytical aspects of the gaze, Jacques Lacan's concept of the mirror stage suggests a child encountering a mirror realizes that he or she has an external appearance (as a visible object), leading to the subject's self-construction. One can conclude that "the gaze is a much more primary part of human subjectivity than patriarchy. . ." (Manlove 84), and also than that of hierarchical power relations perhaps. Such a concept of the gaze is also useful for considering the identity crises of Willy and Tom, both of whom lacked a father figure as a visual model of male identity. Erving Goffman, from a dramaturgical sociological perspective, argues that our life is kind of a stage performance, and such performance in daily life must be always associated with gaze relations (performers to be looked at and an audience to look). In this relation, not only women but also men require a kind of performance called impression management, depending essentially on other people's responsive gaze. Such an approach arguably implies a weakening of rugged American masculinity based on self-reliance and independence. Conversely, Goffman's perspective also suggests the possibility of the oppressed women's active performances based on their strategic impression

management to show how they want to be looked at, apart from passive performance under the control of male gaze. To sum up these observations and implications inherent in the looking activities, focusing on such activities in the conservative Cold War plays surely leads to the important discovery of the suppressed voices implying hidden subverted power relations, sublimated desire, and unacknowledged resistance, even though such voices cannot be found directly in the dialogues on the conservative stage or in the written versions of the plays.

The analysis of plays in terms of the gaze and other looking activities has not in fact become widespread yet, although such analysis of films has become widespread among film critics since the 1970s. However, it is clear that theories of the gaze can be usefully applied to analyzing plays as well as films, and specifically and effectively can be applied to those conservative realistic plays in the Cold War period whose modes of expression were ideologically restricted. More importantly, I would argue that plays are visual and ephemeral live performances, and thus the psychological effects of gaze relationships among the characters and the audiences can be emphasized, and even the implications deviating from social norms can be more effectively represented in the plays, compared to the case with the enduring but unchanging visual texts of films and TV dramas, which were more constrained by strict censorship.

In Part One, I will focus on desperate performances of oppressed women, searching out alternative readings of such performances, which are generally considered to reflect women's passive positions. In Chapter 1, I will investigate the former Southern belle Blanche DuBois in Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947), and her desperate and ambivalent performance playing a pure noble lady and an erotic seductress, which indirectly but surely implies her subjectivity, desire and even resistance, in spite of her restricted situation. In Chapter 2, I will analyze the socially-oppressed Puritan women, and specifically Abigail Williams, in Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* (1953), and her active and hysterical performance as a victim of witchcraft,

which employs various subversive elements in the conservative and surveillance Puritan society, but which also invites comparison to the Cold War society.

In Part Two, I will study common American men, who are suffering from being looked at, and more specifically, white middle-class or lower middle-class breadwinners, who are desperately suffering as the objects of the gaze in the surveillance society and in the family, constantly reflected in women's active gazes and other people's responsive gaze. In Chapter 3, I will examine the common salesman Willy Loman and his desperately exaggerated performance as a comic actor in Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* (1949) in association with his unreliable sense of male identity and masculinity. In Part 4, I will analyze Tom Wingfield's resistance against his position as the object of the gaze in conformist society and family, and his desperate search for a subjective male gaze as an American male artist in Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie* (1945).

In Part Three, I will investigate the relation between the gaze and male homosexuality, which was prohibited from direct representation on the stage (or in the play). For instance, the Wales Padlock Law² made it illegal at that time to produce plays "depicting or dealing with the subject of sexual degeneracy, or sex perversion" (Curtin 100) in New York State. As a primary case study, in Chapter 5, I will examine the masculine patriarch Eddie Carbone's hidden (and unrecognized) homosexual desire embedded in his looking in Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge* (1955). Chapter 6 will investigate the audience gaze (as opposed to gaze relations among the characters and their ways of looking). More specifically, I will focus on how to represent prohibited male homosexuality and the suppressed desires before the conservative and homophobic audience of Tennessee Williams's *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1955).

By focusing on various gaze activities, and especially by focusing on the gaze variations of three kinds of oppressed characters — unmarried women, male breadwinners, and male homosexuals — this dissertation will reveal important

implications of non-verbal communication which could not be directly represented on the stage (or even in the plays), in particular, ideologically subversive elements. I will argue that the gaze in these powerful early Cold War plays constitutes a highly effective method to reveal invisible and suppressed voices, precursors of the voices to be raised in the 60s.

Notes

1. I consider the gaze and other looking activities in plays as non-linguistic, of course, because the gaze depends on actions (not on the words themselves in the dialogue). Sometimes, the characters' actions of looking in a play are indicated literally in the stage directions of the text, but such stage directions themselves disappear on the stage with a live performance.
2. In response to plays like Mae West's *Sex* and Eugene O'Neill's *Desire Under the Elms*, "New York City enacted the Wales padlock law. . ." (119) in 1927, and it "was not rescinded until 1967" (Bordman & Hirschak 119). According to Robert Viagas, "The law was rarely enforced but remained on the books into the 1950s. Gay-themed plays, including 1944's *Trio*, were especially targeted."

Part One

Women and Gaze: Performance Beyond Male Objectification

Chapter 1

Gaze and Resistance in Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*

I. Blanche, A Tragic Actress

In Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947), the protagonist Blanche DuBois's theatrical performance is unmistakably prominent throughout the play. In the opening, she has already lost many things, such as her husband and other family members, her job as a high-school teacher, and the plantation where she grew up. The name of the plantation "Belle Reve", which means 'beautiful dream' in French, impressively symbolizes her brilliant past in contrast with her harsh reality. She is in a desperate situation, and thus she comes to her sister Stella's home in pursuit of her last chance for protection and acceptance. However, Blanche completely hides such miserable circumstances, and appears as if on the stage, pretending to be an elegant lady with noble manners, emphasizing her former position, the Southern belle. She desperately keeps up this pretense in Stella and Stanley's small apartment. Even when she is finally expelled from the apartment and sent to an insane asylum, she plays the role of upper-class lady gracefully with the escort of an unfamiliar but chivalrous doctor, while saying, "I have always depended on the kindness of strangers" (153).¹ Thus, we can surely see that Blanche is a tragic actress.

In fact, Blanche's performance has been indicated by many critics. Calvin Bedient says she is "an actress on a stage emptied of everything except the shadows of her fancy" (41), and Carla J. McDonough points out "her performance as a chaste lady" (25). C. W. E. Bigsby also calls her "a pure actress" (90, 2007), and considers her theatrical tendency as one of the characteristics of Williams's plays: "The theatrical metaphor was to remain central to his work" (90, 2007). However, most such critics only focus on Blanche's inward and personal tendencies as the reason for her performance. For example, Thomas P. Adler indicates "her psychic difficulties" (31,

1990), and C. W. E. Bigsby points out the “creative imagination” (42, 1984) or “illusions” (48, 1984) which Williams’s sensitive characters commonly display as they resist their severe realities. Thomas E. Porter concludes that her performance results from a “tendency toward unreality, toward the romantic” for the Southerner whose “past represents a glory and a heritage. . .” (158). However, I would argue that these critics ignore the external elements such as the “audience” within the play, who for the most part witness Blanche’s performance. When considering characteristics of performances as a visual presentation, one should notice that performance always accompanies gaze relations between the actor/actress to be looked at and the immediate audience looking at them. Therefore, one should emphasize interactional gaze relations in Blanche’s performance, which implicate various cultural and historical elements such as power, gender, and social class. More specifically, by using gaze theories which explore the implications inherent in our looking activities, I will investigate how Blanche’s continuous performance suggests her hidden suffering, desire, and resistance, which are not directly represented in the dialogue but are surely implied in the gaze as non-verbal communication.

II. Performing Woman as Object of Male Gaze

Theoretical consideration of the gaze (in the broad sense of our looking and being looked at) has developed since the 1970s; it was originally derived from John Berger’s book *Ways of Seeing* (1972), suggesting “the way we see things is affected by what we know or what we believe. . .” (8). In other words, “Looking is far from being a neutral process of information gathering: our looking activities are saturated with the residues of our social cultural existence—for example, those relating to class, sexuality, economics” (Hawthorn 508).² Feminist film theorist Laura Mulvey expanded this concept into gender inequality in looking, and she disclosed the patriarchal structure of the active male gaze, which objectifies woman as the gaze object in Hollywood films.

The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure, which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote *to-be-looked-at-ness*. Woman displayed as sexual object is the *leitmotif* of erotic spectacle . . . she holds the look, and plays to and signifies male desire. (19)

This influential essay focusing on male's dominating gaze is applicable to Blanche in this play³ with appropriate alterations, because she also confesses that she has been distressed by playing an attractive woman in male-dominated society.

BLANCHE. When people are soft—soft people have got to court the favour of hard ones, Stella. Have got to be seductive—put on soft colours, the colours of butterfly wings, and glow—make a little—temporary magic just in order to pay for—one night's shelter! . . . People don't see you—*men* don't—don't even admit your existence unless they are making love to you. . . . It isn't enough to be soft. You've got to be soft *and attractive*. (109)

In order to get male protection, Blanche always has to be an attractive eye-catcher. Thus, “She continues to wear soft materials in pastel shades throughout most of the play” (Adler 31, 1990), and emphasizes her feminine “*delicate beauty*” (69) like that of a “butterfly” or “moth” (69) in order to evoke male attention. In short, she has to perform desperately, like an actress depending on male gaze and desire.

Generally, postmodern feminists think of femininity as psycho-social identity, which

is constructed by the external environment. Accordingly, subordinate women are much more likely to perform femininity in patriarchal society and family because, as John Berger suggests, “. . . how she appears to man is of crucial importance for what is normally thought of as the success of her life” (46). Joan Riviere also treats the performance of woman as a tool to hide gender-subversive elements by saying, “Womanliness therefore could be assumed and worn as a mask, both to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals expected if she was found to possess it [masculinity]. . .” (38). Therefore, we can say Blanche, who desperately performs her role depending on the current male gaze, exemplifies oppressed women in the restricted society and family of the Cold War period. After World War II, conservatism and a return to family values were quite emphasized in the United States due to demobilization of soldiers and the nuclear threat in the Cold War. Accordingly, as Betty Friedan points out, “Women who had once wanted careers were now making careers out of having babies” (59), and “The suburban housewife—she was the dream image of the young American woman. . .” (60). In short, “In the fifteen years after World War II, . . . the mystique of feminine fulfillment became the cherished and self-perpetuating core of contemporary American culture” (61). In such circumstances, Blanche, who is a socially powerless woman, is more likely to perform femininity, and it is the only way for her to get the shelter of male protection.

Blanche effectively uses her background as the Southern belle in her passive performance of playing femininity. As typified by her costume, “*a white suit with a fluffy bodice, necklace and earrings of pearl, white gloves and hat*” (69) in the opening, she emphasizes her gentility and appearance as an upper-class lady. Meanwhile, she hides or lies about inconvenient truths such as her age, alcoholism, and lustful desire. She also uses her intelligence, her knowledge of poetry, French, and good conversation skills flexibly, which were acquired in her upper-class background. Her adherence to the color “white suggests the purity (her astrological sign is Virgo) that she desires to

restore. . .” (Adler 31, 1990), and it also enhances her image as the ideal and innocent woman as a prospective bride, from the male point of view.

Moreover, we should notice Blanche’s emphasis on being “soft *and attractive*” (109), because it suggests that her performance also requires sexual attraction to fulfill male desire and pleasure. In fact, she tries to attract Mitch (her prospective bridegroom) by showing her sexy figure with “*pink silk brassiere and white skirt in the light through the portières*” (91). She also asks Stanley to do up her buttons, and questions him about her appearance provocatively, “How do I look?” (83). As Thomas P. Adler indicates, “Blanche is, however, also tigress and seductress, as her red satin robe denotes” (31, 1990). Such ambivalent, simultaneous performance as a noble Southern belle and an erotic seductress surely suggests the dual roles which men have imposed on women, “The traditional bifurcation of all women as ‘madonnas’ or [/and] ‘whore’. . .” (Kuo 52).⁴ Therefore, we cannot simply ascribe Blanche’s performance to her personal factors such as her romantic tendency or psychic difficulties. Rather, she is surely an oppressed woman controlled by the dominating male gaze.

Meanwhile, her younger sister Stella is also an ex-Southern belle and an oppressed woman, who worries about her husband Stanley’s gaze and feelings. However, her performing of femininity or sexuality is not prominent at all as compared with Blanche’s. Neither does she worry about her age, appearance, or even the male gaze. Blanche strongly criticizes her downgraded marriage: “You’re married to a madman! [. . .] your fix is worse than mine is!” (100). However, since she is a married woman, Stella’s suffering as an object of the male gaze does not seem to be serious. Meanwhile, widowed Blanche cannot stop performing femininity, and thus she deeply worries about a decrease in the quality of her performance with advancing age. Blanche’s desperate words, “I’m fading now!” (109) clearly suggest such strong pressure and worry. Therefore, she “*must avoid a strong light*” (69), which discloses her real age, and must take great care in her appearance by frequently asking “how do I look?” (150),

emphasizing her tragic image as a romantic actress.

III. Beyond Male Gaze Object

Laura Mulvey's concept of male gaze is also useful to analyze Mitch's attempted rape and Stanley's actual rape of Blanche. Mulvey indicates psychoanalytically, "the woman as icon, displayed for the gaze and enjoyment of men, the active controllers of the look, always threatens to evoke the [castration] anxiety it originally signified" (22). Similarly, we might say that Blanche, the object of the male gaze, also causes anxiety in male viewers such as Mitch and Stanley. As a result, "punishment or saving of the guilty object [of woman] . . ." (Mulvey 22) is required for a way of resolutions of such anxiety, leading to the sexual violence of rape (or attempted rape).

However, Mulvey's concept of male gaze centers on male domination in looking activities as typified by the defining phrase, "the split between active/male and passive/female" (19). Therefore, Mulvey's concept completely ignores the female active and subjective gaze of sexual desire, and cannot explain Blanche's active gaze toward a high-school student, or a handsome young newspaper boy. Evidently, Blanche is an object of male gaze and plays the roles men desire (madonna or whore) as the situation demands. However, at the same time, she is also a gaze subject, who actively objectifies young attractive men for her own desire and pleasure.

Another exception to Mulvey's concept of male gaze can be found in this play, namely, the "male figure as erotic object" (Stacey 245).⁵ Stanley Kowalski's appearance — he is "*strongly, compactly built*" (77) "*with the power and pride of a richly feathered male bird among hens*" (77)— surely suggests that he is also characterized as an attractive eye-catcher, especially toward women. His "*half-dressed*" (97) figure and his "silk pyjamas" (141), and even his "solid T-shirt, which became the trans-national symbol of Stanley's ethos. . ." (Kolin 27-8, 2000), are also effective in "visualizing Stanley's sexuality" (Kolin 28, 2000).⁶ Actually, Stella directly suggests his sexual

attraction, when she says “When he’s away for a week I nearly go wild!” (75). Blanche is also overpowered by his visual sex appeal when they meet for the first time, and she draws “. . . involuntarily back from his stare” (78). Regarding an overall characteristic in Tennessee Williams’s plays, John Timpane points out the “androgynous gaze” (759), which implies that “Both men and women . . . can be viewed as objects of desire” (758). Clearly, we can conclude that Mulvey’s concept of male gaze is not always adequate to the analysis of Blanche’s performance, including gender-subversive ways of looking.

Another theorist of the 70s, French philosopher Michel Foucault, developed the concept of “Panopticon” in his work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (*Surveiller et punir, naissance de la prison*), centering on the power (not gender) inherent in gaze relations in enclosed spaces and institutions, as typified by a prison or asylum. The Panopticon was originally English philosopher Jeremy Bentham’s concept, and Foucault focuses on the architectural figure producing power relations: “at the periphery, an annular building [with divided cells]; at the centre, a tower [for a supervisor]. . .” (200), which automatically produces a power relationship between a surveillant who observes and all inmates. This concept will provide a useful theoretical framework for analyzing Blanche and her performance, which cannot be fully explained by Mulvey’s concept of the male gaze. Actually, this play focuses on a very limited period of time, Blanche’s stay in New Orleans from her arrival to departure in a limited setting, Stanley and Stella’s small apartment. The apartment can be said to symbolize a space like a cell of the Panopticon which confines Blanche physically, and tortures her mentally through Stanley’s suspicious gaze, as if she were in a prison. Her singing in the bathroom; “From the land of the sky blue water, / They brought a captive maid!” (80) also implies her state of confinement ironically.⁷

Moreover, Foucault indicates that each cell of the Panopticon is similar to a theater: “They [the cells] are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible” (200). This remark suggests that

actress-like Blanche, performing the role of the Southern belle (or sometimes a whore-like woman), is analogous to an inmate confined in the Panopticon, and both Blanche and inmates are oppressed gaze objects. It is clear that Stanley's small apartment symbolizes a theater-like cell in the Panopticon, and accordingly, Blanche has to play a suitable role depending on her audience, whether it is Stella, Stanley or Mitch. While considering such double meanings (the theater and the Panopticon) inherent in the setting of the apartment, in the next section, I will further investigate Blanche and her performance.

IV. Active and Subversive Performance As Gaze Subject

As represented by Blanche's words: "I cannot imagine any witch of a woman casting a spell over you" (84), her performance with emphasis on femininity and sexuality fails to work on Stanley from the beginning. Instead, he skeptically observes her fine dresses, "feathers and furs" (81), and "*a fist-full of costume jewellery*" (82), and suspects that she "*swindled*" (81) him out of his money. Stanley insists on his rights under the "Napoleonic code" (85) in Louisiana, and says that whatever belongs to a wife—money from the sale of Belle Reve in this case—is also her husband's. He calls Blanche a "champion safe-cracker" (82) and her showy accessories a "treasure chest of a pirate" (82), and judges her to be a criminal suspect from the perspective of a powerful overseer of this family. However, we should notice that the small apartment has the structural defect of a Panopticon.

Two rooms can be seen, not too clearly defined. The one first entered is primarily a kitchen but contains a folding bed to be used by BLANCHE. The room beyond this is a bedroom. Off this room is a narrow door to a bathroom.
(70)

The apartment divided only by a “portière” emphasizes the ambiguous border between the space for the inmate (Blanche) and for the surveillant (Stanley), thereby suggesting the imperfect confinement of Blanche on a physical level. Such a situation must lead to the possibility of her resistance, and actually, Blanche frequently escapes to the bathroom and enjoys her privacy apart from Stanley’s continuous and skeptical gaze.

Originally, Foucault did not emphasize the structure of complete confinement or surveillance in the Panopticon. Instead, he put emphasis on the power to control the inmates automatically.

. . . the major effect of the Panopticon: [is] to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. (Foucault 201)

In the beginning of the play, Blanche seems to be less affected by such mental effects of the Panopticon. Blanche even makes fun of Stanley, who has been strictly watching her, saying “. . . you have an impressive judicial air!” (85). Blanche also pretends to be an obedient inmate, claiming she is “ready to answer all questions. I’ve nothing to hide” (84). Meanwhile, she says playfully to Stella, “I laughed and treated it [Stanley’s interrogation] all as a joke, called him a little boy and laughed. . .” (87). Therefore, we can surely conclude that the functional power of the Panopticon is restricted in Stanley’s small apartment, suggesting the resistance of Blanche.

Actually, whenever Stanley leaves the apartment, Blanche uses the opportunity for resistance, and we can see her performance as an active gaze subject, instead of her performance playing an obedient inmate passively. For example, in order to get Stella on her side, Blanche desperately pretends to be the Southern belle, and tries to remind Stella of their upper-class background and class-consciousness: “You can’t have forgotten that much of our bringing up, Stella, and that you just *suppose* that any part of a gentleman’s in his nature! *Not one particle, no!* [. . .] *Don’t—don’t hang back with the brutes!* (104-5). As an active gaze subject, Blanche tries to put her vision of “*common*” (104) working-class Stanley into Stella’s head.

Blanche even describes Stanley as “survivor of the stone age” (105) with “something downright—*bestial*. . . and “something—ape-like. . .” (104). These perspectives clearly represent that she looks down on not only Stanley’s social class, but also his race, namely his existence as “something less than fully White. . . even something—sub-human. . .” (Brewer 74). As many critics and directors indicate, the “. . . connections between Stanley and the figure of the Black male ‘other’ may certainly be drawn. . .” (Brewer 74) in this play, even if Stanley is the “Polack”.⁸ In contrast, “. . . her name ‘Blanche’ signals an association with her white, French Huguenot forefathers and a mythic association with the old colonial South” (Van Duyvenbode 136), emphasizing her superiority in race. Even if Blanche is a powerless and oppressed woman confined in a space like the Panopticon, it is clear that she can supplement her inferiority by performing the Southern belle with an emphasis on her superiority, such as her intelligence, social class, and even her ethnicity (whiteness). Blanche surely resists the patriarchal and brutal Stanley and her passive role as an inmate in his Panopticon.

Blanche resists not only Stanley, but also his “horrible place” (71) inappropriate for her performance of playing an elegant lady. She says, “I can’t stand a naked light bulb, any more than I can a rude remark or a vulgar action” (94), and covers it with “coloured

paper lantern” (94). She also put a light-colored cover on her bed, and “She treats the Kowalski’s apartment as her own theater, altering the décor to make it ‘almost dainty’” (Adler 37, 1990). Blanche seems to remake the place like her former home “Belle Reve” as well as a stage suitable for her romantic performance. In short, as William Kleb indicates, “Blanche feminizes Stanley’s flat, . . . she theatricalizes it, subverting its reality, even altering time and space” (35), suggesting her active gaze in controlling and directing her own performance subjectively.

Specifically, Blanche directs her performance actively in front of Mitch, her naive audience, as she pursues marriage. She says, “I want to *deceive* him [Mitch] enough to make him—want me. . .” (111), and desperately pretends to be an attractive and “prim and proper” (111) lady, while hiding her real age, alcoholism and scandalous behaviors in the past. She also makes full use of her background, such as her good knowledge of literature, French, elegant manners and conversation skills, in order to create her romantic play.

BLANCHE. [*to Mitch*] We are going to be very Bohemian. We are going to pretend that we are sitting in a little artists’ café on the Left Bank in Paris!” [*She lights a candle stub and puts it in a bottle.*] *Je suis la Dame aux Camellias! Vous êtes—Armand! . . .* (116)

Such staging must be enough to attract the romantic Mitch, who admires the “sonnet by Mrs. Browning” (93) and treasures his memory of a sad romance. In fact, he says to Blanche admiringly, “. . . I have never known anyone like you” (115). Such a relation constructed by Blanche proves useful for her to implant in Mitch her own perspective of Stanley as an “insufferably rude” (118) man. Moreover, Blanche’s lines as quoted above surely recall Giuseppe Verdi’s famous opera *La traviata* (“The Fallen Woman”) adapted from Alexandre Dumas’s novel *The Lady of the Camellias*. It deals with a love

relationship between a famed prostitute and a young innocent man, mirroring the whore-like Blanche's dramatic deceptions and her superiority in their relationship. Thomas P. Adler perceptively indicates that "From one perspective, Blanche is as an actress portraying the central character in a play that she first authors and then produces and directs" (37), foregrounding Blanche's subjectivity and active gaze as stage director of her performance.

In addition, we should also notice that Blanche's sexual desire is represented more directly in her active and subjective performance. For example, while Stanley and Stella are out in Scene V, Blanche aggressively lures a young attractive man "collecting for *The Evening Star*" (112) into the apartment, which becomes the stage of her romantic play. While praising his youth and beauty theatrically, "Young, young, young, young—man! Has anyone ever told you that you look like a young prince out of the Arabian Nights?" (113), ". . . she crosses quickly to him and presses her lips to his" (113), leaving no doubt about her active gaze and her sexual desire. Such a seductive performance toward the attractive man is not an exception, but rather a pattern of behavior since Blanche was young, considering her promiscuous sexual activities with her high school student and many young soldiers. As Ann Davies indicates, "Ever since Laura Mulvey (1975) claimed that the gaze was male, debate has continued as to whether women can ever hold the gaze" (187). However, we can clearly find Blanche's active gaze to objectify men for her own desire and pleasure in this play.

Normally, active representation of women's sexual desire and pleasure has been considered to be taboo in the patriarchal society and family. As many feminists suggest, women have originally played the passive and limited roles men imposed on them. For example, Luce Irigaray summarizes such roles as those of "*Mother, virgin, prostitute. . .*" (*This Sex* 186). In fact, we can find women playing these roles in this play, for Stella is seen as a expectant mother, and Blanche as either a virgin or prostitute, depending on the situation. Irigaray further indicates that "The characteristics of

(so-called) feminine sexuality derive from them [such social roles imposed on women]: the valorization of reproduction and nursing . . . , ignorance of and even lack of interest in sexual pleasure; a passive acceptance of men's 'activity' . . . while offering herself as its material support without getting pleasure herself . . ." (*This Sex* 186-7). However, as we have seen, Blanche (and sometimes Stella) surely resist such passive roles and diminished sexual desires in terms of social norms. Through her active performance as a gaze subject, Blanche represents herself as a woman with sexual desire who enjoys visual pleasure from looking at men. In conclusion, Blanche's desperate performance partly results from her oppressed position in the patriarchal society and family. However, at the same time, her intense performance can be understood as a weapon or a tool to represent her resistance and suppressed sexual desire indirectly in the restricted society and family.

V. Stanley's Masculine Performance As Counterattack

In response to Blanche's performative resistance, Stanley's dominating gaze grows weaker in his panoptic family. For example, in Scene IV, "*He stands unseen by the women [Blanche and Stella], . . . and overhears their following conversation*" (104), and thus he surely worries about how they regard him. His anxiety and inferiority about his identity—whether he looks like a white American or not—are implied in his furious objection to Blanche, "I am not a Polack. People from Poland are Poles, not Polacks. But what I am is a one hundred per cent American. . . ." (131). As Mary F. Brewer indicates, these words seem to suggest that ". . . his ascension to full White masculine status depends on her [Blanche's] recognition. Stanley requires the reciprocal gaze of the White woman to cement his identification with U.S. Man..." (76), suggesting the weakening of his dominating gaze. Obviously, Stanley is the dominant surveillant in his patriarchal family, but at the same time, he is also a gaze object, who is suffering from Blanche's scornful gaze. Thus, we can say that the apartment also functions as a space

like the Panopticon, but one in which the patriarch of Stanley is changed into a suffering inmate at times as well.

The reversed position from a gaze subject to a gaze object implies the weakening of Stanley's power in his family, because, as Jonathan E. Schroeder indicates, "To gaze implies more than to look at—it signifies a psychological relationship of power, in which the gazer is superior to the object of the gaze" (58), as also typified in Foucault's concept of the Panopticon. In directing Marlon Brando, who played Stanley in the premiere, the director Elia Kazan also repeatedly stressed that ". . . Stanley's home, his wife, his way of life were being threatened by Blanche. . ." (Kolin 29, 2000). Therefore, Stanley "had to confront and contain this outsider" (Kolin 29, 2000). Specifically, I would argue that their battle is clearly represented in their contrastive performances—Blanche's feminine and conspicuous performance by "showing her all cards" versus Stanley's masculine and inconspicuous performance by keeping his cards close. In other words, the male Stanley also hides his weakness and anxiety, and plays the role of a masculine patriarch in front of his audience (Blanche and Stella), while waiting for the opportunity to take back his power.

Masculinity and brutality are exaggerated in Stanley's performance in contrast with femininity and sexuality in Blanche's performance. He eats voraciously like a pig, makes noise by hurling a plate to the floor, and shouts out his male superiority, "Every man is a King! And I am the king around here. . ." (129). He even uses violence, his most fundamental masculine advantage, to resist Blanche and Stella's upper-class self-confidence. In addition, "Stanley . . . uses his sexual power as a weapon against Blanche. . ." (Fisher 12), as Blanche did in order to draw Mitch to her side. He triumphantly makes a display of his wife Stella, who ". . . *has embraced him with both arms, fiercely, and full in the view of BLANCHE*" (105) in order to add Blanche's distress. He also emphasizes to Stella their sensual nights, "You remember that way that it was? Them nights we had together? . . . with nobody's sister behind the curtains to

hear us!” (130), and tries to get Stella to kick Blanche out.

Meanwhile, Stanley secretly finds an “ace in the hole” to reveal Blanche’s lies and scandalous past. At the same time, he meaningfully asks Blanche a question hinting at her secret life in Laurel: “Say, do you happen to know somebody named Shaw?” (108). As soon as she hears the question, Blanche “. . . closes her eyes as if faint. Her hand trembles as she lifts the handkerchief again to her forehead” (108). It is obvious that Stanley’s question effectively instills a feeling of fear in Blanche, leading to an intensified awareness of being watched, of how other people know her past and look at her. In fact, just after his question, Blanche desperately asks Stella, “What have you heard about me?” (109) with “. . . an expression of almost panic” (109). Blanche also asks Mitch with concern, “Has he [Stanley] talked to you about me?” (118) during their date. These questions effectively enhance Blanche’s perception of continuous fear and a sense of tension from being watched by Stanley, evoking an “automatic functioning of power” (Foucault 201) like of the Panopticon, which controls the inmate (Blanche) psychologically, even though the surveillant (Stanley) is out. Therefore, we can say that the small apartment controlled by Stanley finally starts functioning as a Panopticon not only to confine Blanche physically, but also to control her mentally as a powerless gaze object without resistance.

While dropping Blanche a hint about her past in Laurel, Stanley strategically unmasks Blanche for Stella and Mitch (the obedient viewers of her performance) in private.

STANLEY. The trouble with Dame Blanche was that she couldn’t put on her act any more in Laurel! They got wised up after two or three dates with her and then they quit, and she goes on to another, the same old lines, same old act, some old hooey!. . . That’s why she’s here this summer, visiting royalty, putting on all this act— (124).

While her secret is being disclosed by Stanley, we can still feel (not see but hear) Blanche's desperate romantic performance as resistance, for instance, in her singing in the bathroom: "Say, it's only a paper moon. Sailing over a cardboard sea—But it wouldn't be make believe. If you believed in me!" (123). However, the hard evidence cannot be camouflaged by her romantic performance anymore, and it surely provides Stanley with his victory in their battle, leading to the restoration of his domination in the family.

Obviously, the restoration of Stanley's patriarchal power must be connected with the restoration of his dominating gaze as a patriarch. Actually, as a powerful gaze subject, Stanley cruelly directs the ending of Blanche's feminine performance by giving her a tragic present, a one-way bus ticket to Laurel at her birthday party. Moreover, as Williams Kleb points out, ". . . Stanley's rape of Blanche not only pins her down as a sexual object, but also wrests the house itself (and the stage) from her control" (34). In fact, considering Blanche's subversion of gender norms, such as alcohol abuse, strong sexual desire, and active gaze⁹, the rape of Blanche is surely the most brutal way to represent Stanley's masculine power to control woman as a patriarch and a surveillant in his panoptic family.

Specifically, Scene XI (the last scene of the play)—simultaneously depicting Blanche's departure and the men's world of the poker game—symbolizes her defeat and the restoration of Stanley's assertive patriarchal power. Even Stella, who is wailing over Blanche's cruel exile, is controlled by Stanley saying "*voluptuously, soothingly*" (153), "Now, honey. Now, love. Now, now love" (153-4).¹⁰ Stage directions also indicate "*The atmosphere of the kitchen is now the same raw, lurid one of the disastrous poker night*" (145), emphasizing the revival of the men's world and Stanley's controlling power. As Thomas P. Adler indicates, "Stanley's universe thrives on bold, bright colors—the green and scarlet bowling shirts, the red silk pajamas, the colored lights of sexuality—that

help parade and show off his pure physicality and animality. . .” (31, 1990). Such bright colors were especially prominent on poker night—the men’s world full of drinkers and dirty jokes. It emphasizes the world of Stanley, which completely destroys Blanche’s romantic performance in soft colors. In fact, Tennessee Williams depicts the scene of poker night in reference to “*a picture of Van Gogh’s of a billiard-parlor at night*” (88) in Scene III. The painting, “*The Night Café*”, is filled with primary colors such as blood red and gaudy yellow in the bright lights, implying the sorts of mental effects suffered by the sensitive Blanche. As the painter Van Gogh also notes, “. . . the café is a place where one can ruin oneself, go mad, or commit a crime. . .” (Edwards 31)¹¹, and thus there is little doubt the atmosphere of the poker game functions as a trap for the increasingly nervous Blanche, and a precursor of her madness in the ending. Therefore, the representation of a poker game at the end of the play symbolizes the dead-end conclusion of Blanche, namely, her transfer from Stanley’s Panopticon to the perfect state of confinement in an asylum as the punishment of a rebellious woman driven out of male-dominated society and family.

VI. Performance as Never-ending Resistance

We considered how Blanche’s continuous performing can be attributed to the passive position imposed by male-dominated society, in other words, her desperate need for male protection. However, even after Mitch (her last prospective bridegroom and the primary audience of her performance) deserts her, Blanche still keeps performing the role of a lady by herself: “*Now she is placing the rhinestone tiara on her head before the mirror of the dressing-table and murmuring excitedly. . .*” (139). In addition, by adapting Foucault’s concept of the Panopticon, we examined Blanche’s performance as resistance, namely, as a means to represent her subjectivity and desire by using her temporary position as a gaze subject. Even after such performative attempts result in her defeat, however, Blanche never stops her one-woman show.

In their study of *The Drama of Social Reality*, Stanford M. Lyman and Marvin B. Scott indicate the close relation between resistance and plays (performance): “Resistance is action. But there are all kinds of action. Some are direct and manifest; others are subtle and obtuse. Some speak to the issues facing the people. . . . Some are violent and destructive. . . . Yet all require management of expression and seek to influence impression. All, in short, are plays [performance]” (128). This observation exactly applies to the battle of resistance between Blanche and Stanley—Blanche’s elegant performance versus Stanley’s masculine performance. Moreover, Lyman and Scott continue that such “resistance” is “found in its most profound and dramatic state in the dramas of resistance among the “inmate[s]” (128) of insane asylums. For example, the inmate in an asylum is “. . . subjected to the processes of stripping, mortification, enforced regulation, and routinized humiliation, [and] he becomes merely an inmate, deprived of all those ordinary aspects of humanity that outsiders take for granted” (132), underscoring the inevitability of absolute obedience.¹² Such miserable inmates remind us of powerless Blanche, who is confined in Stanley’s apartment, and finally will be confined in an asylum. However, paradoxically, owing to her increasingly deranged states of mind that nobody can control, Blanche will be able to finally and freely represent herself, that is, she becomes the woman she truly wishes to be, without any concern about other people’s gaze.

In 1938, Tennessee Williams wrote a three act play *Not About Nightingales* focusing on the inmates in a prison, though the play was not discovered until the late 1990s. In the work, Williams depicted a convict with “*the vacant look of the schizophrenic*” (17), who desperately keeps singing nonsense songs to himself regardless of threats by the guard, because he “. . . has nothing to lose and, as a result, cannot be threatened” (Bernard 8) anymore. As Mark Bernard indicates, the situation of this convict clearly suggests “what Foucault calls ‘carnival’” (7), “. . . in which rules were inverted, authority mocked and criminals transformed into heroes” (Foucault 61), suggesting a

temporary but ultimate resistance from the oppressed insane person. I would argue that this character in *Not About Nightingales* must be a predecessor of Blanche, who is beyond reason and threat and can thus perform her role as a lady forever in an asylum.

In fact, Michel Foucault and psychiatrists such as Thomas Szasz recently have emphasized that often “The mentally ill were simply individuals who violated certain basic norms about rationality and predictability. . .” (Tomes 354) rather than people with organic medical conditions. Feminists have also focused on “. . . deconstruction of the meanings of women’s madness. . .”, in particular, “women’s madness as a form of resistance. . .” (Wirth-Cauchon 200). For example, in *Women and Madness*, Phyllis Chester indicates that “. . . mentally ill women were often attempting, consciously and unconsciously, to escape the terrible ‘half-life’ imposed by conventional female roles” (Tomes 354), as exemplified, for instance, by the female narrator in Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s “The Yellow Wallpaper”, Zelda Fitzgerald and Sylvia Plath. These remarks are surely applicable to the analysis of Blanche. Obviously, she must be victimized in the male-dominated society, and finally be confined to an asylum as an insane and subversive woman. However, her never-ending performance in the state of madness can be understood as her never-ending resistance to the roles that male-dominated society and male-dominating gaze imposed on her. In other words, Blanche’s performance surely suggests her ultimate representation of herself in terms of her own perspective.

In addition, I would argue that Blanche’s continuous performance of playing the Southern belle can be also understood as the embodiment of her suppressed voice as an artist, in other words, the expression of herself and her reality from the unique perspective of an artist. In his essay “Person-to-Person” (1955), Tennessee Williams depicted the “peculiar concerns of the artist. . .” (3), namely, the demand to express his/her “lonely idea, a lonely condition” (3). Williams, or more precisely, a character (Val) in *Orpheus Descending*, represents the loneliness of artists in this observation: “‘We’re all of us sentenced to solitary confinement inside our own skins.’ Personal

lyricism is the outcry of prisoner to prisoner from the cell in solitary where each is confined for the duration of his life” (3). Such a potential state of confinement of artists is clearly applicable to the actress-like Blanche, who is performing her interpretations of herself and her reality, alone and desperately as an artist, while shouting “Look at me, look at me. . .” (4) in front of the audience to get their acceptance.

Blanche strongly insists that “I don’t tell truth, I tell what *ought* to be truth. And if that is sinful, then let me be damned for it!” (136). It is clear that Blanche does not treat her performance (performing herself) as her lie or a mad illusion to camouflage her miserable reality. Rather, she surely looks at herself and her reality as a gaze subject, and reenacts them through the artistic perspective of what Williams saw as “Expressionism”, “a closer approach to truth” (Production Notes 131).¹³ According to Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s *The Madwoman in the Attic*, solitary confinement and the desire to represent one’s suppressed lonely voice are more prominent among women writers. In the patriarchal structure of Western society, “The roots of ‘authority’ tell us, after all, that if woman is man’s property then he must have authored her. . . . As a creation ‘penned’ by man, moreover, woman has been ‘penned up’ or ‘penned in’” (13). As one such women artist, Blanche has to resist such confinement of women, more specifically, the confinement of their desires and subjectivity, by using her only weapon, namely, her desperate and even insane performance.

In conclusion, Blanche’s never-ending performance surely embodies her suppressed voice as a lonely woman artist. At the same time, her performance also represents her suppressed voice as a marginalized woman, who is physically and mentally confined in a restricted society and family. Focusing on Blanche’s performance and the accompanying gaze relations, we can surely find that her desire, subjectivity, and resistance are represented indirectly in such desperate performances. Thus, Blanche cannot simply be stereotyped as a dangerous femme fatale or miserable victim, who has to be finally punished in male-dominated society in this androcentric play written in the

Cold War period. The implications inherent in Blanche's gaze and the gaze relations around her performance surely suggest the voices of socially-oppressed woman presaging the Women's Liberation Movement of the 1960s.

Notes

1. Williams, Tennessee. *A Streetcar Named Desire*. 1947. *Four Plays: The Glass Menagerie, and Others*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1974. 67-154. All the quotations from *A Streetcar Named Desire* are from this anthology and are indicated by page numbers in parentheses. Though this version is based on the "first London production" at "the Aldwych Theatre on Wednesday, October 12th, 1949" (67), it has been widely diffused by both Penguin Books and *Tennessee Williams: Plays 1937-1955*, (Library of America), in which British spellings of some words are changed into American spellings.
2. For a brief summary of Jeremy Hawthorn's concept of gaze theories, see the Introduction of this dissertation, pages 1-8.
3. The feminist drama critic Gayle Austin also points out that Laura Mulvey's concept of male gaze is useful for analyzing plays because "Scopophilia and narcissism are just as actively at work in live performance as in film. . .", and moreover, we can often see "the use of filmic devices on the stage" (85). For more details, see *Feminist Theories for Dramatic Criticism* (1990).
4. Many feminists point out this traditional bifurcation of women's images. For example, Ann C. Hall indicates ". . . male authors could only create Madonnas or whores. . ." (6), and Luce Irigaray summarizes the roles of women as "*Mother, virgin, prostitute. . .*" (*This Sex* 186). Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar point out ". . . the extreme images of 'angel' and 'monster' which male authors have generated for her [woman]" (17).

5. Jackie Stacey briefly indicates “Two absences in Mulvey’s argument. . .” about male gaze: “male figure as erotic object” and “feminine [gaze] subject in the narrative. . .” (245). Interestingly, both are found in this play (Stanley as an erotic gaze object and Blanche as a gaze subject), suggesting there is indeed an ‘androgynous gaze’ in this play.

6. Philip C. Kolin points out, as have others, that Marlon Brando’s Stanley was especially represented as a “sex icon, a new male sexual hero arousing women in the audience. . .” (Kolin 27, 2000).

7. According to Jacqueline O’Connor, “Many of Williams’s plays take place in confined space, and the setting often suggests that the characters will face permanent confinement at the play’s end” (20).

8. For more details refer to Philip C. Kolin’s article, “Williams in Ebony: Black and Multi-Racial Productions of *A Streetcar Named Desire*” in *Black American Literature Forum* 25 (1981). Mary F. Brewer also indicates that “Stanley’s character relates to notions of Blackness and a number of productions have cast the role with a Black actor” (74).

9. Regarding the female active gaze, Both Mary Doane [(1987)] and Linda Williams [(1984)] indicate “. . . the female command of the gaze is sexually transgressive” as typified by “femme fatale or vamp in contrast to the pure heroine” (Davies 187).

10. In the film adaptation of *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1951), Elia Kazan (the director of the film as well as the stage production) and Williams (the scriptwriter) suggest the ending from a more feminist perspective by showing Stella’s strong resistance to Stanley, who says “Don’t you ever touch me again!” and “I’m not going back in there again. . .” (Screenplay 218).

11. According to Cliff Edwards, this remark of Van Gogh is excerpted from his letter to his brother Theo on September 9, 1888.

12. Lyman and Scott added the footnote about this quoted part, suggesting that their comments were based on Erving Goffman's *Asylums*, which was published in 1961.

13. For more information about Williams's remarks about Expressionism, see the "Production Notes of *The Glass Menagerie* (1945), and Chapter 4 in this dissertation, pages 73 - 90.

Chapter 2

Being Bewitched: Women's Performative Resistance in Arthur Miller's

The Crucible

I. Oppressed Women Performing Themselves

In Chapter 1, we examined Blanche DuBois's desperate performance as resistance, indirectly representing her subjectivity and suppressed desire in male-dominated society. In Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* (1953), which deals with Puritan society of 17th-century New England, we can find female characters such as Tituba, Abigail, and Puritan girls, who desperately perform or pretend. Like Blanche, all of them are socially vulnerable women, and they are forced to perform their roles depending on the situation in conservative society and family, underscoring their oppressed and passive positions as gaze objects. In this chapter, I argue that the Puritan girls' bewitched performances (including theatrical confessions and behavior) also represent the suppressed voices of women, and that the oppressed Puritan women in this play surely symbolize women oppressed in the conservative Cold War period. Specifically, through the lenses of feminist gaze theories and performance theories, I argue that the Puritan girls' performances embody their repressed desire, subjectivity, and resistance to a dominating gaze, which controls their actions and behavior, and imposes on them culturally defined roles of women.

Many critics regard Arthur Miller as a social dramatist, and focus on his social concerns and the cultural relevance of his plays. In the introductory remarks to *The Crucible*, Miller writes that this play "is not history" (133)¹ about Salem's witch trials in 1692. Thus, it is generally considered that the play deals with "the parallel between the situation in 1690s Puritan New England and 1950s America. . ." (Biggsby 191)², emphasizing an allegory between the literal witch hunts in Salem and the figurative communist witch-hunts of McCarthyism. As both societies were extremely conservative

and androcentric, only the sufferings of male characters in a vicious society are emphasized, while the female characters and their feelings and suffering have been paid little attention to. D. Quentin Miller also claims that “the majority of the play’s criticism concentrates on male protagonist John Proctor’s morality. . .” (440), on “Proctor’s choice between lying/surviving and truth/death . . . rather than on the truth of the incidents involving some dancing teenaged girls and a conjuring Barbadian slave in the woods” (439).³ In such androcentric analyses, the performance of the bewitched Puritan girls seems to be merely regarded as a vicious trigger of the Salem witch trials, and it is left aside as unworthy of attention.

Generally, female characters in Miller’s plays are “simply passive and adjunctive to male authority” (Alter 144). C. W. E. Bigsby notes that “For his [Miller’s] women, character is a product of role. Identity is not problematic” (146), meaning that women “react rather than act” (147), in contrast to the male characters, who actively seek for their identities. Such gender difference is surely reflected in unequal gaze relations between male and female characters in this play. All the women, who desperately perform as objects of social gaze, are powerless females such as slaves, servants, and orphans. Consequently, such women are forced to play passive and normative roles according to male gaze, desire, and pleasure for the purpose of self-protection and survival in restricted society.

For example, in the opening of the play, Reverend Parris’s daughter Betty and Ruth Putnam desperately pretend to be ill in bed. As symbolized by Betty’s closed eyes, their pretense, that is, their performance, suggests their socially weak positions and the need to escape from the skeptical gaze of Parris (the active gaze subject), who witnessed their secret dance in the forest. Obviously, the girls pretend to be bewitched in order to change Parris’ vision of them as transgressors involved in prohibited dances into innocent girls victimized by witchcraft. Tituba, the leader of the girls’ dance, also pretends to know nothing about the secret dance. As an oppressed slave, she is “*very*

frightened because her slave sense has warned her that, as always, trouble in this house eventually lands on her back” (138). Her master Parris’s scolding, “Out of here!” and “Out of my sight!” (138), indicates her nearly invisible position as a Negro slave. As an oppressed servant, Mary Warren is also scared of people’s critical gaze and of potential punishment for their dance. Thus, she desperately performs the role of the innocent servant, showing her “. . . embarrassment and fear” (148) in front of her master, John Proctor.

Abigail Williams is the most prominent woman who performs in reaction to a dominating gaze. Her oppressed situation of being under surveillance and her need to perform are symbolized in her social positions such as an orphan and John Proctor’s ex-servant. In the opening, she is suffering from the dubious gaze of Parris and Proctor’s wife Elizabeth, who are looking at her as a seductress, “something soiled” (141). However, she desperately pretends to be a good girl by insisting “My name is good in the village!” (141), and criticizes Elizabeth as “a lying, cold, sniveling woman” (141), who tried to use her (a white woman) as a slave. As for the skeptical gaze of Parris, who witnessed the girls “dancing like heathen in the forest” (139), she insists “It were sport, uncle!” and “No one was naked!” (140). Moreover, as a young attractive woman, Abigail is suffering from John Proctor’s dual male gaze, namely, his lustful eyes looking at her as the object of desire, and his cold eyes looking at her as a whore-like madwoman, especially after their love affair has ended. Nevertheless, she desperately performs as his attractive object of desire, while dreaming of being his wife.

Originally, the Puritan society was controlled by strict discipline; it was as well a surveillance society. On the basis of his historical research, Miller also writes that there was “a two-man patrol whose duty was to walk forth in the time of God’s worship to take notice of such as either lye about the meeting house, without attending to the word and ordinances. . . .” (135). Thus, we can imagine that many people need to perform conformist roles as self-protection in Salem. Edmund S. Morgan even proposes a

dramaturgical Puritan society: “The mask is Puritanism, and it is worn by many characters. . .” (45). It is obvious that the Puritan girls, who were involved in the secret dance in the woods, especially need to use a mask to camouflage their prohibited behavior, leading to their desperate performance as victims of witchcraft. In the next section, I will investigate such performances of the oppressed Puritan girls more carefully and suggest that their desperate performance results from not only the passive desire for self-protection but also the active desire for indirect representation of their hidden desire and resistance in male-dominated society.

II. Women’s Desire and the Dance in the Forest

First, let us consider that the dancing in the woods is a release mechanism for socially-oppressed girls; for Tituba, in particular, the dancing meant the possibility to escape from the state of surveillance and performance as a gaze object. The dancing was done secretly in the forest at dawn and must have provided the girls with pleasure and the freedom to act, dance, and sing without being seen, implying an active and subjective performance for their own desire and pleasure. More importantly, various subversive elements are also implied in such a performance in the forest. For example, dancing and “anything resembling a theater or ‘vain enjoyment’” (135) were strictly prohibited in Puritan society. The venue of the dance, the forest, also implies a subversive meaning because at that time, Puritan life was on “the edge of the wilderness” (135) with frequent Indian attacks, and “Salem folk believed that the virgin forest was the Devil’s last preserve. . .” (136). Therefore, the oppressed girls’ dance in the forest inevitably implies resistance to male-dominated society.

In fact, Susan Abbotson describes their performance as follows: “The girls dance illicitly in the dark woods around a fire (. . . [a] hellish symbol), some naked, while Abigail drinks blood to cast a spell on Elizabeth, in order to try to break up [her] marriage” (133). Such bewitched performance is surely beyond the scope of what

Abigail calls “sport” (140) of innocent Puritan girls. Obviously, it evokes voodoo (magical practices from the Caribbean) led by the Barbadian slave Tituba. Voodoo would have been treated as heathen behavior in Salem. More importantly, for “people without power. . .” such as African Americans, “. . . Voodoo represented . . . a possibility to upset social hierarchies through the power of subversion” (Fuchs 45). Voodoo-like performances by Puritan women arguably provided an analogous subversive power for them. In discussing Abigail Williams, the leader of the girls, Brian Eugenio Herrera claims that “Abigail’s ‘word-magic’ [in her performance] gives her license to remake her world and to rebel against the injustices she perceives. . .” (342), indicating a resistive performance that can embody her suppressed voice in male-dominated society.

It is notable that women’s repressed sexual desire is also released during their performance in the woods. Specifically, in the 1996 film adaptation, there are “*Whoops of thrilled voices, and all the GIRLS call out the names of the boys they desire*” (Miller 2, *Screenplay*) as well as Abigail’s desire for John Proctor. In the conservative society of the 17th century, however, such strong sexual desires of women were dangerously subversive. As Louise Jackson writes, “Continental texts such as the Catholic *Malleus Maleficarum* of 1486 had portrayed female sexuality as threatening, deviant and subversive and as such, strongly associated with witchcraft” (71)⁴, and actually, it was republished many times and had been known as a handbook of witchcraft until the 17th century. Even in the 1950s, when this play was written and staged, the representation of women’s sexual desire tended to be suppressed on the stage. Referring to Jacques Lacan’s psychoanalytical claim that “. . . women often serve as the mirror for male desire, . . . the *petit object a*. . .” (9), the drama critic Ann C. Hall notes that “Female desire is denied. . .” (9). Therefore, she argues that in the roles of women in male canonical plays, “Women must merely play a part in this psychic, male drama, a role they often play against their will or desire” (Hall 9). These remarks are plainly applicable to this androcentric play because the direct representation of the Puritan girls

and Tituba's desires inherent in their secret dancing were completely deleted in both the original text and the premiere of this play in 1953. Their dancing was just treated as after-the-fact, and neither Puritan girls dancing and screaming the names of their objects of desire nor Abigail putting a curse on Elizabeth were included in the play, while they were clearly depicted in the film adaptations (in both the French film in 1957 and the Hollywood film in 1996).⁵ The deletion of the scene seems to suggest that Miller did not put much emphasis on the representation of women's oppressed desire and feelings in this play. He just needed a trigger to threaten male-dominated society, and in doing so "Miller has denied Woman the sexuality, freedom, and potential individuality that he offers Man. . ." (Mason 113).

In fact, Miller fictionalized ". . . a sexual relationship between Abigail and Proctor. . ." (Martin 83), and emphasized her repressed desire for his own dramatic purposes. He also "raised Abigail's age from eleven to seventeen, at the same time lowering Proctor's from the sixties to the thirties" (Adler 96, 1997). The existence of Tituba's husband was deleted, and as Karen Bovard indicates, "It is striking that there are no young male characters in the Salem of the play: only older married men" (82). These creative attempts in this play emphasize adolescent girls and Tituba's repressed sexual desires without any outlets. Such enhanced female desires effectively produced a dramatic force that caused the epidemic hysteria in Salem. However, at the same time, the deletion of the dancing scene deleted the possibility to represent women's hidden desires and feelings through their physical bodies on the stage.

To a considerable degree, female strong sexual desire must have been still a menace to society even in the 1950s, when this play was written and staged, leading to the omission of the scene. As Mire Koikari points out, "During the Cold War, a narrative of containment became a dominant trope in the United States. Containment of nuclear energy was often equated with containment of women, of racial others, of sexuality, of subversion, . . . and so on" (20). Such restrictive situations of women are analogous to

those of Puritan girls and women in this play. Moreover, as typified by the HUAC (House Un-American Activities Committee), the 1950s was also a surveillance society like that of the 17th century Puritan world. In such a conservative and confined society and on the stage, the direct representation of female sexual desires—the sensual dance by bewitched girls (including some naked girls) and their hysterical shouts of the names of their objects of desire—must have been considered as a subversion, which threatens the ideological domestic confinement in the Cold War period.

Recently, however, the Salem girls' secret dance in *The Crucible* has tended to be dramatized on the stage more often than before, regardless of Miller's original intentions or purpose. This tendency is arguably related to a trend in performance studies, suggesting the potential for resistance against male-domination by women's performance. As Cecilia Aldarondo briefly summarizes, "Since the 1980s, the notion of performance as anti-archive has been central in performance studies".⁶ According to Jacques Derrida, in western culture, "there is no political power without control of the archive" (4), and thus the archives (historical documents and literature, etc.) symbolize male domination and the dominating perspective. However, "Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented. . . . Performance's being . . . becomes itself through disappearance" (Phelan 146). As Rebecca Schneider claims, the advantage of "ephemeral" performance can be treated as resistance, especially for the oppressed people to represent their suppressed voices indirectly: ". . . there is an advantage to thinking about repertoire performed through dance, theatre, song, ritual, witnessing, healing practices, memory paths, and the many other forms of repeatable behaviors as something that cannot be housed or contained in the archive" (106). I would argue that such an advantage of ephemeral performance is clearly found in the recent trend of reenactment of the Salem girls' secret dance on the stage of *The Crucible*. As represented by the original purpose of Voodoo, namely, "self-expression of a displaced people. . ." (Daphne Lamothe 166), the reenactment of the voodoo-like performance

(e.g., dancing and reciting charms) by Salem's socially-oppressed girls on the stage surely impresses the audience with the revival of suppressed voices to express their hidden desires, subjectivity, and resistance by using their own bodies, even though such performances have been deleted in literal archives (such as historical documents in Salem⁷ and the literary text of this androcentric play).

III. Being Bewitched As Gaze Subject

I now turn to another kind of women's performance reenacted in this play, namely the Puritan girls' pretense of being bewitched in public (such as at the church house and in the court for witchcraft). As Robert Warshow indicates, "The girls who raise the accusation of witchcraft were merely trying to cover up their own misbehavior" (214, 1971) at the beginning of the play. However, Tituba's false confession happens to get religious support by Reverend Hale: "You have confessed yourself to witchcraft, and that speaks a wish to come to Heaven's side. . ." (170). This statement suggests her social position has moved from the role of an oppressed slave deserving punishment to the role of an elected holy woman to be treated as "God's instrument . . . to discover the Devil's agents. . ." (170). Tituba's confession results in the Puritan girls' hysterical performance of accusing innocent people of being witches. As Arthur Miller writes in the play, generally ". . . we conceive the Devil as a necessary part of a respectable view of cosmology. . . . Ours is a divided empire in which certain ideas and emotions and actions are of God, and their opposites are of Lucifer" (159) even in modern times. Specifically, in Puritan religious society, ". . . the necessity of the Devil may become evident as a weapon, a weapon designed. . ." by "a particular church or church-state" (159). Given such a dichotomy, Tituba and the girls' performance as victims of witchcraft provides them strong power in the name of the purification of Puritan society.

In fact, the Puritan girls theatrically attempt to enhance their religious status during their performance. For example, just after Tituba's confession, Abigail "*rises, staring as*

though inspired, and cries out. ‘I want to open myself!’ [. . .] *She is enraptured, as though in a pearly light.* ‘I want the light of God!’ (171). Betty also follows her with “*a fever in her eyes, and picks up the chant.* . . . ‘I saw George Jacobs with the Devil!’” (171), leading to “*their ecstatic cries*” (172) on the stage of Parris’s “meeting house” (156) (emphasis added). Abigail’s holy existence as a chief accuser is exaggerated during the performance, and Elizabeth compares her to Moses in the Bible:

ELIZABETH. I thought she were a saint, to hear her. Abigail brings the other girls into the court, and where she walks the crowd will part like the sea for Israel. And folks are brought before them, and if they scream and howl and fall to the floor—the person’s clapped in the jail for bewitchin’ them. (176)

This quotation shows that Abigail and girls’ performance is no longer merely a self-defense mechanism for powerless women. Instead, they viciously use their active gaze in their performance, and see and accuse innocent people freely according to their desires.

Moreover, such bewitched performance gains strength and credibility by the legal support of Deputy Governor Danforth.

DANFORTH. In an ordinary crime, how does one defend the accused? One calls up witnesses to prove his innocence. But witchcraft is *ipso facto*, on its face and by its nature, an invisible crime, is it not? Therefore, who may possibly be witness to it? The witch and the victim. None other. Now we cannot hope the witch will accuse herself granted? Therefore, we must rely upon her victims—and they do testify, the children certainly do testify. (214)

The above remarks clearly show the unreliability of Danforth's gaze regardless of his status as a legal specialist. In the "invisible" crimes of witches, he cannot exercise his dominating gaze as a legal authority that can determine guilt or innocence. Therefore, he cannot help relying on girls' bewitched performances as the only visible evidence in witch trials. He never doubts their performance and his vision, and insists, "I have seen marvels in this court. I have seen people choked before my eyes by spirits. . ." (207), foregrounding the weakening of his gaze. He also insists that "the children certainly do testify", and the stereotypical point of view—all children are innocent and pure—also blinds him to the falsehood beneath the girls' performance.

As for Reverend Hale, an ". . . eager-eyed intellectual" (158), he has confidence in his ability to recognize witches because he is a specialist on "the invisible world" (158). However, his sharp perspective and abundant knowledge do not function at all in the Salem witch trials. Like Deputy Governor Danforth, he cannot recognize the deceit of the girls' performance, and mistakes it for the clear sign of witches: "I have seen too many frightful proofs in court—the Devil is alive in Salem" (192). Therefore, it is clear that male authorities such as Deputy Governor and Reverend are not "reliable" gaze subjects anymore. On the contrary, the oppressed women's false gaze becomes reliable and legally accepted, and they insist that they can see witchcraft and accuse people of being witches freely. Obviously, this is a reversal of normative gaze relations between men (gaze subject) and women (gaze object) as described by many feminists, and such relations imply the weakening of male-dominating power in society, court (law) and church (religion).

Francis Nurse and John Proctor try to resist such false performances by using their cool perspectives and tangible evidence to prove the deceptiveness of the women's performances. Francis Nurse strongly resists Danforth's gaze, saying "we have proof for your eyes. . . The girls, the girls are frauds" (203), and submits "a sort of testament"

(208) with ninety-one good people's names. John Proctor, who knows Abigail's vicious desires to usurp Elizabeth's status as his wife, also brings his servant Marry Warren into the court, and submits her deposition, insisting that "She swears now that she never saw Satan; nor any spirit, vague or clear. . . . And she declares her friends are lying now" (213). However, such confessions and corroborating evidence fail to reveal the falsehood in the women's convincing performance, emphasizing the weakening of gaze and power of the male characters.

Meanwhile, the oppressed women's looking activities are more and more active and powerful. As Thomas P. Adler suggests, "Versions of the word 'see' in fact, recur frequently in the play. . ." (94, 1997). Specifically, the frequent use of the word 'see' is found in the girls' witch-impersonating performance. For example, at Parris's church house, Abigail cries "I saw Sarah Good with the Devil! I saw Goody Hawkins with the Devil!" (171). Betty also insists, "I saw George Jacobs with the Devil! I saw Goody Howe with the Devil!" (171) (emphasis added). After Marry's confession, "I promise you, Mr. Danforth, I only thought I saw them [spirits] but I did not" (220), we can temporarily find Danforth's "*new eyes*" (219) looking at Abigail skeptically. However, she still emphasizes her gaze and the power by saying, "Let *you* beware, Mr. Danforth. Think you to be so mighty that the power of Hell may not turn *your* wits?" (221). Even after Proctor confesses his adultery with Abigail and her vicious desire, Abigail still rejects Danforth's suspicious gaze, ". . . What look do you give me? . . . I'll not have such looks!" (223), and insists that she is the most authoritative gaze subject in the court. However, it is obvious that Abigail requires more convincing evidence to prove her powerful and reliable gaze, which can even see invisible witches and spiritual beings. Thus, she maximizes her talent of "an endless capacity for dissembling" (138), and begins even more hysterical performances in the court, which is followed by those of other frightened girls.

ABIGAIL. *Looking up:* Look out! She's [an invisible bird] coming down!
She and all the girls run to one wall, shielding their eyes. And now, as though cornered, they let out a gigantic scream, and Mary, as though infected, opens her mouth and screams with them. Gradually Abigail and the girls leave off, until only Mary left there, staring up the 'bird,' screaming madly. All watch her, horrified by this evident fit. . . ." (229)

Hysterical performances by the Salem girls surely represent their own terror, but also underline their subversive power and terrifying actions, especially from the male perspective. From the feminist perspective, such irrational performance arguably provides the oppressed girls with the opportunity to express their suppressed voices freely and directly in public. As Susan C. W. Abbotson writes, "In the forest, the girls dance and their spirits and desires can run free; it is no wonder they find such escapades exciting. They carry this freedom forward into the courtroom as Abigail leads them to cry out against many of the town's elders" (135-6). As a result, we can say that the holy courtroom once dominated by male authorities has been transformed into the stage of the oppressed girls' active performance.

Interestingly, theatrical actions and confessions during the Salem witch trials are not merely the fictional creation of Arthur Miller. As Robin DeRosa indicates, the historical records suggest that women's confessions and testimony in the court of Salem witch trials were actually theatrical. DeRosa explains the reason: "Nearly every incident of bewitchment that occurs during the trials is preceded by a verbal description of what is about to happen. . . .", and the "afflicted girls' declaration works like a stage direction, describing what action is to be taken in the scene. . . ." (36). Such theatrical declarations at supposedly objective witch trials are worth examining from the feminist perspective. Women's testimony and confessions were based on a "verbal descriptions" like stage directions, but of course, such stage directions must have been unconvincing and

unreliable in terms of accuracy because “. . . most of the records are oral testimonies offered by one party but recorded by another” (Derosa 30), suggesting that they were at variance with the facts. Derosa also claims emphatically that “. . . the Salem trials were always controversial for the very reason that nobody knew where the authority to judge lay” (31). Considering these facts, the verbal descriptions that Salem women used to stage their theatrical confessions and testimony at the trials may have had room for including their desires and assertions, which were to some degree freed from strict control or regulation by male-dominated legal and religious authorities. In other words, as a historical fact, the oppressed Puritan women arguably had chances to suggest their suppressed voices through their theatrical actions, indicating “the performative nature of witchcraft’s manifestation during testimony” (DeRosa 37).

IV. Hysterical Performance As Resistance

Finally, I will consider hysteria in the Puritan girls’ performance from a feminist perspective. Since Miller commented that “witch hunts had something to say to the anti-Communist hysteria” (Miller 295, “It Could Happen”) in *The New York Times* in 1967, the Salem girls’ lunatic performance on the stage has been treated as “institutionalized hysteria” (Curtis 255), which threatens male-dominated society rather than women’s indirect ways of representing their hidden desires and feelings. Reverend Hale says, “the world goes mad. . .” (198), and Proctor also says “. . . the little crazy children are jangling the keys of the kingdom. . .” (196), and the maliciousness of female performance is emphasized throughout the play. However, I would argue that the state of hysteria in such a performance enhances the oppressed women’s possibilities for resistance because it plainly suggests “carnival” in Mikhail M. Bakhtin’s sense, where social class and gender are destroyed and reconstructed in the world “temporarily turned upside down” (Pearce 230).⁸

Recent feminist critics have successfully used Bakhtin’s theories in order to

reconsider hysterical women because “the hysterical crisis can function in positive ways and thus, like his carnival, produce change” (Neill 166). As Hajdukowski-Ahmed indicates, “Hysteria has been described as a predominantly ‘female malady’ (178). However, Bakhtin’s concept of carnival exposes the “. . . discourse on hysteria as an ideological discourse of power. . ., while uncovering the resisting voices . . .” (178). Clair Wills also points out the significance of hysteria for oppressed people by saying that “In the absence of social forms fitting to what they wish to express, hysterics attempt ‘to produce their own by pastiche and parody in an effort to embody semiotically their distress’. The hysteric’s symptoms thus constitute a ‘staging’ of the carnivalesque. . .” (134).⁹ These comments can be useful for interpreting the performance of the Salem girls, who lacked voices and ways to represent “what they wish to express”. Indeed, Clair Wills points out that the hysteric has a “kinship with the witch and the sorceress (a kinship which Freud also notes)” (135). Therefore, we can say that the Puritan girls’ hysterical performance of being possessed by witches can be also interpreted as a “staging of the carnivalesque. . .” to turn the world upside down for their own purposes, namely, to represent their dissatisfaction and resistance to their oppressed positions and unfair treatment.

In fact, at the end of the play, Tituba succeeds in escaping from her slave position in a chaotic society in which the witch trials have been affected by Salem girls’ hysteria. Her remark, “We goin’ to Barbados, soon the Devil gits here with the feathers and the wings” (233), shows that she temporarily but surely acquires her freedom and hope after performing witchcraft. Hysterical performance also provides Mary Warren with a voice to resist her master Proctor and the freedom to act on her own will: “I must tell you, sir, I will be gone every day now.” (181). She also strongly opposes Proctor’s rude treatment, saying “I’ll not stand whipping any more!” (181), suggesting her temporary but subversive power as an official of the witch trials, which has allowed her to escape from the role of powerless servant, victimized by physical violence.

As for Abigail, many critics treat her as a “most sexual woman” (Mason 110), a vicious femme fatale, who destroys a good man, Proctor, by her lustful desire. However, it should be noted that she eventually strongly rejects her position as an object of male desire and gaze by saying “I cannot bear lewd looks no more, John” (255). From the feminist perspective, this assertion seems to demonstrate Abigail’s “struggles to uncover a sense of self in a highly restrictive society” (Abbotson 135) apart from her role as the object of desire. Hysterical performance as the victim of bewitching arguably provides her with a sense of self, even though her performances sometimes devilishly ruined good people’s lives. In such desperate performance at witch trials, Abigail is no longer an oppressed servant but a socially accepted official. She can temporarily but surely get power to accuse people legally, and thus she insists, “My spirit’s changed entirely. I ought be given Godly looks when I suffer for them as I do” (255). This remark plainly suggests the change of her position from powerless gaze object to gaze subject with authority. As Susan C. W. Abbotson suggests, by performing as the victims of witchcraft hysterically and “by becoming the voice of accusation which all fear. . .”, finally, “She [Abigail] creates for herself a position of respect, outside of the more usual marriage. . . . She bravely refuses to accept a patriarchal society which strives to silence and denounce independent female spirits. . .” (135) through her bodily expressions of performance.

Hysterical performance also provides Abigail with the freedom (and pleasure) to express her prohibited desire for Proctor in public. For example, during dinner in Reverend Parris’s house, “. . . without word nor warnin’ she falls to the floor. Like a struck beast, . . . [she] screamed a scream that a bull would weep to hear. . . .” (194). Then she shows off a needle, which was “. . . stuck two inches in the flesh of her belly. . . .” (194) as the evidence of the Proctor’s wife Elizabeth’s witchcraft. Such hysterical presentation of witchcraft can be viewed as Abigail’s one-woman show according to her own stage direction to represent her desire. Generally, however, the act of expressing female desire publicly was suppressed in the conservative society. Toril

Moi usefully introduces Luce Irigaray's remarks regarding suppressed female desire from *Speculum of the Other Woman*.

Irigaray concludes that in our society representation, and therefore also social and cultural structures, are products of what she sees as a fundamental *hom(m)osexualité*. The pun in French is on homo ('same') and homme ('man'): the male desire for the same. The pleasure of self-representation, of her desire for the same, is denied woman: she is cut off from any kind of pleasure that might be specific to her. (135).

However, Irigaray emphasizes "a form of hysteria" (Moi 135) as a weapon for women's resistance to such suppression, saying "The hysteric *mimes* her [woman's] own sexuality in a masculine mode, since this is the only way in which she can rescue something of her own desire" (Moi 135) in male-dominated society. These remarks can be applied to a reconsideration of Abigail's hysterical performance in this play, in other words, to revision of it from a frightening mass hysteria into a representation of her repressed desire in masculine mode.

We can also reconsider from the feminist perspective the roles presented in the Puritan girls' desperate performance, more specifically, that of "witch". Historically, most people labeled witches were women and specifically, dangerous women. Louise Jackson writes that "The witch trials are significant in the study of gender relations and women's oppression because they are a clear example of organised state violence against women" (71).¹⁰ The ". . . activities associated with witchcraft were a direct inversion of the traditionally accepted roles for women" (72), and the stereotypical image of the witch suggests the opposite of good wife, namely ". . . the woman who was trying to act entirely independently of male control, asserting her own powers, sexual and otherwise..." (72). These images of witches and their subversive powers are surely

found in Abigail and the Puritan girls in this play, who are irrationally playing the role of women affected by witchcraft and are as such beyond male control, and subsequently that such women are not merely victims of witches but witches themselves.

Such role of witches that the oppressed girls undertake is important when we consider their resistance to male-domination. “In *Gender Trouble*, [Judith] Butler proposes that we consider gender as performative, in the sense that it is not what one is but what one does” (Culler 103). In other words, Butler says, “Your gender is created by your acts. . . . You become a man or a woman by repeated acts. . .” (103), suggesting the importance of performative acts for women to recreate their own gender and self on their own, apart from male points of view. Considering Butler’s remarks, it can be reasonably concluded that the more Abigail and the oppressed Salem girls perform as witches (or as the victims of bewitching), namely in the gender-subversive roles, the more likely they are to emphasize their androgynous existence in the male-dominated society and family.

The feminist drama critic Gayle Austin indicates that the “feminist approach . . . paying attention to women” (1) is quite important because “It means making some ‘invisible’ mechanisms visible. . . .” (1) especially in male authors’ literary works. In this androcentric play, *The Crucible*, I would argue that more attention needs to be paid to the oppressed Salem girls’ hysterical performances, and the gaze relations between the performing girls and their male audience, as well as the various implications such as women’s desire and resistance, which cannot be shown directly in dialogue. Clearly, the power relations of gaze embodied in the male-dominating view of the world are repeatedly resisted and subverted by the Salem girls and Tituba in *The Crucible*. Even though Abigail and other Salem girls are marginalized again and excluded in the end of this androcentric play as vicious femmes fatales, we can conclude that the broad range of implications reflected in the power of the gaze surely suggests the rise of women and their irresistible voices in the 1960s.

Notes

1. Miller, Arthur. *The Crucible*. 1953. *The Portable Arthur Miller*. Ed. Christopher Bigsby. New York: Penguin, 2003. 132-258. All quotations from *The Crucible* are from this edition, which includes Miller's Introduction: "A Note on the Historical Accuracy of This Play" and "Appendix: Act Two". All the quotations are indicated by page numbers in parentheses.
2. All the quotations of C. W. E. Bigsby in Chapter 2 are extracted from *A Critical Introduction to Twentieth-Century American Drama: Volume 2, Williams, Miller, Albee*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
3. Miller's focus on a male protagonist John Proctor is prominent, and Proctor's sense of justice is analogous to that of Miller himself. For example, Proctor finally says to Deputy Governor Danforth in the play, "I speak my own sins; I cannot judge another" (248). Similarly, when Miller was called before "the House Un-American Activities Committee in June 1956", Miller also said ". . . I take the responsibility for everything I have ever done, but I cannot take responsibility for another human being." (Bigsby 191).
4. Louise Jackson's essay focuses on the Suffolk witch trials in 17th century England. However, her analysis connects women's confessions of being bewitched with their subjectivities and experiences, and thus it becomes useful for reconsidering the Salem girls' theatrical confessions and their performances in a similar light.
5. The scenario of the film adaptation in 1996 was also written by Arthur Miller, and he comments on the additional scene of the girls' secret dancing as follows: "There was a new excitement in being able to actually show the girls out in the forest with Tituba in the wee hours, playing—as I had always imagined—with the power of the underworld to bring to life their secret heart's desires" (ix-x, *Screenplay* 1996).

6. Web citation, no page numbers.

7. The Salem girls' and Tituba's voodoo-like activities in the woods were not confirmed historically in the archives of the Salem witch trials. However, Arthur Miller says that "I have no doubt that people *were* communing with, and even worshipping, the Devil in Salem. . ." (160). Marion L. Starkey's historical study also shows the possibility of voodoo-like activities, because "there were several girls about who had reached the age of sixteen, seventeen, and even twenty still manless and unprovided for. . ." (32) in Salem. Such historical evidence suggests the presence of "instinct" and "repressed vitality" (32), and thus the need for an outlet. In fact, "The girls who first discovered what sport was to be had in the society of Tituba would be those who lived in the immediate neighborhood. . ." (34), and ". . . in New England at large many people old enough to know better were currently solacing their uncertainties by practising what Cotton Mather called 'little sorceries' by conjuring with sieve and scissors and candle" (35).

8. Interestingly, not only in Miller's play but also in the historical research concerning the Salem witch trials, we can find such remarks as the following: "the general pattern of their [Salem girls'] conduct is clear enough; in modern terms they all of them, in one degree or another, had hysteria" (Starkey 45).

9. According to Clair Wills's note, this quotation is partly extracted from Peter Stallybrass and Allon White's *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*.

10. According to Louise Jackson's note, these remarks are based on Marianne Hester's book, *Lewd Women and Wicked Witches: A Study of the Dynamics of Male Domination* (1992).

Part Two

Men and Gaze: Suffering in the Panoptic Society and Family

Chapter 3

Gaze and American Male Identity in Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*

I. Masculinity as Masquerade

In Part One, I argued that female characters cannot be reduced to mere objects of the male gaze. In other words, oppressed women such as Blanche Dubois and Abigail Williams do not always play the passive roles of erotic object and socially acceptable woman that men and the male gaze impose upon them. Instead, they sometimes use the inverted gaze actively for their purposes, constructing indirect representation of their suppressed desires, subjectivity and even resistance through active performance.

In Part Two, I investigate men and gaze by focusing on male characters who are terribly distressed by being observed. Neither Willy Loman in *Death of a Salesman* (1949) nor Tom Wingfield in *The Glass Menagerie* (1945) employ the stereotypical male dominating gaze, despite their differences in age, work, and social positions. Like Blanche and Abigail, who were examined in Part One, both Willy and Tom are suffering as the objects of gaze in society and family. In this chapter, I consider how Willy Loman's desperate pursuit of success is connected with gaze (i.e., looking activities and interactional relationships through gaze). More specifically, Willy's obsession with success can be understood as his crucial need to acquire a strong male identity, which requires recognition through other people's responsive gaze within the postwar consumer society.

As explained in Part One, feminists generally emphasize androcentric ways of looking in male-dominated society and family. For example, Ann E. Kaplan indicates that women are seen "as 'object' of the dominating male gaze" (4, 1997) and Laura Mulvey refers to "the split between active/male and passive/female" (19). However, Willy Loman, the protagonist of this play, is definitely not an active gaze subject, who exercises an exclusive way of looking. Instead, he always cares about other people's

response, and desperately performs his imagined self and his masculinity in particular, as the situation demands. As a travelling salesman, Willy has worked hard to embody the myth of the American Dream for over thirty years. However, now (in the opening of the play), he is a miserable elderly salesman, who can rarely get commissions or even warm welcomes, and he is far from the ideal of American masculinity. He is too exhausted to keep his car on the road on a business trip, and too confused to distinguish between past memories and present realities. Nevertheless, Willy conceals the misery of his situation and desperately pretends to be something he is not. He lies about his sales volume and popularity. He even borrows money from his friend Charley as a substitute for his salary, so that he can continue to mime masculine roles, the capable salesman, the dependable good husband and father. Thus, we can say that Willy is a tortured man, at the mercy of other people's gaze.

As Harry Brod writes, "The masculine self has traditionally been held to be inherently opposed to the kind of deceit and dissembling characteristic of the masquerade" (13). He continues, "Like the American cowboy, 'real' men embody the primitive, unadorned, self-evident, natural truths of the world The masquerade was the province of the female. . . ." (13).¹ In a postmodern world, however, feminists start resisting such male points of view, and insist that gender (femininity or masculinity) is not an essential and biological condition (something we are born with) but a role of performance (something we do), which is socially constructed and thus variable depending on societies and times. Accordingly, the concept of masculinity has been changed, and many critics suggest that masculinity as well is unstable, a view typified by Harry Brod's fascinating remarks about "masculinity as masquerade" (13). Carla J. McDonough argues that "Just as women are shaped and limited by a compulsory femininity (body shape, dress, gesture, movement, hair, skin, makeup, emotional behavior, dependence), so are men constantly challenged to enact a compulsory masculinity (body shape, dress, gesture, movement, suppressed emotions, strength,

independence)” (5). As explained by Simone de Beauvoir’s famous phrase in *The Second Sex* (1949), “One is not born a woman but becomes one”; however, it can also be said, in short, “one is not born a man but becomes one” (McDonough 5).

Obviously, Willy’s desperate performance illustrates this notion of “masculinity as masquerade”. In his influential book analyzing American theater in the Cold War period, Bruce A. McConachie also analyzes Willy performing himself: “The pressure to perform—in business, sports, and sex—has warped the values of the Loman family and left the protagonist unsure of his identity” (44). I concur with this judgement and suggest that Willy’s performance implies a crisis of male identity which is peculiar to the Cold War period. Traditionally, masculinity has been a central issue in American theater, and “. . . so many male playwrights in America indicate a common concern with male identity. . .” (McDonough 20). In particular, Carla J. McDonough indicates that *Death of a Salesman* is one of “the most well-known portraits of troubled masculinity” (27). David Savran also gives much attention to the works of Miller and Williams which were written during the 1940s and 1950s, because these plays “. . . vividly illuminated the pressures and anxieties circulating around the normative constructions of masculinity and femininity” (9, 1992). As historian William Henry Chafe indicates, “Rarely has a society experienced such rapid or dramatic change as that which occurred in America after 1945” (106), as typified by Cold War fear, McCarthyism, and the postwar economic boom. In such drastically changing times, Willy’s anxieties about his masculinity surely exemplify those of many middle-class American men, namely, their fear and distress due to the weakening of masculinity. In the next section, I will investigate Willy’s desperate performance, particularly, his desperate presentation of himself toward other people’s gaze in connection with the Cold War society and the changing family of that era.

II. Salesman in the Panoptic Consumer Society

With the astonishing growth of the economy in the postwar years, “America had entered what the economist Walt Rostow called the ‘high mass consumption’ stage of economic development” (Chafe 107). Consumerism spread all over America, and the fifties were “. . . characterized by shifts from production to consumption, from saving to spending, from city to suburb, from blue- to white-collar employment. . .” (Breines 55). As a result, many critics, and most notably William H. Whyte in *The Organization Man*, (1956) argue such consumerism led to the weakening of some forms of masculinity, such as rugged individualism. Robert J. Corber also points out “Many men experienced the postwar shift from production to consumption as a threat to their masculinity” (28, 1997), because “. . . a hero who embodied an entrepreneurial spirit . . . could no longer find expression in American society. . .” (28, 1997). Referring to *White Collar* (1951), Corber introduces C. Wright Mill’s point of view as follows: “. . . the entrepreneurial spirit represented the fullest expression of American manhood, and thus its decline marked a feminization of male subjectivity” (33, 1997). In short, the social and historical changes in the postwar U.S., including consumerism, deeply affected the traditional notion of rugged American masculinity, and weakened male identity.

Ironically, the entrepreneurial spirit is exaggerated in this 1949 play in the form of Willy’s icons of success: his father, his brother Ben and Willy’s ideal salesman, Dave Singleman. According to Ben, their father was “a very wild-hearted man” and “Great inventor” (38)² of his products. He “played the flute” and “he’d toss the whole family into the wagon. . . , [and] he’d drive the team right across the country. . .” (38) for sales trips. Thus, Brenda Murphy indicates, Willy’s father was “a peddler” in the nineteenth century, expressing “nostalgia for a lost age when the traveling salesman was free and independent, living by his wits and his own hard work” (108). Ben “walked into the jungle” (40) and finally achieved great success, expressing “. . . the independence and daring that are the hallmarks of the entrepreneurial spirit. . .” (Corber 40, 1997). Even

the legendary salesman Dave Singleman is emphasized as an entrepreneurial type by his name and his way of selling on the phone “without ever leaving his room. . .” (63). These three men, whom Willy idolizes, symbolize the myth of the self-made man of American individualism, and their success symbolizes the frontier myth: the romanticization of the Wild West frontier and the illimitable possibilities of success. However, in the consumer society of the 1950s, such forms of masculinity (and success) have become anachronistic, and thus Willy’s commitment to outmoded ideals of masculinity leads to unfortunate results, such as his continual self-contradiction, ultimate lack of success, and even his son Biff’s roughness and habit of stealing in order to prove his own rugged masculinity.

As Linda Ben-Zvi indicates, it is clear that “he [Miller] inscribes the frontier myth within the play, showing its gradual demise” (222) through the torment of men in the Loman family. In his essay, Arthur Miller also claims the “the central theme of the modern repertoire is the alienation of man. . . social alienation—he cannot find a satisfying role in society” (Family 74). Miller continues that it is as though we “once had an identity, a *being*, somewhere in the past, which in the present has lost its completeness, its definiteness. . .” (74). These remarks recall Willy Loman and his suffering from a loss of solid sense of male identity in changing society, which caused the death of the “rugged” self-made man with the entrepreneurial spirit in the American past. Using C. Wright Mills’s *White Collar*, Robert J. Corber also examines the changes of male identity and values brought by these social changes:

According to Mills, the feminization of male subjectivity was most apparent in the rise of what he called the ‘personality market’. With the shift from industrial to monopoly capitalism the qualities considered necessary for success had undergone a transformation. Whereas in the era of industrial capitalism success had depended on initiative, drive, and ambition, it now

depended on whether one had ‘personality’ and an attractive personal appearance.” (34, 1997)

Interestingly, this quotation echoes Willy’s motto of success and masculinity as a salesman: “the man who makes an appearance in the business world, the man who creates personal interest, is the man who gets ahead” (25). It is clear that Willy tries to achieve success and masculinity according to two contradictory norms, namely, individualism as defined in the American past and “personal attractiveness” (11) as postulated in postwar America.

More importantly, Corber’s quotation suggests the importance of gaze (how Willy is looked at in this play) in achieving success in consumer society. In other words, man has to perform his own identity and masculinity, and has to be an attractive eye-catcher in order to survive in a society full of eye-catching products and people. This situation of men performing masculinity is analogous to that of oppressed women performing femininity as dictated by the dominant male gaze, even though, for example, Willy’s desperate performance is the comical mode full of jokes and humor, while Blanche’s performance is the tragic mode with soft and fragile femininity. With these drastic changes in American society, the solid sense of success and masculinity rooted in the American past, when a man could “create things with his hands, in which his identity is forged by his own actions. . .” (Bigsby 184, 1984), is transformed into unreliable sense of success and masculinity depending on intangible elements such as other people’s favorable gaze. As a result, even American men need to perform themselves more or less in consumer society, illustrating what sociologist Erving Goffman called impression management.

In *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Goffman introduced a dramaturgical theory of human behavior, suggesting that social interaction in a daily life is much like a play with people engaged in performances for and with an audience. Thus,

“impression management is a universal and ubiquitous feature of social life” (Schneider 23) regardless of gender difference. In particular, Goffman’s concept of impression management has become “a routine part of a social matrix in which behavior is a response to internalized norms and to others’ demands for self-identification” (Schneider 23). Adopting this perspective, we can understand a male theatrical tendency to perform oneself, since American men, who are suffering from a loss of masculine identity in the postwar society, desperately need to enhance their personal appearance. Specifically, the tendency to perform masculinity is prominent in Willy, a travelling salesman, who completely depends on sales commissions. His “personal attractiveness” (11), namely how he appears to customers and buyers, is very important and directly leads to his sales totals. Willy’s friend Charley also comments on the salesman’s unreliable sense of identity and the need for theatrical impression management: “. . . for a salesman, there is no rock bottom to the life. He don’t put a bolt to a nut, he don’t tell you the law or give you medicine. He’s a man way out there in the blue, riding on a smile and a shoeshine. And when they start not smiling back—that’s an earthquake” (111). Moreover, as C. Wright Mills indicates, America as a whole in the postwar period had become a “great salesroom”, and thus “The salesman’s world has now become everybody’s world, and, in some part, everybody has become a salesman” (161).³ In such competitive circumstances, Willy has to make himself stand out above a lot of “common” salesmen, who are selling “common” products. In simple terms, his desperate performance to make himself look good and masculine suggests the advertisement of himself in order to sell himself to his customers and buyers. As a result, Willy, a salesman who takes the central role in consumer society, must be also treated like one of his commodities, which always require advertisement in order to be sold.

Actually, Willy is so ineffectual that he is finally fired by his young boss Howard and is treated like a useless “commodity” regardless of his thirty years of contributions. Willy strongly complains that “You can’t eat the orange and throw the peel away—a

man is not a piece of fruit” (64). However, in “a system of capitalism based on the principles of salesmanship”, it was indeed the case that “a person was treated like a commodity to be replaced as soon as it was no longer effective” (Friedman 250). Raymond Williams also indicates in his book *Modern Tragedy*, “Willy Loman is a man who from selling things has passed to selling himself, and has become, in effect, a commodity which like other commodities will at a certain point be discarded by the laws of the economy” (104). As a commodity in a consumer society, Willy’s performance, and especially, the dramatic interpretation of his appearance, becomes much more important than what he really is. The essence of advertisement is that it “creates a dream world of images where anything seems possible” (Schroeder 14) regardless of the original functions of the products. In the requiem of the play, Charley says, “A salesman has got to dream. . . . It comes with the territory” (111), and implies that the salesman Willy had a desperate need to perform and advertise himself if he is to sell anything. Actually, we are never informed about what kind of products Willy sold, even though this play is full of many consumer products, such as cars, refrigerators, washing-machines, a wire recorder, etc. The lack of disclosure about what products Willy sold emphasizes that advertising himself is more important than the products he deals in.

In fact, Willy is insecure about his appearance and conceals his inferiority complex with a bullish and masculine performance. However, he confesses his worries to his wife Linda when he says, “I’m fat. I’m very—foolish to look at , . . . they [people] laugh at me” (29), and we can imagine his stress and torment as a commission-based salesman. Willy’s affair with “The Woman” is also caused by his anxiety of being viewed as substandard. Specifically, while he is traveling alone and feeling lonely, Willy plainly relies on the subjective gaze of his temporary lover “The Woman”: “Willy, I picked you” (29) and “. . .you’re a wonderful man. . . .” (30) in order to gain some self-esteem. Thus, C. W. E. Bigsby points out that Willy’s “misfortune was that he chose

a career in which appearance was everything As a salesman he has always to dissemble, to smile, to put up a front. He is an actor who has increasingly lost his audience” (181, 1984). However, as Carla J. McDonough indicates, “. . . if masculinity is performed successfully, its performer attains power and privilege that can offer him a greater sense of self-determination. . .” (5). This remark exactly suggests the reason why Willy desperately devotes himself to performing masculinity. It is not just to increase his sales revenue; Willy’s performance can camouflage his inferiority complexes and anxieties about his appearance and can redeem a sense of masculine power and privilege. Indeed, Willy strongly and consistently insists on his image as a masculine successful salesman: “They [people] laugh at me, hah? [. . .] Call out the name Willy Loman and see what happens! Big shot!” (48). In conclusion, in a consumer society filled with many salesmen and mass-produced goods, a common (or substandard) salesman like Willy cannot stop an exaggerated campaign of advertising and performing himself for his sales and his male identity. In other words, Willy cannot help being always conscious of others’ gaze, how people look at and think of him. As a result, much like Blanche, who was confined in the panoptic patriarchal society and family, and desperately performed as dictated by the male gaze, Willy also seems to be confined in the panoptic consumer society, in which he constantly and automatically has to perform himself, depending on his customers’ and buyers’ gaze.

III. Breadwinner Confined in the Panoptic Nuclear Family

As a noted historian Elaine Tyler May indicates, “postwar American society experienced a surge in family life and a reaffirmation of domesticity. . .” (xiv) as well as the infiltration of consumerism. As exemplified by many mass-produced home appliances in Willy’s family life, postwar consumerism infiltrated his “small, fragile-seeming home” (7), too. Specifically, “The family home would be the place where a man could display his success through the accumulation of consumer goods”

(May 146), and it is “the most tangible symbol” of “the postwar American dream” (May 143). American ideology also emphasized family values in the early Cold War period. “For [Vice president Richard] Nixon, American superiority rested on the ideal of the suburban home, complete with modern appliances and distinct gender roles for family members”, and “. . . the ‘model’ home, with a male breadwinner and a full-time female homemaker, adorned with a wide array of consumer goods, represented the essence of American freedom” (May 11).

Willy’s home with all its appliances and his family composed of a breadwinner and a housewife exemplify a model home and family of that era. Ironically, however, his house with modern convenient commodities is anything but a symbol of postwar American dream. It does not seem to function either as a comfortable place for his family life or as a retreat from the pressures of the world outside. Instead, it symbolizes the breadwinner Willy’s agonies of continuous payment and family breakup. This point is illustrated when Willy says, “Work a lifetime to pay off a house. You finally own it, and there’s nobody to live in it” (10). As a result, the family home changed into “the domestic version of containment” (May xxiv) in which a middle-class common man like Willy was forced to be a breadwinner responsible for dealing with endless family payments. In fact, the pressure that the payments exert upon Willy is emphasized throughout the play. We often see Linda, his devoted wife, calculating Willy’s sales figures and commissions with concern. As the model housewife in charge of housekeeping, she continuously reminds him of how much money the family requires: “Well, there’s nine-sixty for the washing-machine. And for the vacuum cleaner there’s three and a half due on the fifteenth. Then the roof, you got twenty-one dollars remaining” (27). However, the never-ending series of amounts and calculations impose mental strain on Willy, and he desperately says, “A hundred and twenty dollars! My God, if business don’t pick up I don’t know what I’m gonna do!” (28).

In the Cold War nuclear family that rested on distinct roles for women and men, as

sociologist Talcot Persos and Robert F. Bales indicate, “. . . the American male, by definition, *must* ‘provide’ for his family. He is *responsible* for the support of his wife and children. His primary area of performance is the occupational role, in which his status fundamentally inheres; and his *primary* function in the family is to supply an ‘income’, to be the ‘breadwinner’” [Original emphasis] (339). This quotation surely suggests that how much money a breadwinner of the era earns is more important than his love and affection. As a result, Willy has to perform the role of capable salesman not only in society but also in his family. By acting as a salesman who can afford family expenditures, Willy can finally achieve a masculine identity as a husband and father in his family.

When we consider the gaze relationship in Willy’s performance for his family, Willy does not actually exercise a dominant way of looking as a patriarch. Instead, he is a gaze object who is always worrying about how his audience (in this case, his family and specifically his wife Linda) look at him. Conversely, Linda, who seems to be a passive wife, ironically and unknowingly functions as a gaze subject to watch and control Willy. In the opening of the play, Willy’s “*exhaustion is apparent*” (8), and cannot be camouflaged by his performance anymore. However, Linda pretends not to see Willy’s imaginative performance, while watching him carefully and affectionately. When “*He [Willy] loses himself in reminiscences*” (11) during a conversation, she changes the subject quickly, and when he loses his confidence in his reputation with buyers, she cheers him up just as “The Woman” did: “Willy, darling, you’re the handsomest man in the world—” (29). In this way, Linda keeps him under close watch, and tries to support Willy’s performance as a capable salesman, and to stop his suicide, hinted at by the “little rubber pipe” (47) she found in the cellar. Thus, Linda seems to be the observing subject, practically maintaining a surveillance of her family, and ironically the householder Willy is the object of her close attention. Thomas E. Porter also points out an alternative element of an obedient housewife Linda: “she [Linda] is no

protection—by her silence and her support, she unwittingly cooperates with the destructive myth [of success]” (147). I would argue that such an element of Linda is particularly implied in the inverted gaze relation between Linda and Willy. Of course, her close gaze at Willy is originally derived from her affection and support for Willy, as exemplified in her famous tear-jerking lines: “So attention must be paid” (44). However, her gaze ironically has a forceful impact that makes Willy nervous, forcing him to desperately seek monetary success as compensation for his guilt.

As we saw in Chapter 1, Michel Foucault has developed the concept of “The Panopticon”, which focuses on the gaze interactions between the person to be looked at and the watcher looking at him/her, especially in the context of an organization and its space, both partitioned and closed off for constant inspection (such as jails, schools, asylums, etc). The major effect of “The Panopticon” is “to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power” (Foucault 201). In this play, Willy’s secret affair with “The Woman” and the resulting sense of guilt ironically produce the same kind of power for Linda, who watches Willy continuously and controls him through her gaze, as if she were the guard of a jail. That is to say, whenever he sees Linda supporting the family devotedly as a good wife, especially when mending her stockings, Willy’s sense of guilt erupts, and it implants a deep moral debt in his mind. This debt imposes upon him a need for monetary success as compensation, as illustrated when he says “I’ll make it all up to you, Linda...” (30). Alice Griffin also indicates that “Because women’s nylon stockings were a luxury during and after World War II, the fact that Linda is always mending her stockings infuriates Willy and deepens [his] guilt” (52, 1996). Unmistakably involved in Willy’s paranoid guilt, Linda becomes a constant and powerful source of control by gaze. Foucault also pointed out that the Panopticon “automatizes and disindividualizes power. Power has its principle not so much in a person as in a certain concerted distribution of bodies, surfaces, lights, gazes...” (202). Thus, “The Woman”, who appears laughing in

Willy's consciousness frequently, also functions as an invisible but ever-present watcher of the Panopticon, making Willy constantly nervous, and joining Linda to implant an ever-greater guilt in his mind.

Moreover, there are several other situations in this play which arouse Willy's guilt and make him feel like an inmate of the Panopticon. For example, when Willy is suffering from the laughter of "The Woman", Letta (a young girl at the restaurant) irrelevantly says, suggestively, "Were you fellows ever on a jury?" (89). When Willy and "The Woman" hear an unexpected visitor (Biff) knocking at the door of their hotel room, he is worried because "there's a law in Massachusetts about it [adultery]. . ." (92). Bernard, the lawyer, also asks "What happened in Boston, Willy?" (74), and the cross-examination leads Willy to "*look at him as at an intruder*" (74). Clearly, Willy's sense of guilt over his affair distorts the roles played by Linda, "The Woman", and even the rest of the family and society. Confined in the Panopticon of his own guilt and sense of inadequacy as a good husband and father, Willy is fatally driven by the forceful gazes of others to seek monetary compensation as a breadwinner, the ideal male model in the Cold War period.

IV. Gaze and the Construction of Masculinity

In this section, focusing on the gaze, I examine in more detail the reasons why Willy obsessively adheres to two contradictory male models of success and masculinity: that of the self-made man relying on the ideas of individualism and the frontier spirit in the American past, and that of the successful salesman and breadwinner with personal attractiveness in postwar America. Obviously, Willy absurdly and tragically mixes up these models, and even believes that he can achieve both simultaneously in New York. He confidently says, "Ben, contracts! The whole wealth of Alaska passed over the lunch table at the Commodore Hotel, and that's the wonder, the wonder of this country, that a man can end with diamonds here on the basis of being liked!" (68). Generally speaking,

Willy's occupation, the postwar salesman, seems to have nothing to do with rugged masculinity and enormous success, as is defined in the myth of the self-made man and frontier myth exemplified by Ben and his adventurous fortune-hunting in Alaska. However, from Willy's perspective, a salesman in metropolitan New York can achieve the same kind of big success by his self-promotional performance with his entrepreneurial and self-made spirit, and by being liked by many buyers and customers, while staying with his beloved family. Willy never doubts this belief, and as a result he tragically commits suicide to achieve such a contradictory ideal.

Gaze theories help explain Willy's obsessive attachment to such contradictory notions of manhood because, psychoanalytically, the construction of identity (male identity) is deeply connected with our looking activities. Famously, Jacques Lacan's notion of the "mirror stage" suggests that ". . . the child gains a sense of his own unity with the help of a mirror. The eyes are thus the very source of man's sense of Self" (Altman 519). More generally, as Phyllis Tyson indicates, many psychoanalysts have suggested that the father ". . . plays an important role in helping the child began to establish a male gender-role identification" (180)⁴, but on the basis of his concept of Oedipus complex, Sigmund Freud specifically argued the importance lies in looking activities for acquiring gendered identity, that is, visual identification with a father is essential for a boy to assume male identity. The following is a brief summary of a boy's fears and the system of identification with his father by Olga Silverstein and Beth Rashbaum:

The male child develops a strong emotional attachment to his mother but comes to fear his father's retaliation against him for this attachment. Specifically, the son comes to fear that his father will castrate him. . . [as someone has castrated his mother]. The son deals with this fear by becoming like his father through an identification process called identification with the aggressor. Boys identify with the aggressor to become the aggressor, rather

than the object of aggression. . . . (85-6)

Thus, we now conclude that the construction of the male identity essentially requires a real existence of a father figure and the visual identification with him from psychological perspective.

Such a strong influence of the father as the visual model of male identity is emphasized in this play in, for example, the relationship between Willy and Biff. When Biff was a high school football star, we can see his strong affection for Willy and blind belief in Willy's values of success: "the man who creates personal interest, is the man who gets ahead" (25). Biff joyfully repeats Willy's meaningless words "He's liked, but he's not well liked" (25), suggesting Biff's identification with Willy. Linda also says to Willy, "Few men are idolized by their children the way you are" (29), and Willy was surely Biff's visual and psychological model of success and masculinity. However, when Biff witnessed Willy's adultery, Biff was shocked and disappointed by his father, and left home. Subsequently, Biff has "had "twenty or thirty different kinds of job" (16) drifting from town to town, and now he says, "I don't know what to do with myself" (17), suggesting that he has lost his model of masculinity. As for Willy, he has little memory of his father except for him having "a big beard" (38) and the sound of "flute" (38) he sold. It is clear that Willy lacks the figure of a real father—the identification model with which to create his male identity. Willy has a problem about his identity as is illustrated when he says, "I—well, Dad left when I was such a baby and I never had a chance to talk to him and I still feel—kind of temporary about myself" (40). Therefore, he desperately says to his brother, "Please tell about Dad. I want my boys to hear. I want them to know the kind of stock they spring from" (37-8). Clearly, Willy wants to redeem his father's visual images as his identification model.

Unlike Willy, Biff, who has grown up with his father's deep affection, finally recognizes that he does not need any idealized model of a father. He can accept his

father for what he is, and he is also able to accept himself just as he is: “Pop! I’m a dime a dozen, and so are you” (105). Even though Biff describes himself and his father using money metaphor, which is the typical measurement of masculinity in consumer society, this remark indicates that Biff is taking the first step to creating his own identity and that he has no need to copy his father or his father’s idealized version of masculinity. However, Willy, who psychologically lacks a real father figure and a father’s selfless love, cannot help but depend on his idealized model of a father and masculinity as defined by the frontier myth, even though such a model of masculinity had already become anachronistic. By achieving success based on American individualism like his father and his brother, Willy thinks he would be able to achieve identification with them finally. Concomitantly, he would be able to finally earn their attention and recognition as one of the masculine Loman men. Specifically, as James Hurt indicates, “Biff and Happy [Willy’s sons] are parallel in some ways to Ben and Willy” (136), and thus the common second son Willy, who does not stand out in comparison with his talented brother, inescapably desires the admiring gaze of his father (or his brother Ben, who is a substitute father).

In fact, I would argue that the insurance money that Willy’s family will receive as a result of his self-destruction in one sense allows Willy to become the self-made man that he had always desperately desired to be. Like Ben, who risked his life to enter into darkness (i.e., the jungle) alone with bravery and finally got diamonds (i.e., big success), Willy also risked his life by entering into darkness (i.e., death) alone with bravery, and reaped the reward of the insurance money (i.e., big success). Therefore, Willy’s suicide finally allowed him to identify with his father figure, despite not remembering him, and the father figure of his surrogate father Ben as well.

Another of Willy’s attachments to the measure of success and masculinity in postwar consumer society and family is also deeply connected with looking activities. Historically, a resurgence of a family ideals based on the breadwinner/homemaker

division was promoted by television, the most typical of modern appliances in consumer society.⁵ With the prevalence of television in the 1950s, the image of the happy family composed of a breadwinner father and a full-time homemaker mother in their comfortable (suburban) home was widely emphasized and disseminated by popular situation comedies such as “Father Knows Best” and “The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet”. As a result, as historian Stephanie Coontz argues, many people were trapped by such visual images of the ideal family on TV, and had to suffer from the gap between their real families and the ideal family. Although television is not mentioned in this play, Willy’s small house with some modern convenient appliances unmistakably exemplifies the home of a typical nuclear family in the postwar period. Actually, Willy is a slave to the responsibilities of the breadwinner, and he is reminiscent of those sufferers described by Coontz. Sociologist C. Wright Mills also argued that: “The contents of the mass media are now a sort of common denominator of American experience, feeling, belief, and aspiration. [. . .] Contents of the mass media seep into our images of self, becoming that which is taken for granted,” “imperceptibly” but “surely” (334), suggesting that mass media has the ineluctable influence to indoctrinate us into adopting acceptable gender roles visually and psychologically.

Hollywood movies also emphasized the image of an ideal family man, rather than the self-made hero of the 1950s. Referring to film historian Peter Biskind’s *Seeing is Believing* (1983), Stephanie Coontz points out the characteristics of the heroes in the fifties as follows: “. . . almost every major male star who had played tough loners in the 1930s and 1940s ‘took the roles with which he was synonymous and transformed them, in the fifties, into neurotics or psychotics’. In these films, ‘men belonged at home, not on the streets or out on the prairie, . . . not alone or hanging out with other men’” (27). Like such male characters in the 1950s movies, Willy also gave up his dream of pursuing the frontier myth in Alaska, and stayed in New York with a family to be a breadwinner. Thus, Willy is surely affected by the influence of mass media, which

constantly emphasizes ideal images of the happy American family and the traditional male gender role of breadwinner.

Moreover, Laura Mulvey points out that one of the male pleasure in viewing movies is “. . . developed through narcissism and the construction of the ego, [which] comes from identification with the image seen” (18). More specifically, while watching movies, “The male spectator engages in a narcissistic identification with the male hero, a process that repeats the discovery of an image of oneself in the ‘mirror phrase’ postulated by Lacan” (Curran and Donelan 143). Watching movies and narcissistically identifying with the masculine stars arguably provides the male viewers with the same kind of psychological effects as identification with a father figure, leading to a sense of solid male identity. Willy’s preferences in film are unknown, but Willy, who is always suffering from his unstable male identity, often watches flashbacks, imaginary projections in his head, with an ecstatic look, and such visions may function like Hollywood films for him. Arnold Aronson has pointed out that Miller actually “acknowledges the ‘cinematic’ quality of *Death of a Salesman*. . .” (85), especially of Willy’s flashbacks because movies can transform “the consciousness of a generation” and “move fluidly through time and space—from scene to scene, moment to moment and even from present to past and back” (85) beyond limitations on the stage.

Whenever Willy feels anxiety and insecurity about his masculinity (specifically after his adultery was discovered by his son Biff), flashbacks appear to him. These psychic scenes repeatedly provide Willy with visions of what he used to be, namely, a hero-like father figure for Biff as a reliable breadwinner and a modestly successful salesman. Therefore, these flashbacks surely function as supplemental identification to camouflage his present anxieties about his unstable masculine identity. Ironically, these obsessive visions eventually compel Willy to take his own life because his only way to recapture his masculinity as portrayed in the visions of himself was to exchange his life for financial gain in the form of his life insurance money. The money gained in exchange

for Willy's life can be understood as the ultimate monetary support of an incapable salesman for his beloved family. Strictly speaking, however, the life insurance money must be synonymous with the price of Willy himself, suggesting a self-commodification in a consumer society. Therefore, Willy's death payout suggests that his life was also exchanged for money as the price of a "twenty-thousand-dollar proposition" (99), emphasizing the dehumanization of a common American man and the crisis of masculinity in consumer society and family.

In this chapter, by focusing primarily on Willy's looking activities and interactional relationships through gaze, I have considered that his paranoid obsession with success is derived from his crucial need to acquire solid male identity and masculinity. His sense of identity and masculinity as well as his success as a salesman essentially require recognition through the responsive gaze of people both in society at large and in the family including buyers, customers, his wife, and sons, and even his deceased father and substitute father, Ben. As a result, Willy desperately and tragically has to keep performing several seemingly incompatible masculine roles, such as the rugged self-made man, the competent salesman, the responsible breadwinner and father, depending on the situation. In other words, Willy, a representative of common American men, is a slave of gaze in the panoptic postwar American society and in the family based on consumerism and domesticity. As many feminist critics indicate, the gaze is not always the emblem of male domination over female. Throughout the play, the power relationships embodied in Willy's male gaze are repeatedly resisted and subverted by other characters in this play, indirectly but effectively emphasizing the weakening of the masculine identity in the Cold War period.

Notes

1. To support his remarks, Harry Brod also notes that "Philosophers such as Plato and Rousseau have,

for example, considered any sort of playacting or pretension to be corrupting of the masculine virtues” (5).

2. Miller, Arthur. *Death of a Salesman*. London: Penguin Classics, 2000. All quotations from *Death of a Salesman* are from this edition and are indicated by page numbers in parentheses.

3. Salesmen are common not only in American society of the time but also in the major American plays of the 1940s, whose principal figures are often salesmen; cf., Eugene O’Neill’s *The Iceman Cometh* (published 1940, produced 1946), and Tennessee Williams’s *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947) .

4. For example, Margaret Mahler (1966) and E. L. Abelin (1971, 1975)

5. Regarding the rapid spread of home appliances in postwar America, Elaine Tyler May indicates that “In the four years following the end of the war, Americans purchased 21.4 million cars, 20 million refrigerators, 5.5 million stoves, and 11.6 million televisions. . . . The same patterns extended into the 1950s, a decade in which prosperity continued to spread” (148).

Chapter 4

Searching for the Subjective Male Gaze in Tennessee Williams's

The Glass Menagerie

I. Confinement in the Panoptic Family and Society

In Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie* (1945), we can also find a male character who does not employ the male prerogative even in patriarchal American society and culture. As Willy Loman gave up his adventure in Alaska for his family, Tom Wingfield also sacrifices his youthful dream and desire for adventure, and is forced to work to support his mother Amanda and his sister Laura after his father runs away. He suffers tremendously from the responsibilities and limitations of the traditional male role of breadwinner. Specifically, Tom's suffering and oppressed position are represented more clearly in his gaze (looking activities and the power relation through the gaze), namely, in non-verbal communication rather than in his dialogue, and he clearly suffers from the dominating gaze in family and society. However, unlike Willy Loman, who always keeps performing as a likable gaze object according to the situation, Tom desperately resists his position as a gaze object and struggles to acquire his own gaze, that is, his position as a gaze subject, who can see freely and subjectively. In this chapter, I will consider such desperate struggles for subjectivity in looking in association with the construction of Tom's masculinity and his desire for creativity as an artist. In other words, his desperate search for a subjective gaze can be understood as his resistance to conformity to idealized social norms and roles that weaken his artistic originality and his American masculinity based on individualism and self-reliance.¹

This play is set in Saint Louis, Missouri in 1937, and both Williams and Tom (as a narrator of the play) also emphasize that this is "memory play" (131)² dealing with the past, "the thirties" (145). However, arguably, uniformity and conformity in the prewar 1930s had the effect of at once pressuring and suppressing American men who had

valued individualism, much as domestic confinement in the Cold War period later did. Actually, this play enjoyed great success in the late 1940s, and thus Tom's sufferings as the breadwinner and his instable masculinity can be treated as being parallel to the Cold War masculinity. In his family, where a domestic model of masculinity is ideologically imposed, Tom does not enjoy the male domination of an acting patriarch, regardless of his grave responsibility. Instead, his mother Amanda is "indisputably the dominant presence onstage as a homemaker, and she dominates [her son and daughter] by talking" (Kushner 2) and more importantly, I would argue by looking. She consistently watches Tom and his behavior and says, "You smoke too much" (147), "Promise, son, you'll—never be a drunkard!" (171), and "Comb your hair!" (178). She is even fastidious about his eating, "And chew—chew! . . . human beings are supposed to chew their food before they swallow it down. . ." (146). Tom's remark about her gaze, her ". . . hawklike attention to every bite I take. . ." (146) illustrates his feelings of constant tension and cooped-up feelings under her surveillance. Furthermore, Amanda complains about Tom's artistic preferences and romantic desire for adventure because they negatively affect his work and threaten the economic foundation of her family. She criticizes his D. H. Lawrence novel as "FILTH" (161), hates his frequent movie watching, and strongly rejects his yearning for adventure by saying, "What right have you got to jeopardize your job? Jeopardize the security of us all? . . ." (162-3). These despotic assertions and constant surveillance characterize Amanda as a powerful surveillant in her family. Such a family surely recalls Michel Foucault's concept of the Panopticon, which confines Tom, effectively imposing the values of the organized and administered society of the Cold War period.³

Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* appeared in 1975, almost 20 years after this play was written. William Kleb, however, sees "Williams's work as a kind of imaginative prefiguration of Foucault's theory. . ." (27). Actually, the Wingfield's apartment is depicted as one of many "hive-like conglomerations of cellular living-units. . ." (143),

and this stage direction is comparable to the original structure of the Panopticon, which was composed of a “peripheric building [,which] is divided into [countless] cells. . .” (Foucault 200) for the confined inmates, and a tower for a supervisor at the center. In addition, Williams indicates that these “conglomerations of cellular living-units” for the lower middle class “*exist and function as one interfused mass of automatism*” (143). Such functioning is exactly analogous to “the major effect of the Panopticon: to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power” (Foucault 201). Even the theater audience without access to such stage directions “*is faced with the dark, grim near wall of the Wingfield tenement*” (143) and the building “*flanked on both sides by dark, narrow alleys which run into murky canyons of tangled clotheslines, garbage cans. . .*” (143) at the rise of the curtain. Thus, viewers must visually feel the panoptic family and society confining and controlling Tom. Specifically, “*a fire escape*” is symbolically present in the play because “. . . *all of these huge buildings are always burning with the slow and implacable fires of human desperation*” (143), emphasizing the absolute necessity of Tom’s “*escape from a trap*” (129).

Moreover, Tom’s workplace, a shoe factory warehouse with “*celotex interior*” and “*fluorescent tubes*” (163) also symbolizes a panoptic space that confines him and polices all his actions. As suggested by his nickname, “Shakespeare”, Tom sometimes wrote poems “when business was slack in the warehouse” (190), but such artistic creativity is seen “with suspicious hostility. . .” (190) by others. Metaphorically, Tom compares his desire to escape from such an asphyxiating situation to a “*coffin trick*” (167) in a magic show he saw: “There is a trick that would come in handy for me—get me out of this two-by-four situation!” (167). In panoptic family and society, Tom’s masculinity (including masculine actions, ways of thinking and looking, and desire) and his artistic character (i.e., sensitivity and creativity) are constantly repressed and neglected, and such a situation symbolizes the death of the American male artist.

Therefore, we can agree “His escape, heartless though it may seem, is a ‘necessary and wholesome measure of self-preservation’” (Tischler 10).⁴

II. Movies: Masculinity and Visual Pleasure

Regardless of the infringement on his masculine autonomy and pleasure, especially in looking, Tom desperately resists and tries to acquire an active and subjective gaze. For example, he often peers through the window to see “the Paradise Dance Hall” across the alley, where he sees couples “kissing behind ash pits and telephone poles” (179). Such a “Peeping Tom” surely enjoys the privileged looking, more specifically, “voyeurism”. Peeping is obviously the exercise of the male dominating gaze, and leads to temporary acquisition of masculinity for Tom, an oppressed breadwinner. Actually, Tom says, “This [peeping] was the compensation for lives that passed like mine, without any change or adventure” (179). In fact, feminist E. Ann Kaplan indicates that “The gaze is not necessarily male (literally), but to own and activate the gaze, given our language and the structure of the unconscious, is to be in the ‘masculine’ position” (Is the Gaze Male 30). Peeping obviously ensures Tom acquisition of a sense of masculine identity, including male desire and pleasure, even though his speech and behavior are limited and repressed by his family and workplace.

According to Kaplan, such masculine position and domination in looking are more prominent in relation to “Hollywood films” (Is the Gaze Male 30). Film critics Harry M. Benshoff and Sean Griffin also indicate that within patriarchal cultures, “women have been discriminated against in the media (and in society generally)” (257), emphasizing normative and dominant male gaze in Hollywood films. Laura Mulvey also points out male “voyeuristic fantasy” (17), in particular, the privilege of looking without being looked at in male-dominated movies. Karen Boyle has claimed that such “voyeuristic fantasy” is a typical pleasure that “mainstream film creates for its male spectator” and it “gives the illusion of mastery and control” (126) by “using another person (woman) as

an object of sexual stimulation through sight” (125), just as the peeping does.⁵ Actually, as represented by his “*shower of movie ticket stubs*” (166), Tom is addicted to movies, and such an obsession may well be derived from this pleasure of voyeuristic fantasy in films, as well as wish fulfillment and escapism.

Moreover, movies also provide male spectators with the pleasure of narcissistic identification with male movie stars, allowing viewers access to powerful feelings and the “sense of omnipotence” (Mulvey 21). Karen Boyle briefly summarizes Mulvey’s remarks about this pleasure of identification as follows:

Identification Mulvey explains with reference to Jacques Lacan’s notion of the mirror stage—the moment when a child recognises their own image in the mirror. At this stage in children’s development, their physical ambitions exceed their physical abilities and so this moment is a joyous (mis)recognition—the self in the mirror is imagined to be more complete, more ideal than the child’s experiences of their own body. For the male spectator, cinematic identification involves a similar process in that the spectator (mis)recognizes in the on-screen protagonist a more complete, more ideal version of himself and identifies with the image seen. (125)

French film theorist Christian Metz also closely analyzed the cinematic experience of identification, and “For Metz, the lead character in a film represents the ego ideal, which resembles the pre-Oedipal experience of Lacan’s mirror stage” (Marshall 14), which is the first sense of self-identity (the formation of an ego) by looking in a mirror. Specifically, in the darkened theater, which resembles a state of dreaming, “The character [in a film] represents a more complete being—much as the mirror represents the more complete being of the child than its everyday uncoordinated baby self—and film’s pleasure is partially built on this fundamental misrecognition for identification”

(Marshall 14). Therefore, we can say that male viewers' identification with masculine protagonists in movies is deeply connected with a solid sense of male identities.

When we consider such visual pleasure of identification in movies and psychological effects on the male spectator, Tom's exaggerated addiction to movies obviously implies a crisis in his male identity. In other words, watching movies and exercising the male active gaze must be a temporary means to enhance his sense of masculinity, which is infringed upon in restrictive daily life. Actually, Tom says, "I like adventure. Adventure is something I don't have much of at work, so I go to the movies" (173). It is clear that movies offer Tom virtual adventure and compensate for his dull life through identifying with masculine protagonists in popular movies, which generally include "mythic masculine heroes" on "amazing journeys or quests," or "men attempting to gain success and prove their mettle through violent criminal action" (Benshoff and Griffin 259). Even Tom's ridiculous sarcastic remark to his mother ("I've joined the Hogan Gang [. . .] They call me Killer, Killer Wingfield, I'm leading a double-life, a simple, honest warehouse worker by day, by night a dynamic *czar* of the *underworld*, *Mother*." (164)) seems to imply his narcissistic identification with male protagonists in movies so that he can complement his sense of masculinity arrested by his mother, who always criticizes his behavior. Tom's desire for such identification is undoubtedly exacerbated by his lack of a father figure, the fundamental gender model. The need of a father figure as a role model is prominent in Tom's consciousness, and it is reflected on the stage of his memory play by his father's "larger-than-life-size photograph over the mantel" (145). Actually, in this play that projects Tom's memory of the past from his subjective perspective, he sets up his father as "a fifth character" (145), who is represented by the visual memento. Accordingly, the visual presentation of his father as a handsome young man with a smile and "*doughboy's First World War cap*" (144) emphasizes his father not only as an irresponsible breadwinner but also as a free-spirited adventurer. It foreshadows Tom's escape, which is psychologically influenced by his father as his

model of identification.

Not only Tom but also many American men required movies and narcissistic identification with masculine protagonists in order to reinforce their weakening sense of masculinity before and after World War II. Specifically, as Timothy Barnard notes, “During the 1930s, the experiences of economic depression and world war shaped two of Hollywood’s most distinctively masculine genres—Westerns and war films. . .”, leading to “. . . Hollywood’s ‘Golden Age’ of the 1930s and 1940s” (212).⁶ The spread of large number of masculine movies seems to reflect a rising demand for solid models of masculinity in a drastically changing American society and family. It has been pointed out that “Mass media and other organized entertainments . . . provide the ways and means of acquiring masculinity within American culture” (Benshoff and Griffin 258), and in particular a movie must have been an effective tool to provide the normative (or ideal) images of masculinity, making powerful use of voyeuristic fantasy and narcissistic identification. Meanwhile, Tom observes such phenomena coolly: “People go to the *movies* instead of *moving!* Hollywood characters are supposed to have all the adventures for everybody in American, while everybody in America sits in a dark room and watches them have them!” (201). In a sense, the popularity of masculine movies ironically suggests that such rugged and strong masculinity as seen in cinematic fantasy cannot be actualized by American men’s own actions in reality, especially in urban areas. This is exemplified by Tom’s grief as a worker: “Man is by instinct a lover, a hunter, fighter, and none of those instincts are given much play at the warehouse!” (174). Williams’s description of the setting, “*warty growths in overcrowded urban centers of lower middle-class population*” (143), also emphasizes not only the limitations of actions and opportunities in urban life but also limitations in the outlook of American men concerning self-reliance, as well as a lack of adventurous spirit, instinct, and individuality in a conformist society where people try to “*avoid fluidity and differentiation and to exit and function as one interfused mass of automatism*” (143).

Tom describes this state of affairs as a blinkered way of looking, as if the “. . . huge middle class of America was matriculating in a school for the blind. Their eyes had failed them, or they had failed their eyes. . .” (145). This remark metaphorically suggests that looking activities can be a barometer of masculinity, among other things. In short, the “blind” eyes of American men symbolize their weakening masculinity in conforming society, leading to Tom’s desperate desire for escape.

As typified by his words, “I’m tired of the *movies* and I am *about to move!*” (201), Tom finally breaks away from the virtual adventures presented by movies and embarks on a real adventure in search of his own masculinity based on his subjective actions and gaze. However, we can predict that such an adventurous attempt will end in failure when considering the direct cause of Tom’s escape, namely the influence of the forthcoming war. He says delightedly, “Yes, . . . there’s a war. That’s when adventure becomes available to the masses! *Everyone’s* dish, not only [Clark] Gable’s!” (201). This remark ironically suggests that Tom merely became ensnared in the conformity of another idealized image of masculinity, which was also visually and ideologically emphasized by popular war movies at that time. In other words, even though Tom escaped from organized society, family and conformity to the male domestic role as a breadwinner, he could not finally escape from the influence of normative, culturally-defined images of masculinity. As Lacan’s psychoanalytical concept of the mirror stage indicates, the eye is the source of man’s sense of self. Thus, Tom is creating his sense of self and masculinity not by his own actions and visions but by various external visual images. Accordingly, Tom has little chance to escape from the influence of the floods of such visual images, which affect and control Tom psychologically, becoming a kind of unavoidable destiny that forces him to act out the ideal roles of masculinity unconsciously and tragically. Kaja Silverman insists on “the ideological status of the screen by describing it as that culturally generated image or repertoire of images through which subjects are not only constituted, but differentiated in relation to

class, race, sexuality, age, and nationality” (150, 1992). Popular masculine movies surely provided the male spectator Tom with a temporary subjective male gaze, which tentatively enforced his sense of masculinity, but at the same time, such movies tragically led Tom to fall into a trap with no escape.

III. Memory Play: In Search of the Distinctive Artist’s Gaze

Next, I examine Tom’s search for subjective gaze in connection with his quest as an artist. In his introduction to *27 Wagons Full of Cotton*, Tennessee Williams writes “Art is only anarchy in juxtaposition with organized society. It runs counter to the sort of orderliness on which organized society apparently must be based” (vii). Arguably, Tom’s quest for subjective gaze indirectly suggests his resistance to uniformly conformist society as an artist. In other words, Tom’s artistic temperament essentially requires a distinctive perspective on life, leading to his escape into romantic and free adventure. However, he says at the end of the play, “. . . attempting to find in motion what was lost in space, I traveled around a great deal. The cities swept about me like dead leaves. . .” (237). This implies that his resistance and “. . . dreams of life as a meaningful voyage (or ‘sea-change’) end [in] only aimless drifting” (14, 1987) according to Judith J. Thompson. Tom Scanlan also points out “[Tom’s] Escape from family does not result in a struggle to find a new order to replace family . . . [and] it means, instead, a desperate search for some anodyne to the pain of being bereft of family” (157). In short, Tom finds himself still in a death-like situation, troubled by the memory of his family even after his physical escape.

Before his departure, Tom often poetically expressed his confined and suffocating situation by using death-related metaphors such as “coffin” and “underworld” (164). Even his hopeful plan as a voyager is still haunted by the image of death in the projection of “the sailing vessel with the Jolly Roger” (200) shown in the play by “magic-lantern slides bearing images or titles [of the scene]” (132) which present Tom’s

inner perspective to the audience and the readers. As Bert Cardullo notes, “a pirate ship flying the traditional skull-and-crossbones flag . . . obviously symbolize[s] death” (74) to others or possibly pirates themselves, and it foreshadows “his [Tom’s] own demise, or descent into darkness at sea. . .” (74, 2007). In Tom’s dark and miserable consciousness and memories, only Laura is emphasized as a shining existence in the stage direction: “The light upon Laura should be distinct from the other, having a peculiar pristine clarity such as light used in early religious portraits of female saints or madonnas” (133-4). Laura “retreats to gaze into her tiny glass figures” (Tischler 14), and thus her shining glass animals clearly symbolize Laura herself, “the objective correlative of her fragile, otherworldly beauty” (Thompson 15, 1987). Ironically, however, I would argue that her solemn lighting—as is common in works of art “such as El Greco’s” religious paintings (134)—cannot bring about salvation for Tom, who abandoned her and his family. Instead, as typified by his desperate cry—“Blow out your candles, Laura. . .” (217), Tom is haunted by the relentless memory of his sister, who is always shining quietly. Tom confesses his ceaseless sense of guilt in despair: “Then all at once my sister touches my shoulder. I turn around and look into her eyes. Oh, Laura, Laura, I tried to leave you behind me, but I am more faithful than I intended to be!” (237) (emphasis added). In Tom’s consciousness, crippled Laura is not a powerless crippled woman or a weak gaze object anymore, who always worried about being looked at. Rather, her “eyes” appear at any place and any time in his consciousness, suggesting Laura is the looking subject just like a surveillant who watches Tom and blames him for his cruel action (i.e., his escape) silently and continuously. As a result, Laura’s gaze has a forceful impact that makes Tom feel nervous and guilty, forcing him to desperately seek salvation or escape from his guilt. This clearly suggests the psychological effects of a Panopticon. As “. . . a prisoner of the past” (Durham 34), Tom is ironically and finally confined in the never-ending gaze of the inerasable memory of his abandoned family.

Nevertheless, as an artist, Tom desperately resists his traumatic past through the creation of this memory play. In the opening, Tom declares for the audience as the narrator, “I give you truth in the pleasant disguise of illusion” instead of the stage magician’s “illusion that has the appearance of truth” (144). These remarks clearly show that Tom—as a male gaze subject—tries to review his traumatic past and memories through his own distinctive gaze, and recreate them according to his artistic vision, so that he might be released from his imaginary Panopticon and Laura’s eyes looking at him continuously. The memory play itself, introduced by Tom’s narration, must be quite an effective means for Tom to achieve such a purpose because as R. B. Parker indicates, “. . . in the Memory Play we not only see exclusively what the narrator [Tom] consciously wants us to see, but also see it only *in the way* he chooses that we should” (68). In other words, this memory play can be viewed as the reenactment of Tom’s past and memories from his unique artistic point of view, assuring that Tom can finally acquire a dominant gaze toward his nightmarish memories as a playwright and a stage director.

It has been said that “Tom Wingfield is Williams’s most autobiographical character. Tom’s leave-taking mirrors Williams’s own departure from his family’s SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI, apartment and from his emotionally unstable sister, ROSE. . .” (Heintzelman and Smith-Howard 94). Perhaps, then, Tom’s attempts to recreate his memories through his artistic perspective, can be understood as Williams’s own attempts to be released from his own traumatic memories and sense of guilt. For the purpose of such artistic release, Williams emphasizes “the unimportance of the photographic in art: that truth, life, or reality is an organic thing which the poetic imagination can represent or suggest, in essence, only through transformation, through changing into other forms than those which were merely present in appearance” (131). Specifically, he focuses on “Expressionism”, as one of “unconventional techniques in drama . . . that is a closer approach to truth” (131). Expressionism, originating in

Germany, was used in poetry, painting, and films at the beginning of the 20th century in order to present the world solely from a subjective perspective. In Williams's play, in particular, Annette J. Saddik suggests that German expressionism's "dream-like distortions were an effective means of accessing the truths that exist beneath the surfaces of constructed social realities" (357). Such non-photorealistic ways of representing the world surely suggest Williams's (and indirectly, Tom's) unique subjective gaze as he reviews his traumatic past and memories. More importantly, such transformation of his nightmarish past into "dream-like distortions" arguably releases Williams (or at least Tom) from his miserable vision of the real past.

Some quite cinematic techniques in this play do provide the same kind of effects as German expressionism. Originally, "The play [*The Glass Menagerie*] was an adaptation of a film script (*The Gentleman Caller*) based on a short story ('Portrait of a Girl in Glass')" (Roger Boxill 64), and according to Gilbert Maxwell, a friend of Williams since 1940, Williams "went to the movies to escape 'from a world of poverty and misunderstanding' in his reality" (Crandell 1), so Williams himself was also a movie fanatic like Tom Wingfield. Therefore, we should notice Williams's deep knowledge of cinematic techniques and the adaptation (or duplication) of such techniques in this play. In fact, Philip C. Kolin suggests that "He [Williams] crafted his dramas as if they were films. . ." (5, 2008), and George Brandt also suggests Williams "has most effectively learnt the lessons in freedom that the cinema has to teach" (165), indicating that *The Glass Menagerie* is "the most cinematic of Williams's plays" (181). Specifically, I would like to focus on two kinds of cinematic techniques in this play, the lighting and camerawork, when we try to understand Williams's (and by extension, Tom's) quest for artistic vision.

As mentioned above, Williams emphasizes how to use lighting, and specifically, lighting on Laura, in the Production Notes. He says, "The lighting in the play is not realistic. In keeping with the atmosphere of memory, the stage is dim" (133). As a

narrator, Tom voices this attitude of Williams in the opening of the play: “I give you truth in the pleasant disguise of illusion” (144). It seems that Williams (and in an indirect sense, Tom) attempted to recreate his tragic memory of his sister from his unique unrealistic perspective as the expressionists did. “Shafts of light are focused on selected areas or actors, sometimes in contradistinction to what is the apparent center” (133), even though the realistic theater would usually inform the audience about “what is the apparent center” with a spotlight. Bert Cardullo points out clearly that Williams “sometimes makes Laura the visual focus of our attention ‘in contradistinction to what is the apparent center’” (72, 2007), impressing the radiant Laura at the center of Tom’s consciousness on the viewers. Such an effect, the “. . . free, imaginative use of light can be of enormous value in giving a mobile, plastic quality to plays. . .” (134), Williams said. Anne Fleche also describes the effect as the “cinematic mobile illusion of his [Williams’s] lighting” (70), saying that “As in cinema, the lighting creates shadings of space within the larger space of the scene and the action, a recentering that enables the play’s perspective to move, subjectively zooming in or highlighting features. . .” (Fleche 70). Similarly, in this play, even in the absence of words and actions, highlighting Laura effectively and continuously conveys to the audience the conflicting dual images in the way Tom sees her, that is, as both a shining glass ornament with delicate beauty and as a surveillant with accusing gaze.

In addition, we should notice the adoption of something like cinematic camerawork in this play, which also effectively conveys Tom’s subjective gaze at his past and memory to the audience. Viewers’ identification with Tom Wingfield as one of the characters on the stage must be enhanced effectively by adapting cinematic camera techniques, even though “cinema encourages a more direct perceptual identification with the seeing eye of the camera. . .” (Freedman 68). More specifically, as George W. Crandell argues, “Williams duplicates the motion-picture camera’s organizing point of view, [and] adapts the shot-to-shot formation for the theater. . .” for the purpose of

“fostering identification with a fictional character. . .” (2-3).

In *The Glass Menagerie*, “. . . Williams’s narrator functions in ways analogous to those of the camera in film” (Crandell 3). This is a memory play led by a narrator Tom Wingfield, and thus such a dominant vision of the narrator is similar to that of a camera in a movie, because “both [narrator and camera] operate to provide the spectator with an orienting point of view, one with which the spectator is then compelled to identify”, suggesting Tom is “the cinematic ‘eye’” (Crandell 3). The audience understands that what they see is the vision of narrator, who is controlling everything on the stage as a gaze subject. At the same time, however, we should notice that Tom is also one of the characters in the play (and on the stage), and thus he also performs “as the cinematic ‘I’ who sees (and speaks) within the fictive narrative of *The Glass Menagerie*” (Crandell 3). Crandell compares such a dual role and point of view in Tom Wingfield to the cinematic camera technique “shot/reverse shot formation” (4), which arguably enhances the sense of identification between Tom and audience.

According to Timothy K. Beal, “In the shot/reverse shot formation [of the film], the camera cuts from an initial shot to a reverse shot, (turned approximately 180 degrees), so that we [viewers] are given the point of the character (s) in the initial shot” (166). In this play, this formation opens with a scene of the narration of Tom Wingfield, who guides the audience to his memory play as a narrator, and delivers his vision. We often see the narrator Tom, for instance in Scenes Three, Five, and Six as well as the beginning of the play. Essentially, the initial scene is reversed by showing what the narrator sees (Tom Wingfield as a character). According to Beal, “The effect of this shot formation is to align our point of view with that of the character in the first shot, thereby encouraging us to identify with that character’s subjective position and her/his reaction to whatever s/he sees” (166). Therefore, in this play, the repetition of such a shot/reverse shot technique strongly aligns the audience’s point of view with the narrator Tom, and promotes the audience’s identification with the narrator.

In film, as Kyle William Bishop indicates, “Through camera placement and the creation of each individual shot, film viewers identify themselves with the camera, assuming the perspective of the apparatus to be their own gaze” (167-8).⁷ Moreover, such viewers’ identification with a cinematic camera finally leads to their identification with the characters in cinematic narrative. Bishop continues his analysis by using concepts of Christian Metz:

This identification with the camera causes viewers to align themselves with characters whose visual point of view is represented by that cinematic perspective. Metz explains how the process of seeing a film therefore involves both the imaginary and the symbolic: viewers identify themselves with and see themselves as the characters whose gaze is replicated by the camera, thereby embracing the work of the imagination, and they willingly accept what they see to be real, outside of them, products of the cinema’s symbolic discourse. (168)

In this play, the identification with the camera eye of the narrator Tom finally “causes viewers to align themselves” with the character Tom Wingfield whose visual point of view is represented by the narrator Tom’s perspective, creating a powerful perspective for this highly visual memory play.

Moreover, the screen device, which was tentatively included in the original script, also provides clearly cinematic effects in this play. In fact, Williams says, “The legend or image upon the screen will strengthen the effect of what is merely allusion in the writing and allow the primary point [of the creator] to be made more simply and lightly. . .” (132). However, the screen device was deleted in the stage production of this play. Regarding the reason of the omission, Geoffrey Borney says: “The truth is that Williams wrote a more ‘acceptable’, more realistic, version of his play in order to get it

performed” (33) before viewers, who at that time were more familiar with realistic plays. However, the screen device remains in the published print version. As Frank Durham indicates, “In the most widely published version, though not in the acting edition, Williams calls for subtitles and images to be projected ‘on a section of wall between the front-room and the dining-room,’ like those of the silent film” (27). Such projections to be shown on the screen device present various impressions from the narrator Tom’s perspective even to the readers, who of course have no visual representation of the play before them. Accordingly, the device surely helps the readers to identify with Tom, the male protagonist, just as the stage version’s cinematic techniques do. In other words, Tom (and indirectly Williams) can deliver his subjective and artistic gaze reflecting on his traumatic memories, even as we see the influence of the modern cinematic gaze.

Drawing upon French playwright Antonin Artaud’s remarks, Bert Cardullo notes that the function of movies is “the ‘distribution’ of modern myths”, and more specifically, he explains that “the meaning of myths” is “*tales told in images*—and images that are literally larger than life—*enactments of what life is like. . .*” in movies (5, 2011). Cardullo concludes that “. . . the cinema is a vehicle far more suited to the transmission of myth [*tales told in images*] than either poetry or prose—on stage as well as on the page. . .” (5, 2011). I would argue that the movie fanatic Tennessee Williams surely knew such advantages of cinematic effects, and thus he used such effects in this play, and tried to recreate his tragic memories and past in the name of Tom Wingfield, an autobiographical character, so that William (indirectly Tom) can bring others to shoulder the pain that he is suffering. Actually, in the Production Notes of *The Glass Menagerie*, Williams writes of his attempt to create “a new, plastic theatre”, which “must take the place of the exhausted theatre of realistic conventions” (131). The cinematic techniques of *The Glass Menagerie* enhance the audience’s identification with Tom Wingfield, who is playing a dual role of narrator and character, and psychologically and visually share these burdens with the viewers of his play. At the end of the play, however, the narrator

speaks directly and desperately to Laura: “Blow out your candles, Laura—and so goodbye. . .” (237). We can imagine that Tom cannot fully escape from his sense of guilt and Laura’s inescapable gaze. In short, it is clear that Tom’s attempts to recreate his traumatic memories with this cinematic play, namely, his desperate search for a distinctive and subjective gaze as an American male artist, finally and tragically fail.

Throughout this chapter, I have investigated the male protagonist Tom Wingfield’s desperate search for masculinity and artistic originality by focusing on his looking activities and gaze relationships with those around him. As a result, we can conclude that his ways of looking are deeply connected with his solid sense of masculinity and artistic creativity. Tom’s desperate search for a subjective and distinctive male gaze can be understood as his desperate resistance to conformist society and family at that time when most men were forced to adhere to homogeneous social norms and domestic gender roles. At the same time, the ultimate failure of Tom to acquire a subjective gaze surely implies the unavoidable weakening of American masculinity and artistic originality due to the effects of domestication and commodification of masculinity in the Cold War period and the loss of individualism in a surveillance society.

Notes

1. As Tom Wingfield is the most autobiographical character of Williams, a closeted homosexual playwright, some critics take great interest in looking for implications of his homosexuality. For example, William Mark Poteet indicates that “Williams uses a more subtle indication of gay male sexual cruising in his very first play, *The Glass Menagerie* (1945), when the narrator, Tom Wingfield, relates his long hours spent in a dark movie theater. Williams’ 1954 short story, ‘Hard Candy’, describes in detail the homosexual sexual activity in an old movie theater, the Joy Rio” (214). However, in this chapter, I do not treat Tom’s masculinity as implied homosexuality but as the American ideal of manhood, which was ideologically enhanced in the Cold War period, and

which was foregrounded in the stage production.

2. Williams, Tennessee. *The Glass Menagerie*. 1945. *The Theatre of Tennessee Williams* vol. 1. New York: New Directions, 1971. 123-237. All quotations from *The Glass Menagerie* are from this edition and are indicated by page numbers in parentheses.

3. Although I have investigated Tom's circumstances within family and society, which instill normative social norms and roles, in association with Foucault's concept of the Panopticon, Granger Babcock indicates that Williams's "description of the conformity produced by organized society [in *The Glass Menagerie*] is very similar to the Frankfurt School's conceptualization of 'instrumental reason,' as was produced by what it called 'administered society. . .'" (33). Both approaches suggest the social power to control people psychologically, but my emphasis is on the visual.

4. According to Nancy M. Tischler, this quotation was partly extracted from a statement of John Gassner, but the details are unknown.

5. Karen Boyle points out that "The peeping tom is the extreme expression of this instinct [male voyeuristic pleasure]" (125), which can be provided by male-dominated films.

6. Tom's longing for the ocean and the life of a seaman in this play matches well with pirate and marine adventure films, which were also popular movie genres in the Golden Age of Hollywood. Examples include *Captain Blood* (1935), *Treasure Island* (1934), and *The Sea Hawk* (1940).

7. Kyle William Bishop's research mainly focuses on the extreme example of zombie films. However, he explains simply how cinematic camera works and how shot formation enhances viewer's identification with the characters in films, and thus I adopted his analysis in this chapter.

Part Three

Hidden Desire: Male Homosexual Gaze

Chapter 5

Gaze and Homosexual Desire in Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge*

I. Eddie at the Mercy of Dual Desires

In Part Three, I investigate the relation between male homosexuality and gaze by searching out hidden male homosexual desire and oppressed existence in the plays of the conservative Cold War period. Eddie Carbone, a blue-collar longshoreman in *A View From the Bridge* and ex-football star Brick Pollitt in *Cat in A Hot Tin Roof* are exaggeratedly characterized as masculine husbands by their masculine bodies, athletic skills in boxing (Eddie) and football (Brick), respect for male homosocial bonds, and oppressive attitudes toward their wives. At the same time, their masculinity can be seen as questionable. Both of them are largely sexless married men with no children, and their sexual desires for their dedicated wives are now rare to be seen, implying that their desires deviate from conventional social norms, particularly as homosexual desire.

Critics would generally accept that Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge* centers on the protagonist Eddie Carbone's hidden incestuous feelings and desire for his beautiful niece Catherine¹, though perhaps incest is too strong a word since Catherine is his wife Beatrice's sister's daughter and therefore there is no blood tie. In this chapter, however, I would like to investigate Eddie's other prohibited desire deviating from American norms, namely, his homosexual/homoerotic desire, which is presented as a subtext of this play. Based on the shocking scene of Eddie's violent kissing of Rodolpho (Catherine's future husband), some critics have pointed out Eddie's hidden homosexual desire², but they still offer little definitive or detailed analysis. Since Miller was an apparently heterosexual playwright, who married American sex symbol Marilyn Monroe, homosexuality might be thought less likely to occur as a theme in his works. However, I will argue that the importance of implied homosexual desire in recognizing Eddie's tragedy is unmistakable.

Shown by his essays such as “Tragedy and the Common Man” and “The Nature of Tragedy” in 1949, it is clear that Miller has been eager to create a modern form of tragedy analogous to classical Greek tragedy, even though the protagonist is always the common American man. The implication of Eddie’s homosexual desire is essential in this play, because it surely enhances the tragic force by producing dual hidden desires (incestuous and homosexual desires), leading to even more desperate forces controlling the protagonist psychologically and unconsciously. Gerald Weales also briefly points out such dual desires: the “boy’s [Rodolpho’s] presence nags at him [Eddie], almost forces him to put a label on his incestuous love for his niece and his homosexual attraction to the boy himself” (135). More specifically, we may reconsider that Eddie’s dual latent emotions and desires for both Catherine and Rodolpho reach a climax with the fact of Catherine and Rodolpho’s sexual intercourse, and these unconscious desires become intense enough to force Eddie to take tragic action to prevent their marriage, by betraying his undocumented relatives, Marco and Rodolpho, and informing on them to the immigration authorities.

When considering Eddie’s invisible desires, which cannot be represented in spoken language directly and cannot even be recognized consciously by Eddie himself, his looking activities are very important. As represented by the proverb “Eyes are as eloquent as the tongue”, our looking activities are normally understood to be significant visual communication tools to convey feelings, desires, etc., which may be hidden or repressed during direct oral conversation. For example, Rodolpho convinces Catherine of his love by saying “All the answers are in my eyes, Catherine” (59)³, when she cannot believe his true love. In fact, as shown even by the title *A View from the Bridge*, Miller emphasizes looking activities in this play, and we can find various visual impressions which suggest how the protagonist Eddie looks at the objects of his desire (Catherine and Rodolpho) and how people around Eddie (such as Beatrice and the lawyer Alfieri) look at him. Susan C. W. Abbotson also indicates the importance of the

theatrical elements other than dialogue by saying that most of Eddie's "pent-up emotion is conveyed in the stage directions rather than through what the characters say" (65), and such stage directions often include Eddie's looking activities. By careful analysis of looking activities among the characters and adapting psychoanalytic insights, and specifically by examining Eddie's looking activities toward Rodolpho, I will investigate Eddie's homoerotic desire, hidden away as socially deviant and thus repressed in the conservative society and theater of the Cold War period.

II. Looking at Men as Erotic Objects

Before analyzing Eddie's hidden homosexual desire, however, I will briefly investigate his hidden desire for Catherine embedded in his gaze, based on feminist film theorist Laura Mulvey's concepts of "male gaze". Her analysis "concerning the patriarchal structure of an 'active' male gaze" (Manlove 83) in Hollywood films is derived from Freudian psychoanalysis, and it is thus perhaps useful to understand Eddie's unrecognized desire hidden in his looking activities. As Stephen A. Marino indicates, it is notable that "Eddie refers to Catherine as [Greta] Garbo twice . . ." (91) in the opening of the original one-act version. As soon as he comes home and looks at Catherine's clothing, he says, "You do your lessons today, Garbo?" (513, 1955). He also complains about her waving to Louis (Eddie's friend) from the window and says; "Listen, by the way, Garbo, what'd I tell you about wavin' from the window?" (514, 1955). These remarks suggest seventeen-year-old Catherine's growing femininity, which evokes the sexy Hollywood icon, Greta Garbo. In the revised two-act version, however, the Garbo-esque costuming was deleted in the opening and Eddie's visual pleasure was represented in a manner more appropriate to a surrogate father. He says, "Beautiful. Turn around, lemme see in the back. Oh, if your mother was alive to see you now! . . . You look like one of them girls that went to college" (13). Nevertheless, Catherine's Garbo image reappears when she puts on high heels, and Eddie says

“What’s the high heels for Garbo?” (33). He also complains about her sexy short skirt: “I think it’s too short, ain’t it?” and her sexy walk: “Katie, you are walkin’ wavy! I don’t like the look they’re givin’ you in the candy store. And with them new high heels on the side walk—clack, clack, clack. . .” (14). Thus, even if Eddie cannot recognize his desire, he surely looks at his niece Catherine as an object of desire like sex symbol Greta Garbo, what Mulvey calls “Woman displayed as sexual object . . . the *leitmotif* of erotic spectacle. . .” (19). Eddie’s gaze at Catherine clearly suggests Mulvey’s concept of the male gaze “using another person as an object of sexual stimulation through sight” (18), and such hidden desire in his looking is also implied by the visual representation of “Eddie’s pleasure as Catherine lights his cigar”, implying “blatant sexual and phallic meaning” (Wertheim 109).

On the other hand, “Eddie does not want Catherine desired by other men like some Garboesque screen-star icon” (Marino 91). He complains about Catherine’s eye-catching sexy clothes and behavior, and tries to confine her in his small apartment as much as possible, and thus it leads to his wife’s complaint: “you gonna keep her in the house all her life?” (20).⁴ Eddie, who tries to monopolize Catherine as his own gaze object, is analogous to the male viewer watching movies, who can also monopolize actresses as his gaze objects in a confined theatrical space, and satisfy his desire vicariously. Rosalind Coward classifies such visual pleasure as voyeurism, which she carefully defines as “a way of taking sexual pleasure by looking at rather than being close to a particular object of desire. . .” (34). Thus, we can say that Eddie’s incestuous desire is clearly embedded in his looking activities.

Interestingly, the objects of Eddie’s intense gaze include not only Catherine but also Rodolpho in this play, and we should turn to an analysis of Eddie’s looking activities toward Rodolpho. In Laura Mulvey’s analysis of male looking activities, she denies the function of the male erotic object, and suggests that viewing of males by males is limited to the case of narcissistic identification.

As the [male] spectator identifies with the main male protagonist, he projects his look onto that of his like, his screen surrogate, so that the power of the male protagonist as he controls events coincides with the active power of the erotic look, both giving a satisfying sense of omnipotence. A male movie star's glamorous characteristics are thus not those of the erotic object of his gaze, but those of the more perfect, more complete, more powerful ideal ego (Mulvey 21)

If we adopt this approach in this play, Eddie's looking at Rodolpho would be derived not from desire but from narcissistic identification. Actually, before Rodolpho comes to his house, we can surely find Eddie's desire to identify himself with Catherine's future omnipotent husband, who will provide Eddie with visual pleasure through narcissistic identification, giving him a sense of omnipotence, even if he is just a humble longshoreman and cannot marry his beloved niece. Thus, Eddie has worried about the class of men around Catherine, asking rhetorically, "she'll be with a lotta plumbers? And sailors up and down the street?" (19). He strongly insists to Catherine, "I want you to be with different kind of people Maybe [I want you to work at] a lawyer's office someplace in New York [Manhattan]. . ." (19). Such a remark seems to suggest Eddie's need to narcissistically identify with Catherine's future husband. Accordingly, it is obvious that the undocumented and effeminate Rodolpho cannot be an object appropriate for Eddie's visual identification in a narcissistic mode, and Eddie says "I ain't gonna stand around lookin' at that [Rodolpho]. For that character I didn't bring her up" (35).

Beatrice's cousins Marco and Rodolpho came from Sicily illegally in search of jobs in the United States. Compared to other longshoremen and Marco, who are hardworking strong guys of few words, Rodolpho's versatility and individuality are prominent. He is

epicurean, and frequently “sings on the ships” (34), and it seems that “a whole song comes out of his mouth—with motions” (35). He also spends his money all on himself, buying such things as “a snappy new jacket. . . , records, a pointy pair new shoes. . .”, even though “his brother’s kids are starvin’ [in Sicily]. . .” (41). Thus, surrogate father Eddie becomes frustrated with the love relationship between Rodolpho and Catherine. Eddie insists to the lawyer Alfieri: “I see it [marrying to get a passport] in his eyes, he’s laughin’ at her and he’s laughin’ at me” (45). Such suspicious looks at Rodolpho are represented by Eddie’s verbal abuse of him: “a hit-and-run guy” (41) and “a goddam thief” (49).

Specifically, Eddie’s antipathy is concentrated in Rodolpho’s effeminate appearance and temperament. He is “a blond guy” (46) with white skin and slight body, and is clearly different from the stereotype of Italian-American working-class males with dark skin and a masculine demeanor, the “regular bull” or “regular slave” (37) like Eddie or Marco. Rodolpho also has a high voice like a woman’s, and Eddie complains to Beatrice: “I don’t like his whole way” (35). Moreover, “He sings, he cooks, he could make dresses. . .” (55). Obviously “Rodolpho is given many of the attributes of the fifties homosexual stereotype—he is thin and blond, has a high voice, enjoys women’s company” (Clum 16). Thus, Eddie repeatedly makes derogatory remarks suggesting that he is gay: “. . . he ain’t right. . .” (47) or “. . . he’s a punk” (48). As exemplified by Eddie’s words, “He gives me the heeby-jeebies the first minute I seen him” (69), his homophobic looking at Rodolpho is quite exaggerated throughout the play.

Meanwhile we should not overlook the implication that Eddie partly has pleasurable homoerotic feelings toward Rodolpho when he is looking at him.

EDDIE. [*to Alfieri*] I’m tryin’ to bring out my thoughts here. . . . [. . .] He [Rodolpho] takes the dress, lays it on the table, he cuts it up; one-two-three, he makes a new dress. I mean he looked so sweet there,

like an angel—you could kiss him he was so sweet (47).

Such pleasure in looking clearly contradicts Eddie's homophobic gaze. Besides, the impression of Rodolpho as a sweet angel cannot be simply explained by Eddie's jealousy of Rodolpho, who gets into a relationship with Catherine. I would argue that such conflicted representations of Eddie's looking, namely, his visual displeasure (homophobia) and pleasure (homoeroticism), take on more meaning in light of Eve Sedgwick's remarks: ". . . the potential brokenness of a continuum between homosocial and homosexual—a continuum whose visibility, for men, in our society, is radically disrupted" (1-2) in terms of homophobia. Eddie's unconscious repression of such prohibited homosexual desire is combined with his jealousy based on his hidden desire for Catherine, leading to his intense homophobia toward Rodolpho.

Taking Eddie's sudden kissing of Rodolpho as an example, David Savran also notes Eddie's contradictory feelings, intense homophobia and homosexual desire, in relation to the structure of Cold War masculinity at that time. He indicates that this play "demonstrates how the fear of effeminacy slides into homophobic panic, which, almost inevitably, slides into homosexual desire. It documents the difficulty in Miller's work of separating erotic fascination from erotic dread. . ." (42, 1992). Savran's point is well made, and specifically I would insist that such unbroken connections between homophobia and homosexual desire are indirectly represented in how Eddie looks at Rodolpho.

Eddie's visualization of Rodolpho as a sweet angel might be just a sarcastic remark, but we should notice the place of the confession, Alfieri's office. The lawyer Alfieri symbolizes intelligence and education in the town of Red Hook, which is filled with blue-collar laborers. Eddie, who is confused, deeply depends on him and says "Mr. Alfieri, I'm tryin' to bring out my thought here" (47). Thus, Alfieri plays roles of both the psychoanalyst and the chorus, analyzing Eddie's hidden desires precisely and telling

them to the audience in this variant of Greek tragedy. Indeed, Alfieri impressively depicts the scene of Eddie's visit "like a dream" (65), and he implies that Eddie's hidden desires, which are repressed in daily life, are released in Alfieri's office as if in a dream. Alfieri also says "His [Eddie's] eyes were like tunnels. . . . I saw it was only a passion that had moved into his body, like a stranger" (45), conveying the blindness of Eddie, who is unconsciously trapped by prohibited desires.

Originally, Mulvey derived the term "male gaze" from Freud's *Three Essays on Sexuality*, and she indicated that "Freud isolated scopophilia as one of the component instincts of sexuality which exist as drives quite independently of the erotogenic zones. At this point he associated scopophilia with taking other people as objects, subjecting them to a controlling and curious gaze" (Mulvey 17). As typified by his concept of polymorphous perversity, Freud did not emphasize biological/gender determination in scopophilia, leading to the possibility for us of expanding Mulvey's idea of the male gaze into that of males looking at other males as erotic objects. In fact, Eddie's visual control of Rodolpho is prominent, just as it is over Catherine, and he says "He [Rodolpho]'s supposed to stay in the house when he ain't working. He ain't supposed to go advertising himself" (34). Taking into consideration Eddie's reaction of "*uncomfortably grinning*" (37) at other men's curious gaze at Rodolpho, he surely tries to monopolize his gaze objects (both Rodolpho and Catherine) as a patriarch, and prevent them from being objects of desire for many flirty eyes. Such attempted control exactly suggests Freud's scopophilia itself and "taking other people as objects, subjecting them to a controlling and curious gaze" (Mulvey 17). In conclusion, we can say that Eddie's hidden homoerotic desire for Rodolpho is shown in his looking activities, along with his quasi-incestuous desire for Catherine. Such dual desires are not represented directly in oral conversation, yet produce an invisible dramatic force to control Eddie unconsciously and tragically.

III. Desire and Anxiety: Sadistic and Fetishistic Looking at Men

We can now look more carefully into Eddie's conflicted gaze at Rodolpho from the psychoanalytic point of view. According to Laura Mulvey's psychoanalytic analysis of male gaze, ". . . in psychoanalytic terms, the female figure poses a deeper problem" (22) because the woman evokes visual displeasure (castration anxiety) as well as pleasure for the man looking at her as his erotic object. Such a psychoanalytical analysis of the male gaze at women will be useful in considering Eddie's conflicted homophobic and homoerotic gaze at Rodolpho, both visual displeasure and pleasure, despite the fact that Mulvey denied the cinematic function of a male erotic gaze directed on another male.

Several male film critics have raised questions about her denial of male erotic gaze objects. For example, D. N. Rodowick argues that Mulvey's claim was ". . . falling back on biological essentialism" (9), and that "she makes no differentiation between identification and object-choice in which active sexual aims may be directed towards the male figure. . . ." (8). Steve Neale agrees with Rodowick and he adds ". . . it is not surprising either that 'male' genres and films constantly involve sado-masochistic themes, scenes, and phantasies or that male heroes can at times be marked as the object of an erotic gaze" (13). Specifically, taking Anthony Mann's films (*T-Men* (1947) and *Border Incident* (1949)) as examples, Paul Willemen analyzes male looking at the male as follows:

The viewer's experience is predicated on the pleasure of seeing the male 'exist' (that is, walk, move, ride, fight) And on the unquiet pleasure of seeing the male mutilated (often quite graphically in Mann) and restored through violent brutality. This fundamentally homosexual voyeurism (almost always repressed) is not without its problems: the look at the male produces just as much anxiety as the look at the female. . . (Willemen 211).

Willemen's comments are originally premised on Mulvey's claims about "voyeurism", which ". . . has associations with sadism. . ." (22). She indicates that sadism can remove male castration anxiety while looking at women, and thus it leads to male visual pleasure. As exemplified by film noir, the male viewer's "pleasure lies in ascertaining guilt . . . , asserting control and subjugating the guilty person [woman] through punishment or forgiveness" (Mulvey 22). The same pattern is found in this play, in the scene of Eddie's sadistic kissing of Garbo-like Catherine. In her films, Greta Garbo often played the *femme fatale*, the "mysterious lady of obscure origins doomed to catch good men in her net and to destroy them" (Payne 7), and thus she would be finally punished. Similarly, the *femme fatale* Catherine evokes a consequent castration anxiety for Eddie, and thus she must be punished for her sexual intercourse with Rodolpho. However, Paul Willemen and Steve Neale argue that such sadism is also required in male looking at "men" as erotic objects, because in a homophobic patriarchal society "The repression of any explicit avowal of eroticism in the act of looking at the male seems structurally linked to a narrative content marked by sado-masochistic phantasies and scenes" (Neale 16). Considering so many sado-masochistic scenes in male-oriented genres (westerns and gangster films, etc.) centering on male homosocial bonds essentially connected to homosexual desires, I surely agree with their analysis that sadism functions in films to repress the taboo eroticism of males' looking at men, and similar processes are at work in this play.

Indeed, Rodolpho is punished by Eddie in sado-masochistic scenes (the boxing lesson and the forced kiss), when Rodolpho's existence as an erotic gaze object is exaggerated in the play. While "*Looking at RODOLPHO*" one day, Eddie repeats that "He sings, he cooks, he could make dresses . . ." (55), emphasizing a feminized Rodolpho as the object of Eddie's erotic gaze. Viewed from another perspective, Rodolpho's unmasculine versatility (singing, cooking and sewing) also seems to irritate Eddie, because as he says, ". . . the water-front is no place for him [Rodolpho]" (55), and it is

clear that Eddie cannot monopolize looking at Rodolpho as his own object of desire. His confusion and indignant jealousy are clearly shown in the stage directions, not in dialogue: “*He has been unconsciously twisting the newspaper into a tight roll*” (55), implying his hidden unrecognized desire for Rodolpho, like that which he has for Catherine. Of course, such unconscious action might be just caused by Eddie’s jealousy (not by his desire) toward Rodolpho, whose versatility is superior to Eddie’s, though Rodolpho’s masculinity is surely inferior to Eddie’s as a competitor for Catherine. However, even such jealousy can be an implication of Eddie’s hidden homosexual desire for Rodolpho. According to a view of the early 20th century psychoanalyst Ernest Jones, “jealousy [itself] is a weak and cowardly emotion and incompatible with traditional moral values and the characteristics of heterosexual masculinity. . . , [thus] it is symptomatic of repressed homosexuality. . .” (Yates 27).⁵ Therefore, Rodolpho, the dangerous gaze object, has to be punished sadistically in order to repress the prohibited homoerotic component inherent in looking at him. Eddie says “Come on, Rodolpho, I show you a couple a passes” (56) and invites Rodolpho (not the masculine Marco) to box. It is clear that Eddie only pretends to teach Rodolpho boxing, and he actually succeeds in hitting Rodolpho quite hard, exposing Eddie’s sadistic pleasure in punishing the object of his desire.

Eddie’s kiss on Rodolpho’s lips also suggests psychological repression of Eddie’s homoerotic component by sadistic punishing of his male gaze object, as well as the visually direct implication of his hidden homosexual desire on the stage. One day, Eddie comes home drunk, and as soon as he finds Rodolpho and Catherine have had sexual relations, “*he [Eddie] kisses her [Catherine] on the mouth*” (64). At the same time, interestingly, Eddie also “*pins his [Rodolpho’s] arms, laughing, and suddenly kisses him*” (64), implying Eddie’s sadistic punishment of Rodolpho, the cause of his prohibited homoerotic desire. Originally, Rodolpho’s criminal status and the need for punishment are emphasized in his relationship with Catherine. For example, Eddie often

says that “he [Rodolpho] takes and puts his dirty filthy hands on her [Catherine] like a goddam thief!” and “He’s stealing from me!” (49). But more importantly, such sadistic punishment indirectly represents Eddie’s visual pleasure if we see it as an attempt to disavow the eroticism in looking at Rodolpho.

Steven Neale adds the following comments to Willemen’s analysis of male anxiety about looking at men: “The anxious ‘aspects’ of the look at the male to which Willemen refers are . . . both embodied and allayed not just by playing out the sadism. . . but also by drawing upon the structures and processes of fetishistic looking. . .” (17). Such “fetishistic scopophilia” (22) is also originally explained by Mulvey as a second way to solve male castration anxiety in looking at females. Psychoanalytically, it means “complete disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object or turning the represented figure itself into a fetish so that it becomes reassuring rather than dangerous. . .” (Mulvey 22). Fetishes are generally considered as triggers of strong and often dangerous sexual desire. However, Mulvey’s interpretation suggests that fetishes can also function as “safe and reassuring” substitute icons rather than “dangerous” sexual triggers, and this function of fetishistic substitution can in fact be found in Eddie’s looking at Rodolpho. Eddie desperately tries to substitute seemingly safe visual replacements for Rodolpho, his object of desire, in order to repress his unconscious but dangerous desire.

For instance, Eddie often calls Rodolpho “kid”, as he calls Catherine “baby” or “kid”. Specifically, when Catherine announces her decision to marry Rodolpho, Eddie insists, “you’re still only kids, the both of yiz” (71), and he desperately tries to repress the sexually mature status of Rodolpho and Catherine, and to transform them into sexually immature kids, or visually safe substitutes. When Eddie’s colleague Mike joyfully says that “He [Rodolpho] comes around, everybody’s laughin’. [. . .] I mean he gives you a look sometimes and you start laughing’!” (37-8), Eddie replies “he’s a kid yet . . . he’s just a kid, that’s all” (37), and he replaces Rodolpho, an attractive gaze object among

longshoremen, with an immature kid, that is an image ordinarily apart from homosexual desire.

However, I would argue that Eddie's "kid" image of Rodolpho does not seem to completely work as the disavowal of Eddie's homoerotic desire. Instead, ironically, the "kid" image of Rodolpho seems to expose Eddie's hidden homosexual desire in this variant of a Greek tragedy whose setting is the Italian American community Red Hook. In the opening of the play, the lawyer Alfieri ceremoniously tells us Red Hook is not so different from Sicily in the Greco-Roman world, saying "the flat air in my office suddenly washes in with the green scent of the sea, the dust in this air is blown away and the thought comes that in some Caesar's year. . ." (12). In the Greco-Roman world, "boy-love. . . was an accepted practice with a widely acknowledged socially beneficial effect, namely the education and acculturation of young men" (Whitmarsh 201), and "it is not surprising that teen-age boys would become objects of sexual interest" (Beye 157). Thus, even Eddie's perception of Rodolpho as a "kid" indirectly suggests that Rodolpho might be Eddie's homoerotic object of desire.⁶

When we consider Eddie's fetishistic looking at Rodolpho, we must also draw attention to Eddie's visualization of Rodolpho as an "angel" (47). As Stephen A. Marino indicates, depiction of Rodolpho as an angel suggests that "Eddie ironically reveals the same attraction to Rodolpho as he does to Catherine" (96) because angels are often depicted as "blonde and sexless" and attractive. On the other hand, the angel traditionally suggests a sacred religious figure, and thus it also can be Eddie's visual substitute used to repress his hidden homoerotic desire. "Certainly an angel recalls the Madonna image [in Catherine's case], for an angel possesses the same whiteness and purity" (Marino 96). Eddie's visualization of Catherine as Madonna, ("you look like a madonna. . . . You're the madonna type. . ." (20)) suggests Eddie's fetishistic scopophilia, which turns her Garbo-like sexy figure (the cause of castration anxiety) into a Madonna fetish. Similarly, Eddie transforms Rodolpho's visual figure (the cause

of dangerous homoerotic desire) into a holy iconic angel, suggesting his fetishistic scopophilia in looking at Rodolpho.

In addition, the castrated and feminized image of Rodolpho is emphasized by his various nicknames and derogatory terms, such as “blondie”, “Danish” (a sweet pastry), “a chorus girl”, “Paper Doll”, etc. throughout the play, and all of these appellations can be seen as male characters’ attempts to turn Rodolpho’s figure as an erotic gaze object into a safe substitute, a naturalized fetish. Specifically, regarding the expression “Paper Doll” (35), many critics have concluded that “Catherine is Eddie’s paper doll” because “Eddie repeatedly accuses Rodolpho of having stolen Catherine from him or alludes to it” (Epstein 83). However, we should note that Eddie obviously says “Paper Doll they [longshoremen]’re callin’ him [Rodolpho]” (35). Eddie also says “if you close the paper fast—you could blow him [Rodolpho] over” (46). It is clear that he compares Rodolpho’s body to a thin powerless and a sexless “Paper Doll”, suggesting the transformation of Rodolpho into an object of desire like the feminine, who draws the “flirty eyes” of many “flirty guys” (32). Conventionally, male erotic gaze objects were often feminized in the conservative Cold War period, as exemplified by Rock Hudson⁷ in Douglas Sirk’s melodramas of the 50s. Steve Neale claims that “There are constantly moments in these films in which Hudson is presented quite explicitly as the object of an erotic look” (18). He continues: “But Hudson’s body is *feminized* in those moments, an indication of the strength of those conventions which dictate that only women can function as the objects of an explicitly erotic gaze”(18). Similarly, Rodolpho in this play is surely represented as visually erotic object for longshoremen, including Eddie, so that Rodolpho has to be definitely transformed into safe substitutes, such as a castrated and feminized male figure.

In conclusion, I have expanded the analysis of Eddie’s conflicted gaze toward Rodolpho from several psychoanalytical points of view, yielding two psychic functions and processes at work: voyeurism related to sadism and fetishistic scopophilia. Despite

Laura Mulvey's denial of male erotic gaze objects, we can surely use her analysis of how men look at women to help find Eddie's sadistic voyeurism and fetishistic scopophilia in his looking at Rodolpho, suggesting his hidden homoerotic desire.

IV. Rodolpho in the Homophobic 50s

Let us now consider how other characters look at Rodolpho and investigate Eddie's conflicted homophobic and homoerotic gaze toward Rodolpho in relation to homophobic American society in the 1950s. In referring to Beatrice and Alfieri's frequent attempts to persuade Eddie to give up Catherine, many critics have simply concluded that Eddie's homophobic feeling toward Rodolpho results from his incestuous desire toward Catherine and jealousy for Rodolpho. However, we should notice that Eddie's reaction, especially his homophobic gaze toward Rodolpho, is not an isolated instance. As Arthur Epstein indicates, “. . . we have seen . . . that other characters in the play, namely, Eddie's longshoreman pals—whose background is similar to Eddie's and whose views are not distorted by incestuous desire for Catherine—also read Rodolpho as ‘weird’” (84).

MIKE [*grinning*]: That blond one [Rodolpho], though—[EDDIE *looks at him.*] He's got a sense of humour. [Louis *snickers.*]

EDDIE [*searchingly*]: Yeah. He's funny—

MIKE [*starting to laugh*]: Well he ain't exactly funny, but he's always like makin' remarks like, y'know? He comes around, everybody's laughin'. [Louis *laughs.*] (37)

These ambiguous words and suggestive laughs imply unexplainable but pleasurable feelings about the unusual Rodolpho as well as weird or funny feelings in the hyper-masculine homosocial Italian American community. Mike continues: “You take

one look at him—everybody’s happy. [Louis *laughs*.] [. . .] You never can remember what he says, y’know? But it’s the way he says it. I mean he gives you a look sometimes and you start laughin’!” (38), suggesting that effeminate Rodolpho visually attracts and amuses the masculine longshoremen in Red Hook. Such conflicted gaze toward Rodolpho is analogous to Eddie’s gaze, the pleasure and simultaneous displeasure of looking at Rodolpho, which connotes unconscious homoerotic feelings embedded within a male homosocial relationship.

Moreover, Rodolpho is an attractive gaze object not only for male characters (longshoremen including Eddie) but also for female characters (Catherine and Beatrice) in the play. He may even evoke Rudolph Valentino, the Italian American dancer and attractive movie star with the same name. Valentino was “the Hollywood male icon” (Marino 94), and symbolized “a new model of masculinity that defied normative American models” (Studlar 27) in the 1920s. With his background as “a former [tango] dance partner to café society matrons” (Studlar 27), Valentino exemplified the symbol of a sexy “Latin lover”, who embodied women’s desire for pleasure, and attracted many female fans. He was represented as “‘the lure of the flesh,’ the male equivalent of the vamp” (Studlar 28). Accordingly, he stood apart from ideal masculinity and “all-American standards of ruggedness and authenticity,” (Hansen 259) insinuating “the dual scandal of his ethnicity and ambiguous sexuality. . .” (Hansen 254). So as to deflect such criticisms, Rudolph Valentino strategically would be depicted in films as “a European aristocrat . . . in appearance, manners, and taste” with “European man’s appreciation of music, of painting, of literature” (Hansen 258). Through playing such socially-accepted character roles, Rudolph Valentino succeeded in camouflaging his controversial appearance in ethnicity and ambiguous sexuality, and became a Hollywood star.

Similarly, in this play Beatrice and Catherine “. . . see Rodolpho’s physical and personal eccentricities as charming” (Wertheim 110), and admire his European ways,

doing things “the way they [men] do in Italy” (35), as exemplified by his talents with dancing and singing arias. His gentle manners also make Catherine crazy about him: “We walk across the street he takes my arm—he almost bows to me!” (40-1). Moreover, Rodolpho in this play also enjoys his position as gaze object like a movie star, and he uses his position of being looked at to his advantage, like the movie star Valentino. For example, Rodolpho asserts his need of a motorcycle in order to be a successful messenger, because he knows the importance of attracting people’s eyes. He says, “a man who rides up on a great machine, this man is responsible, this man exists” (31). He also says “I have a nice face, but no money” (30), and he knows “money was falling like a storm in the treasury” (31) when he was able to attract audiences as a part-time singer in Sicily.

Eddie’s disgust for the effeminate Rodolpho is also analogous to many American men’s reactions to Rudolph Valentino in the 1920s. Especially Dick Dorgan’s “A Song of Hate” explicitly illustrates such disgust toward Valentino, and it criticizes Valentino’s ethnic appearance and ends with the words, “What! Me jealous?—Oh, no—I just hate Him” (Hansen 258). We can imagine that in the 1950s, Rodolpho and his effeminacy in this play must have produced an even bigger threat to American men, including the protagonist Eddie. In the early Cold War period, a growing crisis over national security was evident and people were afraid of internal subversion from invisible threats, such as communists and homosexuals, as well as threats from the Soviet Union. Alfred Kinsey’s reports on male and female sexuality were published in 1948 and 1953, and “their most immediate impact was to exacerbate the emergent heterosexual panic. . . [because] Kinsey’s findings that the sexual identities of most Americans were fluid and unstable only reinforced fears that homosexuals and lesbians had infiltrated the federal government and threatened to subvert it from within” (Corber 63, 1993). Such observations suggest that homophobia is not only derived from Eddie’s personal feeling or jealousy toward the effeminate Rodolpho, but that it was also a cultural and social

phenomenon among American males in the 50s.

I would argue that Arthur Miller, known as a social dramatist, uses the homosexual panic and homophobia of the 50s in order to effectively depict Eddie's conflicted feelings, possibly including unconscious homosexual desire for Rodolpho, in a way commonly understandable for readers and audiences at that time. John M. Clum also indicates that "Miller's attitude toward homosexuality can be attributed in part to the time and place of his plays and audience; it may also mirror the attitude of a well-meaning liberal of the forties and fifties" (17). As a result, even if Eddie himself cannot recognize his homoerotic desire, readers and viewers surely recognize that such desire leads to Eddie's tragedy. I would insist that Miller aimed at the creation of tragic forces to control the protagonist irresistibly and unconsciously in the modern world. Rodolpho's existence as a male gaze object is persuasively exaggerated throughout the play. He takes over Rudolph Valentino's effeminacy and sensuality to seduce people's attention, but on the other hand, the ethnic stereotype of dark hair and dark eyes was strategically transformed into Caucasian-American standards of male beauty (blonde hair and white skin) derived from "the Danes" (27). As a result, Rodolpho in this play can be visually analogous to sexy Hollywood actresses, the popular Hitchcock blondes in the 50s or "the blonde bombshells of Hollywood" (Marino 94), strategically implying that he must be an attractive object of desire among the hyper-masculine longshoremen. The more Rodolpho's feminized existence is emphasized in the play, the more the evocation of forbidden homoerotic desire is enhanced.

V. The Spectacle and Punishment of Prohibited Desire

In the opening of this play, the lawyer Alfieri describes the setting of the play, the Italian community Red Hook, where famous gangsters such as "Al Capone" and "Frankie Yale" (12) gathered, and emphasizes the influence of gangsters in the neighborhood. Traditionally, as Fred L. Gardaphé indicates, ". . . the gangster stereotype

has been associated with Italian culture” (xiii). The gangster has remained a very popular character type in the United States, and specifically in movies such as *The Godfather* (1972). Considering the background of this play, which was originally written as “a movie script (never to be produced)” (102), Albert Wertheim notes that “What Miller found was a longshore world that smacked of a Hollywood celluloid gangster script. . . . Hollywood is just where Miller eventually took his material” (102). In such gangster movies, “the gangster’s death [is] presented usually as ‘punishment’. . .” (Warshow 35, 1998). The death as punishment is also represented in this play staged in a slum of Italian Americans. Alfieri says that “. . . in Sicily, from where their fathers came, the law has not been a friendly idea. . . . [. . .] Oh, there were many here who were justly shot by unjust men. Justice is [still] very important here” (12). Thus, Eddie’s death obviously represents the punishment of a betrayer in the community, who gave the names of undocumented Marco and Rodolpho to the immigration office.

Furthermore, the point to notice is that Eddie’s death by a knife also seems to suggest the castration-like punishment for his forbidden incestuous and homosexual desires, which are directly and indirectly represented in the play, respectively. Implications of Eddie’s prohibited desires were essential in the staging of the play, because as Miller himself insists, “. . . by knowing more than the hero, the audience would rather automatically see his [Eddie’s] life through conceptualized feelings” (Miller xiii, 2009). Specifically, on the conservative stage of the Cold War period, Eddie, who has incestuous and homoerotic desires, must be punished visually in a dramatic way, regardless of his awareness or denial of these desires.

If one dares to consider the similarity of the names Eddie and Oedipus, Eddie’s incestuous desire for Catherine might be associated with King Oedipus’s desire for his mother (and by extension the oedipal complex). Susan C. W. Abbotson claims that “The relationship of Eddie and Catherine lends itself to a psychoanalytical interpretation, as it

offers an interesting twist on the classic oedipal complex” (75). Basavaraj Naikar argues that “The growing intimacy between Catherine and Rodolpho awakens his [Eddie’s] unconscious desires which might be designated as incestuous and hence part of the Oedipus complex” (221). Various influences from Greek tragedy are found in this play, especially in the original version, such as a one-act structure “. . . equivalent to Greek drama, which also unfolded within a single act” (Bigsby 179, 2005), the set with “two massive columns. . .” (Epstein 80), and the existence of a chorus. All of these points may emphasize the similarity between Eddie and **Oedipus**, but there is a big difference in the recognition of their prohibited desires. Obviously, Oedipus’s poking out his eyes constitutes a visual representation of his own punishment (castration) due to his guilt. On the other hand, Eddie cannot see his desire nor punish himself throughout the play. His dark and tunnel-like eyes also symbolize his blindness (lack of understanding) towards his prohibited desire. Therefore, it is obvious that this play requires someone to punish Eddie for his prohibited but unrecognized desires, and more specifically, someone who is more masculine and powerful than Eddie, someone typified by the omnipotent father in Sigmund Freud’s concept of Oedipus complex. That is Marco, who is Rodolpho’s older brother, and he climactically punishes Eddie through the fatal stabbing of the betrayer.

In fact, Marco has three children and works stoically in the United States in order to support his family in Sicily. Therefore, his image as a responsible and masculine “father” is emphasized in the play, compared to the depiction of childless Eddie and unmarried Rodolpho, both of whom have desires beyond the institution of marriage. Marco has tan skin and a masculine build, and he is called “a regular bull” or “a strong guy” (37). His physical strength is prominent even among manly longshoremen, symbolizing his existence as a father that Eddie has to overcome. Actually, when “Eddie tricks Rodolpho into boxing with him to prove he is the better man” for Catherine, “Marco recognizes what Eddie is doing and warns him off by showing his strength”

(Abbotson 65-6), specifically by raising the chair “like a weapon” (58). Hence, Marco’s turning Eddie’s own knife on Eddie to kill him visually suggests that father-like Marco symbolically castrates Eddie, who adheres to quasi-Oedipal incestuous desire until the end.

Moreover, I would argue that this duel scene between Eddie and Marco can be also interpreted as the castration-like punishment of Eddie’s homosexual desire. Generally, the visual implication of homosexuality or homosexual voyeurism can be found in many male genre movies, such as Anthony Mann’s films, and Westerns, which are often hybridized with “. . . what Molly Haskell has called the ‘buddy movie’, in which the active homosexual eroticism of the central male figures can carry the story without distraction” (Mulvey 20). David Savran also indicates that “the cowboy [in Westerns] most clearly exemplifies the hegemonic masculinity of the late 1940s and the 1950s [. . . .] Working among exclusively male comrades-in-arms, he defined his masculinity through a form of male bonding that retained, at the least, ambiguous sexual resonances” (18, 1992). Therefore, these critics indicate that sadistic scenes are essentially required in such films, because “in a heterosexual and patriarchal society, the male body on display cannot be marked explicitly as the erotic object of another male look: that look must be motivated in some other way, its erotic component repressed” (Neale 14). For example, sadistic scenes such as “mutilation” of the male body (Neale 14) or killing male friends or partners, as typified by Anthony Mann’s movies, are usually required so that “the male body may be disqualified so to speak, as an object of erotic contemplation and desire” (Neale 14).

Steve Neale emphatically points out that sadism is exaggerated in male struggles in male genres, that is, in any film focusing on male relations; “. . . there is a struggle between a hero and a male villain. War films, Westerns, and gangster movies, for instance, are all marked by ‘action’ by ‘making something happen.’ Battles, fights, and duels of all kinds are concerned with struggles of ‘will and strength,’ ‘victory and

defeat, . . .” (16).⁸ Meanwhile, Ralph Poole points out the sadistic scenes of male struggles evoke homoerotic components, specifically, in peplum films between the late 1950s and the mid-1960s, and asks of the “‘classical’ male genre” with “strongly implied subversive gender politics”: “how does a heterosexual male audience deal with the fact . . . that the *peplum* films show non-heteronormative spectacular performance of legions of almost naked, well-built, oil-shined male bodies?” (112). Obviously, a battle in male relations is exaggerated in the duel scene between Eddie and Marco on the stage of this play. Of course, they are not the almost-naked classical heroes or cruel gangsters represented in male genre movies, but they are still well-built masculine Sicilians, who highly respect justice in their homosocial society, just as gangsters do. Thus, their battle is also likely to evoke homoerotic voyeuristic looking and, accordingly, Eddie’s death is required as the sadistic repression of such homoerotic desire on the stage.

Moreover, regarding Anthony Mann’s Westerns films, Paul Willemen interestingly suggests “‘The characteristic love/hate rapport of charming ‘villain’ and near-psychotic ‘hero’ indicates that the greater danger for the Mann protagonist is the possibility of becoming completely what he so closely resembles, the Mann villain.’” (209).⁹ Considering the effects of male struggles as a homoerotic spectacle, the similarity between male heroes and villains in Mann’s Westerns seems to imply male pairs or couples, which connote homosexual desire potentially inherent in homosocial relationships. This analysis can be also applied to the relation between Eddie and Marco in this play. Both of them are reticent hardworking masculine longshoremen and serious breadwinners supporting their families. Thus, unlike the effeminate Rodolpho, Eddie “always liked Marco” (81) and treated him kindly in the opening of this play. As the play proceeds, interestingly, they come to be closer. Eddie, who values male homosocial and family bonds, has earned respect from the other longshoremen, but he finally turns into a betrayer, “a rat”, who “. . . belongs in the sewer!” (81). Eddie’s marginalized situation in the Italian American community at the end of the play is analogous to the

situation of the undocumented “submarine” (illegal immigrant) Marco in the United States. Eddie gets angry about Marco’s brother’s ungrateful act of stealing Catherine, but Marco also complains that Eddie “robbed my children. . .” (79). They hate each other in the end, demand an apology, and insist on justice according to law (immigration law for Eddie and community law for Marco). Therefore, in the duel scene, Eddie and Marco arguably look like a male pair locked in cinematic struggle, suggesting that the homoerotic component is enhanced, and the weaker and more feminine one (Eddie) in the male pair has to be killed as the means of repressing such a homoerotic spectacle. At the same time, Eddie’s symbolic death by his own knife indirectly but surely suggests castration and the end of Eddie’s own prohibited homoerotic desire for Rodolpho.

In her analysis of the play, Susan Abbotson indicates that “Psychoanalysis . . . [has] provided a new key to the understanding of character. It showed how people’s behavior is often dictated by hidden and unconscious motives, which can be uncovered by close scrutiny of a person’s words and actions. . .” (74). Actually, in his introduction to this play, Arthur Miller also pointed out the importance of psychology: “In general, then, I think it can be said that by the addition of significant psychological and behavioral detail the play became not only more human, warmer and less remote, but also a clearer statement” (Miller xv, 2009).¹⁰ Specifically, when considering Eddie’s tragedy “dictated by hidden and unconscious motives”, a psychoanalytical perspective must be useful, and thus I have focused on Eddie’s looking activities (how he looks at his objects of desire) beyond his words and actions. As a result, we can say that Eddie’s homoerotic desire for Rodolpho is indirectly but clearly implied in his looking. By combining Eddie’s easily understandable incestuous desire with the motif of his obscure homosexual desire, the fatal power controlling Eddie is recognized more effectively, leading to the climax with the heroic Eddie at the mercy of the unconscious power named desire.

Notes

1. For example, Arthur Epstein points out “Eddie’s subliminal incestuous love for Catherine” (81). Albert Wertheim also examines Eddie’s “. . . appropriate, protective paternal feelings toward Catherine . . . situated as they are on the extreme edge of the paternal or avuncular, threaten to spill over into taboo sexual desire” (109).
2. For instance, Gerald Weales indicates Eddie’s “homosexual attraction to the boy himself” (135) and Eric Mottram suggests Eddie’s “nervous sexual feeling for Rodolpho” (39) .
3. Miller, Arthur. *A View from the Bridge/All My Sons*. 1957. Most quotations from *A View from the Bridge* are from the revised and commonly-used two-act version, and are indicated by page numbers in parentheses. Some quotations are extracted from the original one-act version of 1955, however.
4. Compared with Eddie’s earnest gaze at Catherine, we cannot find any indications of his looking at his wife Beatrice, even if her name can be read as symbolizing the Italian poet Dante’s idealized woman in his *The Divine Comedy*. Thus, it is clear that Eddie does not see his wife as an object of desire at all.
5. Even though Ernest Jones’s concept of jealousy connected to repressed homosexuality may seem to be old-fashioned, it is perhaps representative of how many came to view this emotional complex. This quotation is extracted from Candida Yates’s book, *Masculine Jealousy and Contemporary Cinema*, but according to Yates, it was originally extracted from Jones’s paper; ‘Jealousy’ in *Papers On Psychoanalysis*, 5th ed., London: Baillière, Tindall and Cox, 1929. 325-40.
6. Actually in the 50s, homosexual men were considered psychologically as perpetual children, who

had failed to pass through the oedipal phase. For more detail, see Douglas Arrell's psychoanalytical perspective discussed in Chapter 6.

7. The American actor Rock Hudson remained in the closet for most of his life, but Richard Meyer indicates that "In the summer of 1985, when Rock Hudson's homosexuality was finally spoken of the popular media, it was as the 'New Terror of AIDS'" (283).

8. This quotation of Steve Neale's analysis is partly extracted from Laura Mulvey's "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" published in 1975, which is included in her book *Visual Pleasure and Other Pleasures*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

9. This indication by Paul Willemen partly includes an extract from "one American critic" (209), but the details are unstated.

10. Miller indicates the importance of psychology in creating this play, but he sometimes complains about extreme commitment to the psychological analysis of the play. For example, in his essay "On Social Plays", Miller writes: ". . . all the cues to great length of treatment are there in *A View from the Bridge*. It is wide open for a totally subjective treatment, involving, as it does, several elements which fashion has permitted us to consider down to the last detail. There are, after all, an incestuous motif, homosexuality, and as I shall no doubt soon discover, eleven other neurotic patterns hidden within it. . . (66).

Chapter 6

Implied Homosexuality and the Representation of the Southern Plantation in Tennessee Williams's *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*

I. Revealing Homosexuality to the Homophobic Audience's Gaze

In his study of homosexual characters in the New York stage plays produced from 1950 to 1968, Donald L. Loeffler notes, "Many of the early declared homosexual characters never appeared onstage and were reported as having met tragic death" (30), surely suggesting how deeply homophobic American society and theatre were. The same backdrop is useful in reviewing *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, which was first produced on Broadway in 1955. All suspected homosexuals, such as the ex-plantation owners, Straw and Ochello, and Brick's close friend, Skipper, have already passed away before the play begins, leading John M. Clum to remark that this play is ". . . filled with homosexual ghosts" (127). When considering hidden homosexual desire in a play where there are no male characters as potential erotic gaze objects except for Brick, we need a new approach, rather than only focusing on gaze relations between male characters and Brick's looking activities.

In this chapter, I will investigate audience gaze, and in particular, how prohibited male homosexual desire and oppressed identity are represented indirectly. Specifically, I insist on the importance of the setting, the Southern plantation home and the bedroom in this play in considering the implied homosexuality in this play. We can find Tennessee Williams's clear emphasis on setting throughout the play, and one central location in particular: "the bed-sitting-room of a plantation home in the Mississippi Delta" (15)¹. Though the play's time frame is described in a very simple and ambiguous way as ". . . precisely the time of its performance" (15), the description of the bedroom and the plantation is very detailed and emphatic, for example, in his "NOTES FOR THE DESIGNER" (15-6). Prominent descriptions about the place include its historical

heritage, the furniture, the properties, the color tone, and even a description of how we (the viewers and the text readers) are supposed to feel.

Despite Williams's emphasis on the place of the main setting, it has received surprisingly little attention. Michael P. Bibler also remarks that "Despite all the criticism and response provoked by *Cat*'s textual slipperiness, sexy content, and general popularity, no one has bothered to address the play's plantation setting in detail" (382). However, we can find Williams's various attempts to depict homosexual desire and identity indirectly but emphatically through the dramatic and textual effects in the representation of Brick's bedroom and plantation home. As John M. Clum says, in general, "Tennessee Williams . . . paradoxically managed in his most successful work to make homosexuality an insistent presence while keeping it an absence" (122). We can agree, but go on to argue that Williams's emphasis on the representation of the Southern plantation home and the bedroom is a skillful and effective strategy depicting homosexual identity in the homophobic society and theatre of the Cold War period.

II. The Southern Gentlemen and Implied Homosexuality on the Plantation

First, it is necessary to analyze the play's implications of homosexuality in relation to the cultural aspects of the Southern plantation. Michael P. Bibler, a representative critic in this area, has investigated Brick's mysterious homosexuality by focusing on the masculine economics and the cultural system of the Southern plantation, but I will insist that Brick's Southern gentleman heritage inherent in the plantation setting, particularly his qualities as a Southern aristocrat and a Cavalier in the Old South, functions as an effective indirect representation of male homosexuality.

As Dean Shackelford indicates, "Brick . . . is the quintessential male ideal in American culture" (109), and he is a rich, good-looking muscular ex-football star, symbolizing "the all-American hero" (Arrell 67). However, masculine Brick also has things in common with Williams's delicate female characters, such as Laura in *The*

Glass Menagerie and Blanche in *A Streetcar Named Desire*. As Laura did, he evades his job, shuts himself away from society, and confines himself in the bedroom. He also excuses himself for his parasitic situation by saying “I’m crippled” (70). Brick is “*alcoholic*” (98) and suffering from guilt for the suicide of his friend Skipper, a suspected homosexual, and so he reminds us of Blanche, who suffers guilt after her homosexual husband’s suicide. He abandons his familial and social responsibilities as a breadwinner, and greatly depends on his family, leading to the impression that hyper-masculine Brick also displays certain aspects of gender-reversal, at times becoming an almost effeminate figure. Such effeminacy can be understood as an effective implication of homosexuality on the stage, as John M. Clum has pointed out: “On the [repressive] American or British stage [before the 60s] . . . homosexual characters and relationships could be inferred from the behavior of the actors, though it could not be discussed openly” (77). Accordingly, “effeminacy” and “sensitivity” (77) can be important visual signs of stereotypical homosexuality.

Brick’s effeminacy and dependence are exaggerated by his position as a Southern aristocrat on the plantation. As Thomas E. Porter indicates, “Life on the plantation is easy and gay, a round of lawn parties, dress balls and visiting . . .”(157), and such an easy-going aristocratic life is epitomized by the Pollitt family of this play dressing up and getting together for the patriarch Big Daddy’s birthday party. Brick (and Skipper) “. . . turned down wonderful offers of jobs in order to keep on bein’ football heroes” (58) and now Brick is jobless and completely depends on Big Daddy and his expensive alcohol, “Echo Spring” (53). Thus, compared to Big Daddy, a rude social climber who “hasn’t turned gentleman farmer . . . [and] is still a Mississippi redneck” (53) and first son Gooper, a pragmatic aggressive lawyer, it is clear that Brick is the most and indeed the only male character exemplified as a decadent Southern aristocrat in his family. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has also analyzed this sort of “aristocratic-style, ascriptively feminine, ‘tragic,’ and affluent or apolitical male homosexual stereotype . . .” (217), and

we can say that Brick's qualities and his status as a Southern aristocrat clearly evoke such a reaction.

Thomas E. Porter provides a useful description of the plantation myth: "The owners of the big house are aristocrats with the appropriate chivalric virtues and patrician vices. The master is autocratic, prideful, gallant. . ." (157). Obviously, Brick is an autocratic, prideful husband, and a gallant "conquering [Football] hero" (152) as well as the next heir of the rich plantation, so we can reasonably say that the Southern aristocratic Brick also can qualify as a Cavalier² of the Old South, and such a Cavalier image can also be understood as an implication of Brick's homosexuality in this play.

Cavalier loyalties, in the original sense of intimate male-male bonds, are shown in the devoted relationship of the previous plantation owners, who are supposed to be a homosexual couple bound by "*tenderness*" (15). As Big Daddy explains, "When Jack Straw died—why, old Peter Ochello quit eatin' like a dog does when its master's dead, and died, too!" (117), and their strong emotional relation suggests "the mythical Cavalier's loyalty, symbolizing deadly devotion to the master Straw by the knight Ochello, (because his status as a 'bachelor' (15) hints at the archaic meaning of a knight as well as an unmarried man)"³ (Okaura 60). Such a relation also exists between Brick and Skipper, and it is represented as "the deadly devotion of the bachelor/knight Skipper to the master Brick, suggesting that Skipper's suicide is designed to protect Brick, to deny ultimately 'the dirty, false idea' (123) of his unconscious desire, or if considered from the opposite point of view, it synchronizes with Brick, who seems to be a mourning master, alcoholic after his knight Skipper's suicide" (Okaura 60).

Although the male bonding between Skipper and Brick is much idealized as part of the Cavalier myth, the "evil" aspects such as homosexual desire are excluded, as would be appropriate for a play in the 50s. Maggie says their relation is like the "beautiful, ideal things they tell about in the Greek legends" (57). Brick also emphasizes it was "a clean friendship" (120), although the emphasis itself makes us wonder why such a

cleanness of friendship needs to be insisted on. According to Eve Sedgwick, however, such strong homosocial relationships are essentially related to unconscious homosexual desire, and she argues there is “. . . the potential unbrokenness of a continuum between homosocial and homosexual—a continuum whose visibility, for men, in our society, is radically disrupted” (1-2). Her argument is evidently confirmed in the relation between Brick and Skipper, as suggested by Maggie’s remark about Skipper’s “*unconscious* desire for anything not perfectly pure between you two! [Brick and Skipper]” (58).

Represented by Brick’s intense homophobia, the fear of such a “continuum between homosocial and homosexual” is especially prominent for the present-day Cavalier, Brick, who always respects male homosocial bonds in football games and fraternities; Big Daddy, on the other hand, abuses these bonds: “Clubs!—Elks! Masons! Rotary!—*crap!*” (108), and Gooper is indifferent to emotional male bonds. As David Savran also indicates, “Homosexuality and homosociality are no longer represented as unmediated opposites but as fluid and complicitous states of desire” (101, 1992), and his claim is supported in the case of Brick, who is suffering from an inescapable hidden homosexual desire. As Thomas E. Porter points out, “The Southerner had a sense of identification with a given segment of the earth, of belonging on the ancestral estate. . .” (157), and thus Brick is clearly depicted as such a character influenced by the ancestral estate, the Southern plantation. Surprisingly, his Southern aristocratic background is associated with effeminacy and Cavalier loyalty with homosexual desire, creating a homosexual subtext, even without his coming-out.

III. Bedroom, a Closet to Secure Homosexuality

It is also necessary to analyze the implications of Brick’s homosexuality by focusing on the description of the bedroom occupied by Brick and Maggie. From the opening, we consistently see an impressive double bed on the stage, and Williams also explains that “. . . the surface . . . should be slightly raked to make figures on it seen more easily. . .”

(16). So, obviously, this most intimate space is considered worthy of the audience's attention, and it offers a view of the private sexual activities of Brick and Maggie.

As represented by Big Mama's impressive words "When a marriage goes on the rocks, the rocks are *there*, right *there*!" (47-48), the double bed symbolizes the couple's sexual problem, Brick's sustained rejection of his wife Maggie, and the associated issue of the lack of a future heir of the plantation. In considering Brick's lack of masculine desire and implied homosexuality, Douglas Arrell's summary of the psychoanalytic point of view of the time is helpful: "In fifties Freudianism, homosexual men have failed to pass through the oedipal phase and so remain perpetual children; terms like 'arrested development' and 'immaturity' can be code words for homosexuality in this period" (67).

In fact, Brick's immaturity is prominent in actions such as avoiding a steady job and childishly jumping hurdles at midnight. We should also notice that his lack of sexual desire for women, including his seductive wife, can be understood as his immaturity, suggesting Brick's fear of being a mature male and father, thus making his sexual orientation suspect. Moreover, such an image is exaggerated by Big Mama's overly maternal concern. She treats Brick like a child, for instance, saying, "you're my bad little boy. Give Big Mama a kiss . . ." (66), suggesting his homosexuality may have derived from a mother obsessed with her son, if we accept the 50s thinking about origins of gay tendencies. Indeed, Brick's bed is a reflection of the former plantation owners, a homosexual couple, as he indicates with disgust: ". . . that pair of old sisters slept in a double bed where both of 'em died!" (115). Thus, the double bed visually symbolizes the connection between the homosexual former owners and the present owner Brick, as a suspected homosexual.

In Williams's detailed representation of the bedroom, the readers of the plays—as opposed to viewers—can also find various metaphors of homosexuality, while the double bed offers visual implications for audiences.

It is Victorian with a touch of the Far East. It hasn't changed much since it was occupied by the original owners of the place, Jack Straw and Peter Ochello, a pair of old bachelors who shared this room all their lives together. In other words, the room must evoke some ghosts; it is gently and poetically haunted by a relationship that must have involved a tenderness which was uncommon. This may be irrelevant or unnecessary, but I once saw a reproduction of a faded photograph of the verandah of Robert Louis Stevenson's home on that Samoan Island (15)

Interestingly, Williams explains in "NOTES FOR THE DESIGNER" (15-6) that there is "a touch of the Far East" in the bedroom, a bit like "Robert Louis Stevenson's home on that Samoan Island". In 1928, the anthropologist Margaret Mead first introduced the free sexual lives of people living in Samoa, including homosexuality⁴. Mead herself was suspected of being a homosexual; Nancy Lutkehaus suggests that Mead may have had "sexual relationships with Ruth Benedict and other women" (79). Thus, her famous book *Coming of Age in Samoa* must have evoked an image of a heaven-like place for homosexuals in the homophobic American society of the 50s.

Robert Louis Stevenson might even be seen as a trope for homosexuality, if we consider his famous novel, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Queer Theory finds that this novel is ". . . an exemplary text that demonstrates how the Gothic theme of the double works through what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick calls 'homosexual panic', where the desire of men for men is a possible meaning at once invited but also brutally suppressed by a text" (Luckhurst xxvi). Such a reading must be a hint when considering the inner conflict of Brick, who seems to be suffering between his homophobia and hidden homosexual desire for Skipper.

In Williams's description of the bedroom, we can also find what Judith J. Thompson

calls “symbols of transcendence”⁵, which remain invisible but are “beyond the time and space of the particular dramatic situation of the play” (142, 1980), in particular the ex-owners’ spirits haunting the bedroom. After the plantation became Big Daddy’s, “the place got bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger!” (77), but the bedroom is still home to the ex-owners’ spirits, which evoke “some ghosts; it is gently and poetically haunted by a relationship that must have involved a tenderness which was uncommon” (15). Such eternal tenderness clearly corresponds to the close friendship between Skipper and Brick, typified by pure and mythical “Greek legends” (57) or Cavalier loyalties in the Old South. Thus, Brick’s present desperate situation, confinement in the bedroom, can be reappraised as his being haunted by Skipper’s ghost-like tender spirit. As John M. Clum point outs, “the positive image the love of Jack Straw and Peter Ochello provides is presented only in the stage directions. . .” (127). Thus, it is clear that the bedroom of the Southern plantation home is full of an invisible tenderness of homosexual spirits, and it functions as a closet, a safe place to preserve homosexual mythical love eternally. In the bedroom, various symbols and metaphors implying homosexuality are mixed together to create a subtle but inescapable homosexual atmosphere. As a result, the bedroom tenderly envelops the present occupant Brick, who is physically immobilized with a broken leg, and exaggerates his image as a homosexual kept in the “closet.”

IV. Visual Effects of Confinement in the Bedroom

Alice Griffin indicates that “The injury to Brick . . . is also a theatrical device to confine all of the action to a single setting” (147, 1995); for instance, we can see various people continually enter Brick’s bedroom for celebration of Big Daddy’s 65th birthday. However, the emphasis also succeeds in creating a negative visual image/impact for the bedroom, as a prison-like place for Brick, by emphasizing his state of confinement and surveillance as a suspected or hidden homosexual.

Big Daddy says to Mae, “You listen at night like a couple of ruttin peekhole spies. . .” (82), because Gooper and Mae are always checking on what’s happening in Brick and Maggie’s bedroom. Their five noisy children also frequently intrude into the bedroom without knocking. Big Mama often bursts into the bedroom, and interferes in the couple’s sex life, for example by saying to Maggie: “D’you make Brick happy in bed?” (47). Even Reverend Tooker, a party guest, surveys the situation in the bedroom intently, so that Big Daddy says sarcastically “What’re you lookin’ for, Preacher?” (116).

Originally, people’s continuous interest in the bedroom is related to disputes about the inheritance. Brick’s sexuality, and in particular whether he is a fertile heterosexual who will create a future heir or an ineffectual homosexual, directly relates to their disadvantage or advantage in the inheritance of the plantation. However, such frequent intrusions also effectively visualize social interventions in individual sexuality; in a larger sense, they constitute attempts at heterosexual compulsion in the conservative Cold War period. As a result, we can say that the continual intrusion into the bedroom by the Pollitt family symbolizes family intervention, and the lawyer Gooper and Reverend Tooker’s intrusions also can be understood as legal and religious interventions in Brick’s suspected homosexuality.

In fact, homosexuals were treated as criminals in the American society of the day. Referring to Neil Miller’s notes in *Out of the Past*, Dean Shackelford indicates that “homosexuals in the 1950s faced the growing influence of Senator McCarthy and his ‘witch’ hunts. Gay men and lesbians were considered security risks. . .” (103). Shackelford also indicates that “. . . gay men and lesbians were considered mentally ill. . .” before 1971, “when the APA⁶ officially removed homosexuality from its list of mental disturbances. . .” (104). Such social facts emphasize the necessity of confining the suspected homosexual Brick as if he were a criminal or madman.

Thomas Szasz broadens the definition of madness apart from the psychiatric disease,

and explains that “we call people mentally ill when their personal conduct violates certain ethical, political, and social norms” (17). Making use of this definition, Jacqueline O’Connor says, “Williams’s plays work as spectacle, . . . the play presents to the public characters whose behavior makes them unfit for societal interaction. We are able to view those who must be confined out of sight in the mental institution” (18). Actually, Brick is not sent to a mental institution as Blanche was, but according to Maggie he is also “a perfect candidate for Rainbow Hill” which “. . . is famous for treatin’ alcoholics an dope fiends. . .” (21). Thus, O’Connor’s analysis can be obviously adapted for Brick, who seems to violate many socially idealized norms for the American male, such as his effeminate dependency, inadequacy as a male breadwinner, addiction to alcohol, and possible homosexuality, all leading to inevitable confinement in his bedroom.

O’Connor also indicates that “Williams’s plays demonstrate his preoccupation with images of entrapment, and he uses the theater space to convey the constricting nature of the characters’ worlds” (17). Such an analysis clearly suggests through visual effects that Brick’s bedroom is like a jail or an asylum. His desperate words to Big Daddy offer solid verification of these effects, too: “Oh, *you* think so, too, you call me your son and a queer. Oh! Maybe that’s why you put Maggie and me in this room that was [homosexual] Jack Straw’s and Peter Ochello’s. . .” (115). In reality, of course, Brick is neither a criminal nor a madman, and he can escape from the state of confinement, if he wants. But his “*broken, plastered and bound*” ankle (19) and his addiction to alcohol physically deprive him of the opportunity to escape from his bedroom with its “liquor cabinet” (16), and as a result, his image as a helpless homosexual jailed by a homophobic society is dramatically conveyed both visually and verbally, as well as in the stage directions.

V. Searching for Imaginary Freedom in the Southern Plantation

In a discussion of Williams's *Memoirs*, David Savran argues that Williams “. . . conceives his homosexuality in extremely conflicted ways, as a locus of desire and scandal, ‘freedom’ and ‘crime’” (46, 2002). Such conflicted representations of homosexuality as “freedom and crime” are surely reflected in Brick's suffering, which suggests his hidden inner conflicts, inescapable homosexual desire and intense homophobia. However, as mentioned before, the bedroom also provides contrasting images, a safe closet for shelter and a jail or asylum, and thus such contradictions are also reflected in the representation of Brick's bedroom. More specifically, they are transformed into the images of “sky and jail” in depicting the plantation home.

A peaceful sky image, “the cool (white and blue) tones of the gallery and sky” (16), is exaggerated as part of the setting, and sets up a contrast to “a house on fire. . .” (31) in a world of inheritance dispute and “mendacity” (106). Williams also explains that “I think the walls below the ceiling should dissolve mysteriously into air; the set should be roofed by the sky; stars and moon suggested by traces of milky pallor. . .” (16). Thus, the description of sky evidently symbolizes peaceful and serene freedom, that is, the salvation for Brick, apart from his jail-like confinement on the earth. The sky as a metaphor of freedom is also found in Big Daddy's words of relief: “*The sky is open! Christ, it is open again! . . .*” (92), when he comes to believe that his fatal cancer is just a spastic colon.

In concordance with the emphasis on the peaceful image of sky, Brick with a broken leg is also associated with the image of a bird with a broken wing, which is deprived of a means of movement and confined in a cage. Maggie also says “We occupy the same cage” (35), and it suggests helpless confinement for both the injured bird-like Brick and herself. In fact, Brick's strong association with flying can be typified by his “Jumpin' hurdle. . .” (21) on the high school athletic field and his famous “aerial attack” (122) with Skipper in football games. Brick's birdlike image is also prominent in his singing

“By the light, by the light, Of the sil-ve-ry mo-ooo-n. . .” (140), especially frequent in the original version of Act Three, which was not altered by the director Elia Kazan. Thus, it is clear that his singing suggests his desperate searching for a free and open sky like a bird. Perhaps that is even why Brick often goes to the gallery, linked to the sky, for his one temporary escape from the confinement in the bedroom.

Commonly, birdlike images are seen in connection with Williams’s female characters, and symbolize their powerless and moneyless dependence. For example, in *The Glass Menagerie*, Amanda worries about Laura’s future as a spinster, who is seen as “little birdlike women without any nest—eating the crust of humility all their life!” (10). Jobless and helpless Blanche also frequently sings, and she is also called a “canary bird!” (127) by Stanley in *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Even “catty” (37) Maggie calls herself poor as “Job’s turkey” (53) before she marries the wealthy Brick. In this play, however, such birdlike images are also notably associated with Brick, in an interesting case of gender reversal, suggesting his powerless and desperate situation.

In addition, it is possible to associate Brick’s injured birdlike image with the image of an angel with a broken wing, who wishes to fly back up to heaven. The name of the athletic field of “Glorious Hill” (22) High School, where Brick tries to jump hurdles, hints at his wish for a sacred retreat like heaven. His addiction to the symbolically named liquor, “Echo Spring” (53), also suggests his wish for heaven, because of the name of the manufacturer, Heaven Hill Distilleries, Inc. It should be remembered that angels are not always related to female figures. As Eugene Stiles indicates, “Angels have not always been represented as soft, feminine, winged figures. In the Bible, angels often appear as men and without wings. Three messengers who tell Abraham that his wife is going to have a son are men. Likewise, two of the four Gospels describe as ‘a young man’ or ‘two men’ the angel or angels. . .” (8), thus reinforcing the possibility of Brick’s depiction being interpreted as that of an angel.

Specifically, Brick’s angel-like “spiritual” existence⁷ is intensified by his pure “real,

real, deep, friendship!" (120) with the deceased Skipper, and by the fact he desperately rejects sexual union with the vicious Maggie, who wants Brick just for her sexual satisfaction and the inheritance, not out of pure affection. Sadly, the Southern plantation home on the earth is full of far-from-pure heterosexual couples scorned for their mere "Pretenses!" (108), not to mention the loveless marriage of Big Daddy and Big Mama, and brother Gooper and Mae as well as Brick and Maggie themselves. It is clear that such heterosexual couples on the plantation may symbolize reproductive ability, as exemplified by Big Daddy's growing plantation after his heterosexual marriage; it is called "the richest land this side of the valley Nile!" (86). However, spiritually, these loveless relationships are declared "mendacity" (106) by Big Daddy. Gooper and Mae's five children may be products of heterosexual marriage but they are also represented as vicious "no-neck monsters" (17). Therefore, we can say that only male-male relations, typified by Brick and Skipper's friendship and the former owners' relation, are mythologized as "beautiful, ideal things" (57) and "a clean, true thing" (120) unrelated to any interests or tactics; rather, "it was a pure an' true thing an' that's not normal" (121) on the earth, thus leading to the depiction of Brick as a fallen angel.

If Brick is a fallen angel on the earth, we can understand why Maggie is characterized as a vicious catty woman coming between men. As represented by Maggie's words, "I destroyed him [Skipper], by telling him the truth that he and his world . . . yours and his world . . . could not be told. . ." (59), she brought Brick and Skipper down from heaven, and thus she becomes like Eve, who led Adam to his downfall. Moreover, Maggie is also symbolized as a cat, a natural enemy of bird-like Brick and Skipper, which is suggested most emphatically when during her rape-like attack on Brick she is described as "*a big circus cat*" (41). She assaults "*cock robin*" (59) Skipper too, as represented in her words: "*Who shot cock robin? I with my—/—merciful arrow!*" (59).

There is considerable evidence then to support the case that such angelic images of Brick create effective implications of homosexuality in this play. Angels sometimes

have become symbols of homosexuality on the stage, as typified by Tony Kushner's play, *Angels in America: A Gay Fantasia on National Themes* in 1991, and the character Angel (a drag queen) in *Rent* in 1994. It is clear that Williams himself uses references to angels for discreetly indicating homosexuals; James Fisher points to Williams's poem "The Angels of Fructification" in 1956 ". . . in which his angels provide a vision of homosexual eroticism comparatively rare in his dramas" (5). We have also seen that Rodolpho is described as an angel by Eddie in Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge*. Since the stage before the 1960s was strictly censored, Williams could not have represented homosexual desire openly as Tony Kushner did, but we can say that Williams used angel images subtly in this play in order to suggest Brick's homosexuality by emphasizing his adherence to a pure male relationship which could not exist on the earth, so that he desperately wishes to fly back to a glorious heaven. Brick can then be seen as an angel wishing for heaven, where his dead friend Skipper has become an angel and lives forever. His suffering wishing for heaven can be shown in his birdlike singing: "Show me the way to go home . . . /Wherever I may roam,/ On land or sea or foam" (153-4), and it emphasizes Brick's dual images of a bird and an angel,⁸ desperately searching for the open sky and a heaven, apart and above his confinement on the earth.

In some ways, Brick's addiction to alcohol also suggests his desperate searching for sky-high freedom. As C. W. E. Bigsby indicates, "all of Williams's characters are crippled in one sense or another . . . and out of that imperfection there comes a need which generates the illusions with which they fill their world" (48, 1984). For example, such illusions are represented by glass animals for Laura in *The Glass Menagerie*, and Blanche's performance as a Southern Belle in *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Brick's alcohol also reveals the need for such illusions to compensate for his confined and desperate situation. Brick's words, "Switch clicking off in my head, turning the hot light off and the cool night on and—" (98), clearly suggest that his heavy drinking brings him

sudden visions of a quiet and cool night sky full of stars, symbolized by the shining “. . . liquor cabinet, bearing and containing many glasses and bottles . . . a composition of muted silver tones, and the opalescent tones of reflecting glass. . .” (16) in the bedroom. The “*huge console*” alongside the liquor cabinet is also emphasized as “a chromatic link, this thing, between the sepia (tawny gold) tones of the interior [in the bedroom] and the cool (white and blue) tones of gallery and sky” (16), and the site of his drinking becomes the transformation zone between the jail-like confinement of the bedroom and an imaginary open sky.

In addition, we can say that Brick’s alcoholism may be linked to the satisfaction of his hidden homosexual desire in other ways. In his study of drinking on the stage, Geoffrey S. Proehl analyzes “the function of alcohol” in some plays “as an *analog for sexual activity*” (32). He continues that “Alcohol often serves as a release mechanism, in this instance, not of words or emotions, but of sexual inhibitions. Furthermore the act of drinking itself is inherently sensual in its employment of hands, mouth, and lips—in the processes of filling, warming, and loosening” (32). Thus, Brick’s addiction to alcohol can be hypothesized as another compensatory activity, and perhaps as a more or less direct means to fantasize about sex with Skipper. Mark Royden Winchell also points to the possibility of Brick’s fantasy sex with Skipper, but through Maggie’s body; “by sleeping with Maggie, Brick may be vicariously establishing a sexual bond with his dead friend” (710) in the ending. Though his analysis is perhaps unconvincing, it is usefully provocative, and it might be possible, when considering the efficacy of alcohol as an analog for sexual activity, release mechanism, and the state of unconsciousness.

Actually, in “NOTES FOR THE DESIGNER” (15-6), Williams emphasizes the importance of the “*huge console*” (16) full of bottles of liquor in Brick’s bedroom as well as the double bed directly suggesting sexual activities. He explains that the console is “a very complete and compact little shrine to virtually all the comforts and illusions behind which we hide from such things as the characters in the play are faced with. . .”

(16). This quotation might be taken as evidence of Brick's eagerness to fulfill through alcohol the desire he normally hides, his hidden homosexual desire for Skipper. As shown by Maggie's words: "we were blissful, yes, hit heaven together ev'ry time that we loved!" (58), Brick's drinking until the sound of the click and the subsequent sexual activity with Maggie evidently bring him an imaginary heaven-like joy and freedom, perhaps because of a fantasized sexual union with Skipper, his angel in heaven. Brick finally finds a temporary route back to heaven through Maggie's body, even if he remains confined ultimately in the bedroom, closeted with his unspeakable desires.

In the conservative and homophobic American theater of the 1950s, homosexual characters were taboo and could not be depicted directly on the stage since they were prohibited by legislative censorship such as the Wales Padlock Law, which penalized theater owners who allowed the presentation of homosexuality. We can also imagine Williams's fear, which Michael Paller indicates: "He [Williams] may have feared, if he was entirely honest about homosexuality, losing the fame and wealth that came with being his country's leading playwright" (109). However, as Dean Shackelford insists, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, first performed in 1955, was understood as "the first major American play to confront the taboo subject of homosexuality directly and without apology" (104-5). I have argued that Williams's courageous attempts to depict homosexual identity can be found clearly in the representation of the main setting, even if he avoids direct expression of the coming-out. In fact, according to John Lahr's biographical studies of Williams's plays, Williams surely aimed to imply Brick's homosexuality in this play; however, he originally tried to use more symbolic and poetic representations apart from the realistic framework. Lahr points out "the dramatization of Brick, whose mystery, for Williams, was 'the poem of the play, not its story but the poem of the story'" (303). Williams also wrote in his diary: "Things are not always explained. Situations are not always resolved. Characters don't always 'progress'" (Lahr 303). However, the director Elia Kazan treated such mysteries about Brick as "the

outstanding problem” (Lahr 303), and compelled Williams to revise the script. As a result, Williams had to provide more understandable and acceptable reasons for Brick’s impasse. As a solution, Williams came “to the narrative conclusion that Brick did love Skipper, whom he identified with sports, ‘the romantic world of adolescence which he couldn’t go past’” (Lahr 304). As exemplified by Cavalier loyalties, such romantic male bonds in adolescence are surely and effectively idealized and emphasized in the realistic representation of the Southern plantation home full of vicious heterosexual relationships, managing to hint at homosexuality effectively and acceptably within the realistic framework.

As John M. Clum says, “In the 1950s, Broadway was still a [*sic*] the venue for serious drama . . .” and “Williams, Albee, and Inge had to negotiate between their experience as homosexual men and the conventions of popular, realistic drama” (122). Thus, we might say that such negotiations by Williams are effectively transformed into a strategy: creating a detailed representation of the Southern plantation home and the bedroom, effectively implying homosexuality, but also creating a play which is acceptable to society and within the conventions of realistic drama. In conclusion, we can say that the representation of the Southern plantation home and the bedroom evidently represents Williams’s clever and innovative gay vision for provocatively portraying homosexual identity and desire to the audiences of that era.

Notes

1. Williams, Tennessee. *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. 1955. *The Theatre of Tennessee Williams* vol. 3. New York: New Directions, 1971. 1-215. All quotations from *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* are from this edition and are indicated by page numbers in parentheses. Regarding Act Three, I chose the original version over the revised version because Act Three was revised for New York production based on the instructions of the director, Elia Kazan. I would argue that Williams’s intentions to

imply homosexual identity in this play are more directly reflected in the original version.

2. The Cavalier originally derived from “the elements of English squirarchy, feudalism, and aristocracy”, and “began to emerge as a mythic character in plantation novels” (Durant 1131), leading to the idealized image of Southern chivalry in the United States.
3. See “bachelor” in OED (second edition). Even if the meaning of knight is archaic, it is apropos for considering the original mythical loyalties of the Cavaliers.
4. Today, many researchers claim that Mead’s research results in Samoa were sometimes inaccurate or unjustified, but without a doubt Samoa was associated with open sexuality in the popular mind.
5. Judith J. Thompson explains that the function of “symbols of transcendence” is “not to anchor the psychic reality of the character in corresponding sensory forms, but to enlarge and expand our consciousness of his subjective world. . .” (142, 1980).
6. Abbreviation for American Psychiatric Association
7. Brick’s transcendent status is also found in Maggie’s words: “you—superior creature! you godlike being! . . .” (56), which emphasize the image of Brick as a man fallen from heaven.
8. Not only angels but also “birds” sometimes become symbols for homosexuality. As Ed Madden indicates, “In Western literature, birds have often been used as a symbol of transcendence or aspiration; in gay literature, such an association may have roots in Plato’s *Symposium*, in which pederastic love is tied to the ‘heavenly’ or Uranian Aphrodite. . . . More recently, bird imagery . . . has been reduced to simple stereotype: the flamboyant plumage and flightiness (and perhaps

refined lunacy) of drag queens in the film *The Birdcage*. . .” (333).

Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have analyzed six plays of America's leading playwrights, Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams, during the specific period (the late 1940s to the 1950s) known as the early Cold War period, searching for the hidden implications in the realistic family plays. Specifically, in order to find hidden suppressed voices of the characters (and the closeted homosexual playwright Williams), I focused on the gaze and looking activities in these plays as non-verbal ways to imply hidden power relations, gender inequality, identity problems, and desire as well as resistance to social norms and forces.

In Part One, I investigated the topic "women and gaze" by focusing on various female characters, Blanche DuBois in *A Streetcar Named Desire* (Chapter 1) and Puritan girls such as Abigail Williams in *The Crucible* in (Chapter 2), and their looking activities. Specifically, the most important point to note is the desperate performances of Blanche and Abigail, who are socially oppressed women having no jobs, money, or husbands to support them. The former Southern belle Blanche has already lost many things in the opening of the play. However, she completely hides her miserable situation and scandalous past, and desperately keeps playing the role of what she used to be, namely, the upper-class lady with pure beauty and nobility, in her sister Stella's small apartment. We can also find a desperate performance of the oppressed Puritan girls within the conservative family and society. In particular, Abigail keeps performing as Proctor's object of desire, but also as an innocent Puritan girl victimized by witchcraft in the 17th Salem community, which was controlled by strict commandments and watched by religious authority, and was very similar to communities of the 1950s under the power of conservative ideology and The House Committee on Un-American Activities. These performances suggest that it is essential for women to live in pretense as a means of self-protection or survival in male-dominated society and family,

indicating their passive positions as gaze objects. However, by adopting theories of the gaze and other feminist critical concepts, careful investigation provided us with alternative readings of such women's performances. More specifically, we could conclude that Blanche's and Abigail's performances are not only passive, desperate activities but also self-motivated and oppositional actions to express their suppressed desires and resistance against the male gaze and male-dominated society and family.

In considering women's performance based on Laura Mulvey's concept of male gaze and on Michel Foucault's concept of the Panopticon, the power relations of gaze embodied in the male-dominating gaze are seen to be repeatedly resisted and subverted by the oppressed women in *A Streetcar Named Desire* and in *The Crucible*, two of the most significant plays of the early Cold War period. Analyses surely suggest the subversive elements inherent in women's performance apart from the passive roles that men impose upon them. It is obvious that the oppressed women temporarily but surely enjoy their gender role reversal, and organize their self-performances actively with a director's eyes. Specifically, such a tendency is notable for the assertive and attractive women, Abigail and Blanche, who are desperately trying to perform their own identities based on their own will and desires throughout the plays.

We should also notice that the roles which they play, the upper-class Southern belle or the madwoman (for Blanche), and the witch or the hysterical woman (for Abigail), have long been associated with gender subversion, as has been clearly demonstrated by Sandra M. Gilbert, Susan Gubar, Justyna Sempruch, Michel de Certeau and others. According to Judith Butler, gender is "performative", suggesting that "You become a man or a woman by repeated acts, which . . . depend on social conventions, habitual ways of doing something in a culture" (Culler 103). Therefore, we can say that the more Abigail and Blanche enter into such gender-subversive roles, the more likely they are to emphasize their androgynous existence in male-dominated society and family of the Cold War period. Therefore, even though Abigail and Blanche are finally marginalized

and excluded in the end of these androcentric plays as vicious femmes fatales in accordance with the conservative ideology at that time, various implications found in the inverted gaze of women temporarily but surely suggest the rise of women and their irresistible voices as the precursor of the Women's Liberation Movement in the 1960s.

In Part Two, I examined the motif of “men and gaze” by focusing on male characters such as Willy Loman in *Death of a Salesman* (Chapter 3) and Tom Wingfield in *The Glass Menagerie* (Chapter 4). Regardless of their differences in age, work, and social position, neither Willy nor Tom employ a dominating male gaze, as is stereotypically insisted upon by some feminist critics. They are suffering terribly as the objects of gaze in the panoptic society and family or, in other words, a surveillance society and family in which the ideal image of the nuclear family and the male gender role of breadwinner are ideologically imposed. Meanwhile, female characters such as Linda and Amanda ironically use the active gaze to watch and control (or perhaps motivate) the breadwinners Willy and Tom, becoming surveillants in the panoptic family. Such subversion of the male gaze and the inverted gaze relations between men and women surely imply a weakening of male-domination, in particular, a crisis of American male identity based on rugged masculinity and individuality in the drastically changing postwar society and family.

As we have seen, the gaze is deeply connected with the construction of identity as well as the implication of power relations. Famously, Jacques Lacan’s notion of the “mirror stage” suggests that “. . . the child gains a sense of his own unity with the help of a mirror. The eyes are thus the very source of man’s sense of Self” (Altman 519). Specifically, the construction of the male identity essentially requires the real existence of a father figure and visual identification with him. Therefore, obviously, Willy and Tom, who lack a real father figure or his memory for a male identification model, suffer from an unreliable sense of male identity and masculinity. Accordingly, they have to psychologically and visually seek a masculine figure of identification as a substitute

father, for example, in figures incarnating success, such as brother Ben and salesman-idol Dave Singleman for Willy, and the masculine heroes in movies for Tom.

These analyses focusing on looking activities clearly account for why Willy tragically adhered to success. Willy's paranoid obsession with success is derived from his crucial need to acquire a solid sense of male identity and masculinity by identifying with his successful substitute father, in particular his brother. More tragically, not only such identification with a substitute father but also Willy's occupational success as a salesman and even domestic success as a responsible breadwinner and father also essentially depend on the gaze, more specifically, recognition through the responsive gaze of other people in family and society. As a result, Willy has to also be like a comic actor at the mercy of others' gaze, and cheerfully and tragically has to keep performing masculine roles such as the competent salesman, the responsible husband and father, depending on the situation just as socially-oppressed women such as Blanche and Abigail did.

Meanwhile, Tom strongly resists his passive gaze position in his panoptic family and workplace, and finally he cannot even satisfy his temporary male gaze and identification with masculine heroes through watching movies. Tom desperately tries to acquire a subjective and distinctive gaze as an American male artist, and escapes from the panoptic society and family in searching for a solid sense of masculinity and artistic creativity. However, it is clear that his traumatic memories and sense of guilt ironically create an imaginary Panopticon in his consciousness, where Tom is trapped and is watched eternally by Laura's eyes, continuously shining like her glass collection. In conclusion, the ultimate failure of Willy and Tom (the middle-class or lower middle-class American common man) to acquire a subjective gaze surely implies the unavoidable weakening of American masculinity and individuality in the Cold War period, even though popular TV dramas in the 50s ideologically emphasize stereotypical happy families and the ideal image of father-breadwinner, who knows best.

In Part Three, I investigated the relation between gaze and male homosexuality in searching for hidden male homosexual desire and its existence in the repressive theater and plays of the Cold War period. The blue-collar longshoreman Eddie in Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge* (Chapter 5) and ex-football star Brick in Tennessee Williams's *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (Chapter 6) are characterized as similar patriarchal husbands, both having exaggeratedly masculine bodies and stereotypical male behavior patterns. However, their lack of desire for their dedicated wives and their sexless marriages without children make their masculinity questionable, implying that their desires deviate from social norms, particularly in their repressed homosexual desire.

In *A View from the Bridge*, Eddie's quasi-incestuous desire for his niece Catherine seems to be generally emphasized as the main theme. However, a detailed investigation into Eddie's gaze gave a good account of his hidden homosexual desire for Rodolpho, an illegal immigrant from Italy. As exemplified by Eddie's conflicting feelings in looking, that is, his visual pleasure (homoeroticism) and displeasure (homophobia) in looking at Rodolpho, psychological investigations are very helpful in considering his complicated feelings and unrecognized homosexual desire toward Rodolpho. Specifically, I adopted psychological analyses of male gaze connoting hidden homosexual desire, which have been mainly suggested by male film critics such as Steve Neale and Paul Willemen. These critiques are mainly based on reactions against Laura Mulvey's psychological analysis of male pleasure and displeasure in looking at women (not men), as typified by scopophilia and fetishistic looking. Mulvey herself denied a male erotic gaze directed on another male, but her analysis was originally derived from theories of Lacan and Freud. As typified by his concept of polymorphous perversity, Freud did not emphasize biological/gender determination in scopophilia, leading to the possibility for us of expanding Mulvey's idea of the male gaze into that of Eddie's looking at other males as erotic objects.

As exemplified by the mode of presentation of Brick's alleged homosexuality and his

friend Skipper's preparatory death in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, male homosexual desire and the direct representation of homosexuality are strictly prohibited on the stage (and in the plays) of the early Cold War period. However, having carefully investigated the audience gaze, and in particular, how prohibited male homosexual desire and oppressed identity are represented indirectly to the viewers (or even readers) of the plays, we could find that homosexual desire and its existence are cleverly implied in this play. Specifically, my investigations focused on the setting of the play, such as the representation of the Southern plantation home and the bedroom as well as stage properties such as Brick and Maggie's double bed and huge console full of bottles of liquor, all of which could be—surprisingly—understood as effective implications of homosexuality in this realistic play. In addition, Brick's image of a Southern aristocrat associated with effeminacy and Cavalier loyalty, and that of an angel with a broken wing, who wishes to fly back up to heaven, also implied homosexuality. These various implications of homosexuality found within the conventions of realistic drama can be understood as the strategy of the closet homosexual playwright Williams: effectively implying homosexuality, but also creating a play which is acceptable to conservative society and the constrained audience gaze of the Cold War period. These investigations led to the conclusion that male homosexuals' suppressed voices—asserting their sufferings, desires, and existence in homophobic Cold War period—are already and indirectly embedded in conservative plays in the 1950s.

Regardless of differences between Miller and Williams, such as their styles and the distinctive characters of the plays, lives, and sexuality, all the plays that I have dealt with here are realistic ones with domestic scenarios, and thus they are seemingly acceptable to the conservative audiences, and also commit to the conservative ideology in the early Cold War period. However, by carefully investigating the looking activities and the implications in these plays, we finally concluded that hidden suppressed voices of the oppressed characters (and the closeted homosexual Williams) are indirectly but

surely represented in such conservative plays. More specifically, such voices express women's active desire, subjectivity, and resistance, white middle-class men's weakening sense of masculinity (the so-called male identity crisis), and hidden male homosexual desire. All these topics obviously deviate from the social norms and ideal gender roles in the conservative family and society, and thus cannot be shown directly in the dialogue on the stage (or in the play). However, the broad range of implications found in the gaze has already expanded our understanding of social phenomena in the 1960s such as the rise of women and homosexuals as well as male identity crisis, and also their irresistible voices as the precursor of various social movements.

Originally, theories of the gaze had been actively developed by film critics (not theater critics), in particular, feminist film critics such as Laura Mulvey and E. Ann Kaplan, and they psychoanalytically revealed the patriarchal male gaze in Hollywood films. For example, Kaplan briefly explained the function of the cinematic male gaze this way: "the signs in the Hollywood film convey the patriarchal ideology that underlies our social structures and constructs women in very specific ways—ways that reflect patriarchal needs. . ." (Kaplan 24, *Is the Gaze Male*). As we have seen in this dissertation, such functions of the male gaze as a carrier of the patriarchal ideology can also be found in these Cold War plays, which despite their reputations as radical remain quite conservative on the surface. For instance, we can see the oppressed female characters, who desperately play the social role of normative women which men and the androcentric gaze impose upon them. Thus, the tragic endings of Blanche and Abigail, who deviated from such passive roles, portray patriarchal ideology to conservative theater audiences in an easily perceptible and provocative way.

Moreover, as typified by Steven Cohan's research into masculinity and the movies in the fifties, the cinematic male gaze also affects male characters (and viewers), and "constructs men in very specific ways," projecting ideologically ideal masculinity, leading to male anguish and pressure. Such influence on men could be also found in the

Cold War plays, as exemplified by Willy and Tom, who are suffering from a dilemma facing American men: “projecting contradictory ideals for American manhood, requiring a ‘hard’ masculinity. . .” (Cohan xii, 1997) as typified by Willy’s brother Ben or masculine heroes in the movies Tom watched, but also a “soft masculinity as the foundation of an orderly, responsible home life” (xii). It is clear that the gaze and the implications in the plays are deeply connected with the Cold War ideology and politics, and specifically convey ideologically acceptable masculinity and femininity, including ideal gender roles and behaviors as mainstream film does.

However, more importantly, my investigation of the gaze and the implications in the early Cold War period surely suggests that anti-ideological and subversive elements could be also implied in such conservative plays. In his research on Cold War plays, David Savran also briefly indicates the oppositional functions of the plays as an effective carrier of subversive elements as well as traditional values and ideology: “Miller’s work tends to reinforce . . . hegemonic constructions of gender. . .”, and “Williams’s work, on the other hand, challenges these same constructions by offering subtly subversive models of gender and sexuality. . .” (9, 1992). I would argue that this categorization of the plays of Miller and Williams is often superficial, and seems to rely deeply on the distinctiveness of characters in their plays: “Williams’s plays were most often overtly poetic and symbolic and populated with nearly fantastical individuals, while Miller’s characters were seemingly far more prosaic and situated in more pedestrian environs” (Aronson 79). We have seen, however, that the early Cold War plays of both Miller and Williams surely contain oppositional elements (ideological vs anti-ideological, conventional vs unconventional, conformist vs subversive elements), and specifically subversive elements are effectively hidden in the gaze and the gaze relations as non-verbal communication. Therefore, investigation focusing on the gaze and looking activities can clearly be a very important and effective way of alternative reading of Cold War plays whose contents, characters, and styles must have been

constrained by conservative Cold War politics and ideology.

The American film critic James Monaco points out that generally “Film has changed the way we perceive the world. . .” (291), and thus “. . . on the one hand, the form of film is revolutionary; on the other, the content is most often conservative of traditional values” (292), suggesting the oppositional politics of film as well as conservative elements. As we have seen, such complex functions of film can surely be found in Cold War plays also, although it should not be forgotten that film “can be mass-produced, reaching the many rather than the few” (Monaco 290) by comparison with the theater. Moreover, each particular performance of a play will have distinctive nuances of characterization, although this matter has not been addressed in this dissertation. However, historically, postwar American theatre in the 40s and the 50s was dominated by Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams, and “the Broadway theater was a genuinely popular art (at least for the middle classes) . . .” (Savran 6, 1992) at that time. Thus, we can surely conclude from the huge influence that the early famous plays of Miller and Williams act as a mirror of postwar America, reflecting both the conservative ideology as well as the subversive elements we now see as precursors of the social phenomena in the 1960s.

In comparison to films, which are recorded and then archived, and which thus invite strict institutional censorship, I would argue that performances of plays can be a more suitable means to convey such subversive and revolutionary elements. As Peggy Phelan says, “Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented Performance’s being . . . becomes itself through disappearance” (146). Thus, compared to other emphatically visual representations such as TV drama and film, plays are ephemeral, and therefore we can say that the analysis of the non-verbal gaze in ephemeral plays can possibly become a powerful strategy for resistance against the ideological modes of presentation controlled and restricted by authorities, freeing up possibilities for indirect representation of a range of unheard voices. In this dissertation, I investigated only six

representative plays of Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams during the early Cold War period. Therefore, I will extend this productive approach in the future, focusing on the gaze in other early Cold War plays, films, and TV dramas.

Bibliography

<English>

- Abbotson, Susan C. W. *Student Companion to Arthur Miller*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000.
- Adler, Thomas P. *A Streetcar Named Desire: The Moth and the Lantern*. Boston: Twayne, 1990.
- . "Conscience and Community in *An Enemy of the People* and *The Crucible*." *The Cambridge Companion to Arthur Miller*. Ed. C. W. E. Bigsby. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. 86-100.
- Aldarondo, Cecilia. "Rebecca Schneider's 'Archives Performance Remains.'" 5 May, 2013
<<http://josharmstrong.eu/rebecca-schneider%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%9Carchives-performance-remains%E2%80%9D/>>
- Alter, Iska. "Betrayal and Blessedness: Explorations of Feminine Power in *The Crucible*, *A View from the Bridge*, and *After the Fall*." *Feminist Rereadings of Modern American Drama*. Ed. June Schlueter. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1989. 116-45.
- Altman, Charles F. "Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Discourse." *Movies and Methods Volume II*. Ed. Bill Nichols. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. 517-530
- Aronson, Arnold. "The Symbolist Scenography of Arthur Miller." *Arthur Miller's America: Theater and Culture in a Time of Change*. Ed. Enoch Brater. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2005. 78-93.
- Arrell, Douglas. "Homosexual Panic in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*." *Modern Drama* 51:1 (Spring 2008): 60-72.
- Atkinson, Brooks. "The Crucible: At the Theatre." *The New York Times*. 23 January 1953: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XIV. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1953, 386. Microfilm.
- . "'The Crucible' Arthur Miller's Dramatization of the Salem Witch Trial in 1692." *The New York Times*. 1 February 1953. [University of Toronto Libraries](http://onesearch.library.utoronto.ca/). 16 August 2013
<<http://onesearch.library.utoronto.ca/>>
- . "Theatre: 'A View from the Bridge.'" *The New York Times*. 30 September 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 273. Microfilm.
- . "Theatre: Tennessee Williams' 'Cat'." *The New York Times*. 25 March 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 344. Microfilm.

- Austin, Gayle. *Feminist Theories for Dramatic Criticism*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1990.
- Babcock, Granger. "The Glass Menagerie and the Transformation of the Subject." *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* 14.1 (Fall 1999): 17-36.
- Bak, John S. *Homo Americanus: Ernest Hemingway, Tennessee Williams, and Queer Masculinities*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2010.
- . "'sneakin and spyin' from Broadway to the Beltway: Cold War Masculinity, Brick, and Homosexual Existentialism." *Theatre Journal* Vol.56, No.2 (May 2004): 225-249. JSTOR. 24 October 2011 <<http://www.jstor.org/>>
- Barnard, Timothy. "Hollywood." *American Masculinities: A Historical Encyclopedia*. Ed. Bret E. Carroll. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2003. 212-15.
- Beal, Timothy K. *Religion and Its Monsters*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Bedient, Calvin. "There Are Lives that Desire Does Not Sustain: A Streetcar Named Desire." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Tennessee Williams's A Streetcar Named Desire* New Edition. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009. 35-48.
- Benshoff, Harry M. and Sean Griffin. *America On Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality At the Movies* Second Edition. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Ben-Zvi, Linda. "'Home Sweet Home': Deconstructing the Masculine Myth of the Frontier in Modern American Drama." *The Frontier Experience and the American Dream: Essays on American Literature*. Ed. David Morgan, Mark Busby, and Paul Bryant. College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1989. 217-25.
- Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin, 1972.
- Bernard, Mark. "Punishment and the Body: Boss Whalen, Michel Foucault, and *Not About Nightingales*." *The Tennessee Williams Annual Review* November (2005): 1-18.
- Beye, Charles Rowan. *Ancient Greek Literature and Society*. New York: Anchor Press, 1975.
- Bibler, Michael P. "'A Tenderness which Was Uncommon': Homosexuality, Narrative, and the Southern Plantation in Tennessee Williams's *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*." *Mississippi Quarterly* Vol. LV, No.3 (Summer 2002): 381-400.

- Biggsby, C. W. E. *Arthur Miller: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- , ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Arthur Miller*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- . *A Critical Introduction to Twentieth-Century American Drama: Volume 2, Williams, Miller, Albee*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- . "Entering *The Glass Menagerie*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Tennessee Williams's The Glass Menagerie* Updated Edition. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007: 79-94.
- Bishop, Kyle William. *American Zombie Gothic: The Rise and Fall (and Rise) of the Walking Dead in Popular Culture*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co. , 2010.
- Biskind, Peter. *Seeing Is Believing: How Hollywood Taught Us to Stop Worrying and Love the Fifties*. New York: Pantheon, 1983.
- Block, Marcelline. "Gaze Theory." *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Film Theory*. Ed. Edward Branigan and Warren Buckland. New York: Routledge. 2015. 225-30.
- Bloom, Harold, ed. *Modern Critical Views: Arthur Miller*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987.
- , ed. *Willy Loman*. New York: Chelsea House, 1991.
- Bordman, Gerald and Thomas S. Hischak. *The Oxford Companion to American Theatre* Third Edition. New York: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Borny, Geoffrey. "The Two Glass Menageries: An Examination of the Effects of Meaning That Result From Directing the Reading Edition as Opposed to the Acting Edition of the Play." *The Critical Response to Tennessee Williams*. Edited by George W. Crandell. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996. 30-47.
- Bovard, Karen. "Witch-Hunting, Thwarted Desire, and Girl Power: Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*." *Women in Literature: Reading Through the Lens of Gender*. Ed. Jerilyn Fisher and Ellen S. Silber. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2003. 82-4.
- Boxill, Roger. "The Glass Menagerie." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Tennessee Williams's The Glass Menagerie* Updated Edition. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. 59-68.

- Boyle, Karen. *Media and Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2005.
- Brandt, George. "Cinematic Structure in the Work of Tennessee Williams." *American Theatre*. Ed. John R. Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Arnold, 1967. 163-87.
- Brater, Enoch. *A Student Handbook to the Plays of Arthur Miller: All My Sons, Death of a Salesman, The Crucible, A View from the Bridge, Broken Glass*. Ed. Enoch Brater. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Breines, Wini. "Postwar White Girls' Dark Others." *The Other Fifties: Interrogating Midcentury American Icons*. Ed. Joel Foreman. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1997. 53-77.
- Brewer, Mary F. *Staging Whiteness*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 2005.
- Brissett, Dennis and Charles Edgley, ed. *Life as Theater : A Dramaturgical Sourcebook*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1975.
- Brod, Harry. "Masculinity as Masquerade." *The Masculine Masquerade: Masculinity and Representation*. Ed. Andrew Perchuk and Helaine Posner. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995. 13-20.
- , ed. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. New York: Routledge, 1987.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Callow, Heather Cook. "Masculine and Feminine in *Death of a Salesman*." "*The Salesman Has a Birthday*": *Essays Celebrating the Fiftieth Anniversary of Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman*. Ed. Stephen A. Marino. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 2000. 65-77.
- Cardullo, Bert. "The Blue Rose of St. Louis: Laura, Romanticism, and *The Glass Menagerie*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Tennessee Williams Updated Edition*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. 65-76.
- . "Introduction: Theater Versus Film: An Historical Introduction." *Theater and Cinema: Contrasts in Media, 1916-1966*. Ed. Bert Cardullo. Palo Alto: Academica Press, 2011. 1-17.
- Cardullo, Robert James. "Selling in American Drama, 1946-39: Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh*, and Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*." *The Explicator*. 66:1 (2007): 29-33. U of Toronto Libraries. 28 March 2012 <<http://onsearch.library.utoronto.ca/>>

- Chafe, William Henry. *The Unfinished Journey: America Since World War II* 5th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Chapman, John. "'Cat on a Hot Tin Roof' Beautifully Acted, but a Frustrating Drama." *Daily News*. 25 March 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 343. Microfilm.
- . "Miller's 'The Crucible' Terrifying Tragedy About Puritan Bigotry." *Daily News*. 23 January 1953: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XIV. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1953, 383. Microfilm.
- . "Miller's 'View from the Bridge' Is Splendid, Stunning Theatre." *Daily News*. 30 September 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 273. Microfilm.
- Chaudhuri, Shohini. *Feminist Film Theorists: Laura Mulvey, Kaja Silverman, Teresa de Lauretis, Barbara Creed*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Clum, John M. *Still Acting Gay: Male Homosexuality in Modern Drama*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000.
- Cohan, Steven. *Masked Men: Masculinity and the Movies in the Fifties*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1997.
- , and Rae Hark, ed. *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Coleman, Robert. "'A View from the Bridge': Twin Bill at Coronet Fine for Box Office." *Daily Mirror*. 30 September 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 272. Microfilm.
- . "'Cat on a Hot Tin Roof' Is Likely to Be a Hit." *Daily Mirror*. 25 March 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 343. Microfilm.
- . "'The Crucible' A Stirring, Well-Acted Melodrama." *Daily Mirror*. 23 January 1953: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XIV. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1953, 385. Microfilm.
- Corber, Robert J. *Homosexuality in Cold War America: Resistance and the Crisis of Masculinity*.

- Durham: Duke UP, 1997.
- . *In the Name of National Security: Hitchcock, Homophobia, and the Political Construction of Gender in Postwar America*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.
- Coontz, Stephanie. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Coward, Rosalind. "The Look." *Reading Images*. Ed. Julia Thomas. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 33-9.
- Crandell, George W. "The Cinematic Eye in Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie*." *The Tennessee Williams Annual Review* 1 (1998): 1-11.
- . ed. *The Critical Response to Tennessee Williams*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Curran, Angela and Carol Donelan. "Gender." *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film*. Ed. Paisley Livingston, and Carl Plantinga. New York: Routledge, 2009. 142-52.
- Curtin, Kaier. *We Can Always Call Them Bulgarians: The Emergence of Lesbians and Gay Men on the American Stage*. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1987.
- Curtis, Penelope. "The Crucible." *Arthur Miller The Crucible: Text and Criticism*. Ed. Gerald Weales. New York: The Viking P, 1971. 255-71.
- Davies, Ann. "The Male Body and The Female Gaze in *Carmen* Films." *The Trouble with Men: Masculinities in European and Hollywood Cinema*. Ed. Phil Powrie, Ann Davies and Bruce Babington. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2004. 187-95.
- DeRosa, Robin. *The Making of Salem: The Witch Trials in History, Fiction and Tourism*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2009.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Dukore, Bernard F. *Death of a Salesman and The Crucible: Text and Performance*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Education, 1989.
- Durant, Susan S. "Cavalier Myth." *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*. Ed. Charles Reagan Wilson

- and William Ferris. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1989. 1131.
- Durham, Frank. "Tennessee Williams, Theatre Poet in Prose." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Tennessee Williams's The Glass Menagerie* Updated Edition. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. 23-36.
- Dyer, Richard. *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representations*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Edwards, Cliff. *Mystery of The Night Café: Hidden Key to the Spirituality of Vincent Van Gogh*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2009.
- Epstein, Arthur. "A Look at A View from the Bridge." *The Critical Response to Arthur Miller*. Ed. Steven R. Centola and Michelle Cirulli. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006. 79-90.
- Fisher, James. "'The Angels of Fructification': Tennessee Williams, Tony Kushner, and Images of Homosexuality on the American Stage." *Tony Kushner: New Essays on the Art and Politics of the Plays*. Ed. James Fisher. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2006. 5-27.
- Fleche, Anne. *Mimetic Disillusion: Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee Williams, and U.S. Dramatic Realism*. Tuscaloosa: The U of Alabama P, 1997.
- Fortier, Mark. *Theory/Theatre: An Introduction* Second Edition. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Freedman, Barbara. *Staging the Gaze: Postmodernism, Psychoanalysis, and Shakespearean Comedy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1991.
- Freud, Sigmund. *On Sexuality: Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality and Other Works*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.
- Friedman, Walter A. *Birth of a Salesman: The Transformation of Selling in America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2004.
- Fuchs, Carmen. *Race, Gender and the Vernacular in the Works of African American and Mexican American Authors*. Norderstedt, Germany: GRIN Verlag, 2009.
- Furuki, Keiko. *Tennessee Williams: Victimization, Sexuality, and Artistic Vision*. Osaka: Osaka

- Kyoiku Tosho, 2007.
- Gardaphé, Fred L. *From Wiseguys to Wise Men: The Gangster and Italian American Masculinities*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and The Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1984.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books, 1959.
- Griffin, Alice. *Understanding Arthur Miller*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996.
- . *Understanding Tennessee Williams*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1995.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Jacques Lacan: A Feminist Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Hajdukowski-Ahmed, Maroussia. "The Framing of the Shrew: Discourses on Hysteria and Its Resisting Voices." *Bakhtin Carnival and Other Subjects: Selected Papers From the Fifth International Bakhtin Conference University of Manchester, July 1991*. Ed. David Shepherd. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. 177-95.
- Halberstam, David. *The Fifties*. New York: Random House, 1993.
- Hall, Ann C. "A Kind of Alaska": *Women in the Plays of O'Neill, Pinter and Shepard*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1993.
- Hansen, Miriam. *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991.
- Haber, John. "Laura Mulvey: Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." Feminist Cinema and Visual Pain. 21 June, 2010 <<http://www.haberarts.com/mulvey.htm>>
- Harris, Dave. "Reading Guide to Mulvey on Cinema and Psychoanalysis." 23 August, 2011 <<http://www.arasite.org/mulvey.htm>>
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. "Theories of the Gaze." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford UP, 2006. 508-18.
- Heinemann, Evelyn. *Witches: A Psychoanalytic Exploration of the Killing of Women*. trans. by Donald Kiraly, London: Free Association Books, 2000.
- Heintzelman, Greta and Alycia Smith-Howard. *Critical Companion to Tennessee Williams*. New

- York: Facts On File, Inc., 2005.
- Herrera, Brian Eugenio. "I was a Teenaged Fabulist: The *Dark Play* of Adolescent Sexuality in U.S. Drama." *Modern Drama* Vol.53:3 (Fall 2010): 332-49.
- Hooper, Michael S. D. *Sexual Politics in the Work of Tennessee Williams: Desire over Protest*. New York : Cambridge UP, 2012.
- Hurt, James. "Family and History in *Death of a Salesman*." *Approaches to Teaching Miller's Death of a Salesman*. Ed. Matthew C. Roudané. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1995. 134-41.
- Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP. 1985.
- . *Speculum of the Other Woman*. trans. Gillian C. Gill. New York: Cornell UP. 1985.
- Jackson, Louise. "Witches, Wives and Mothers: Witchcraft Persecution and Women's Confession in Seventeenth-century England." *Women's History Review*, 4:1. London: Roehampton Institute, 1995. 63-84.
- Kaplan, Ann, E. *Looking for the Other: Feminism, Film, and the Imperial Gaze*. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Women and Film: Both Sides of the Camera*. New York and London: Methuen, 1983.
- . "Is the Gaze Male?." *Women and Film: Both Sides of the Camera*. London and New York: Routledge, 1983. 23-35.
- Kerr, Walter F. "A View from the Bridge." *Herald Tribune*. 30 September 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 275. Microfilm.
- . "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof." *Herald Tribune*. 25 March 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 342. Microfilm.
- . "The Crucible." *Herald Tribune*. 23 January 1953: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XIV. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1953, 385. Microfilm.
- Kleb, William. "Marginalia: *Streetcar*, Williams, and Foucault." *Confronting Tennessee Williams's A Streetcar Named Desire: Essays in Critical Pluralism*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993. 27-43.

- Koikari, Mire. *Pedagogy of Democracy: Feminism and the Cold War in the U.S. Occupation of Japan*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2008.
- Kolin, Philip C. *Williams: A Streetcar Named Desire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- . "Introduction: The Panoptic Tennessee Williams." *The Influence of Tennessee Williams: Essays on Fifteen American Playwrights*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2008. 3-13.
- Kuo, Lenore. *Prostitution Policy: Revolutionizing Practice Through a Gendered Perspective*. New York: New York UP, 2002.
- Kushner, Tony. "Introduction: Notes on *The Glass Menagerie*." *The Glass Menagerie: Tennessee Williams Deluxe Centennial Edition*. New York: New Directions, 2011. 1-50.
- Lahr, John. *Tennessee Williams: Mad Pilgrimage of the Flesh*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2014.
- Lamothe, Daphne. *Inventing the New Negro: Narrative, Culture, and Ethnography*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P. 2008.
- Loeffler, Donald L. *An Analysis of The Treatment of the Homosexual Character in Dramas Produced in the New York Theatre from 1950 to 1968*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Luckhurst, Roger. "Introduction." *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and Other Tales*. Robert Louis Stevenson. New York: Oxford UP, 2006. vii-xxxii.
- Lutkehaus, Nancy C. *Margaret Mead: The Making of An American Icon*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008.
- Lyman, Stanford M., and Marvin B. Scott. *The Drama of Social Reality*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.
- Madden Ed. "Flowers and Birds." *Gay Histories and Cultures: An Encyclopedia*. Ed. George E. Haggerty. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 2000. 331-4.
- Manlove, Clifford T. "Visual 'Drive' and Cinematic Narrative: Reading Gaze Theory in Lacan, Hitchcock, and Mulvey." *Cinema Journal* 46, No. 3, Spring 2007: 83-108.
- Marino, Stephen A. *A Language Study of Arthur Miller's Plays: The Poetic in the Colloquial*. New York: E. Mellen Press, 2002.

- Marshall, P. David. *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997.
- Martin, Robert A. "Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*: Background and Sources." *Essays on Modern American Drama: Williams, Miller, Albee, and Shepard*. Ed. Dorothy Parker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1987. 80-93.
- , ed. *Critical Essays on Tennessee Williams*. New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1997.
- Mason, Jeffrey D. "Paper Dolls: Melodrama and Sexual Politics in Arthur Miller's Early Plays." *Feminist Rereadings of Modern American Drama*. Ed. June Schlueter. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1989. 103-15.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* Revised and Updated Edition. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- McClain, John. "'The Crucible': Play of Enormous Strength and Depth." *Journal American*. 23 January 1953: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XIV. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1953, 383. Microfilm.
- . "Drama Socks And Shocks: Critic Thinks Entire Proceedings Have Strange and Unsavory Flavor." *Journal American*. 25 March 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 344. Microfilm.
- McConachie, Bruce A. *American Theater in the Culture of the Cold War: Producing and Contesting Containment, 1947-1962*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 2003.
- McDonough, Carla J. *Staging Masculinity: Male Identity in Contemporary American Drama*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1997.
- Meyer, Richard. "Rock Hudson's Body." *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories Gay Theories*. Ed. Dianna Fuss. New York: Routledge, 1991. 259-290
- Miller, Arthur. *A View from the Bridge (One Act Version, 1955)*. *Arthur Miller Collected Plays 1944-1961*. Ed. Tony Kushner. New York: Library of America, 2006. 507-567.
- . *A View from the Bridge/All My Sons*. 1957. New York: Penguin Books, 2000. 1-85.
- . *The Crucible*. 1953. *The Portable Arthur Miller*. Ed. Christopher Bigsby. New York: Penguin,

2003. 132-258.
- . *The Crucible Screenplay*. New York: Penguin, 1996.
- . *Death of a Salesman*. New York: Penguin Books, 2000.
- . "The Family in Modern Drama." *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. Ed. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola. New York: Da Capo P, 1996.
- . "Introduction." Arthur Miller *A View from the Bridge*. New York: Penguin, 2009. xi-xv.
- . "It Could Happen Here—And Did." *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. Ed. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola. New York: Da Capo Press, 1996.
- . "The Nature of Tragedy." 1949. *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. Ed. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola. New York: Da Capo Press, 1996. 8-11.
- . "On Social Plays." 1955. *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. Ed. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola. New York: Da Capo Press, 1996. 51-68.
- . "Tragedy and the Common Man." 1949. *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. Ed. Robert A. Martin and Steven R. Centola. New York: Da Capo Press, 1996. 3-7.
- Miller, D. Quentin. "The Signifying Poppet: Unseen Voodoo and Arthur Miller's Tituba." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. Vol.43, Issue 4, 2007:438-54.
- Mills, C. Wright. *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* Fiftieth Anniversary Edition. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Moi, Toril. "Patriarchal Reflections: Luce Irigaray's Looking-Glass." *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. New York: Methuen & Co., 1985. 127-49.
- Monaco, James. *How To Read a Film: Movies, and Beyond* Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Morgan, Edmund S. "Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* and the Salem Witch Trials: A Historian's View." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations Arthur Miller's The Crucible New Edition*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008.41-54.
- Mottram, Eric. "Arthur Miller; Development of a Political Dramatist in America." *Arthur Miller: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert W. Corrigan. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall,

1969. 23-57.

Mulvey, Laura. *Visual Pleasure and Other Pleasures*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Murphy, Brenda. "'Personality Wins the Day': *Death of a Salesman* and Popular Sales Advice Literature." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Arthur Miller—New Edition*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. 107-14.

Naikar, Basavaraj. "A View from the Bridge: A Modern American Tragedy." *Modern American Literature*. Ed. Rajeshwar Mittapalli and Claudio Gorlier. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2001.

Neale, Steve. "Masculinity as Spectacle: Reflections on Men and Mainstream Cinema." *Screening The Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Ed. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. New York: Routledge, 1993. 9-19.

Nell, Sharon Diane. "The Last Laugh: Carnivalizing the Feminine in Piron's *La Puce*." *Carnivalizing Difference: Bakhtin and the Other*. Ed. Peter I. Barta, Paul Allen Miller, Charles Platter and David Shepherd. New York: Routledge, 2001. 165-190.

Nicolay, Claire. "Hoboes, Sissies, and Breeders: Generations of Discontent in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*." *The Tennessee Williams Annual Review* Number 12, 2011. 12 Dec., 2014
<<http://www.tennesseewilliamsstudies.org/journal/work.php?ID=108>>

O'Connor, Jacqueline. *Dramatizing Dementia: Madness in the Plays of Tennessee Williams*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State U Popular P, 1997.

Okaura, Hiromi. "The Southern Gentleman and the Implied Homosexuality in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*." *Kyushu American Literature* No. 52. 2011. 57-64.

Olin, Margaret. "Gaze." *Critical Terms for Art History*. Ed. Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996. 208-219.

Pagan, Nicholas. *Rethinking Literary Biography : A Postmodern Approach to Tennessee Williams*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1993.

Paller, Michael. *Gentlemen Callers: Tennessee Williams, Homosexuality, and Mid-Twentieth-Century Broadway Drama*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

- Palmer, Barton R. "Elia Kazan and Richard Brooks Do Tennessee Williams: Melodramatizing *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* on Stage and Screen." *The Tennessee Williams Annual Review* 2 (1999): 1-11.
- Parker, R. B. "The Circle Closed: A Psychological Reading of *The Glass Menagerie* and *The Two Character Play*." *Critical Essays on Tennessee Williams*. Ed. Robert A. Martin. New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1997. 65-82.
- Payne, Robert. *The Great Garbo*. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1976.
- Pearce, Lynne. "Bakhtin and the Dialogic Principle." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: Oxford UP, 2006. 223-32.
- Persos, Talcot and Robert F. Bales. *Family: Socialization and Interaction Process*. London: Routledge, 1956.
- Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: the Politics of Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Poole, Ralph J. "'Everybody Loves a Muscle Boi': Homos, Heroes, and Foes in Post-9/11 Spoofs of the 300 Spartans." *Ancient Worlds in Film and Television: Gender and Politics*. Eds. Almut-Barbara Renger and Jon Solomon. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013. 95-122.
- Porter, Thomas E. *Myth and Modern American Drama*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1969.
- Poteet, William Mark. *Gay Men in Modern Southern Literature: Ritual, Initiation, and the Construction of Masculinity*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2006.
- Proehl, Geoffrey S. *Coming Home Again: American Family Drama and the Figure of the Prodigal*. London: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1997.
- Riviere, Joan. "Womanliness as a Masquerade." *Formations of Fantasy*. Ed. Victor Burgin, James Donald, and Cora Kaplan. London and New York: Methuen, 1986. 35-44.
- Rodowick, D. N. "The Difficulty of Difference." *Wide Angle*, 5 (1982): 4-15.
- Rollins, Peter C. and John E. O'Connor, ed. *Hollywood's West: the American Frontier in Film, Television, and History*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2005.
- Roudané, Matthew C. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Tennessee Williams*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Saddik, Annette J. "'Drowned in Rabelaisian Laughter': Germans as Grotesque Comic Figures in the

- Plays of Tennessee Williams." *Modern Drama*. 55:3 (Fall 2012). 356-72.
- Sakai, Takashi. "Yesterday Once More: Queer Time, Physical Memory, and Gay Partnership in Tennessee Williams." *Studies in English Literature* (54), 2013. 47-64.
- Savran, David. *Communists, Cowboys, and Queers: The Politics of Masculinity in the Work of Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 1992.
- . "'By Coming Suddenly into a Room that I Thought Was Empty': Mapping the Closet with Tennessee Williams." *Tennessee Williams's Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Broomall, PA: Chelsea House Publishers, 2002. 45-62.
- Scanlan, Tom. *Family, Drama, and American Dreams*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Schneider, David J. "Tactical Self-Presentation: Toward a Broader Conception." *Impression Management Theory and Social Psychological Research*. Ed. James T. Tedeschi. New York: Academic Press, 1981. 23-39.
- Schneider, Rebecca. *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Schroeder, Jonathan E. *Visual Consumption*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- Sempruch, Justyna. *Fantasies of Gender and the Witch in Feminist Theory and Literature*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue UP, 2008.
- Shackelford, Dean. "The Truth That Must Be Told: Gay Subjectivity, Homophobia, and Social History in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*." *The Tennessee Williams Annual Review Premier Issue* (1998): 103-18.
- Silverman, Kaja. *The Subject of Semiotics*. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- . *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Silverstein, Olga and Beth Rashbaum. *The Courage to Raise Good Men*. New York: Penguin Group, 1944.
- Sinfield, Alan. *Out on Stage: Lesbian and Gay Theatre in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale

- UP, 1999.
- Single, Lori Leathers. "Flying the Jolly Roger: Images of Escape and Selfhood in Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie*." *Tennessee Williams Annual Reviews*, 2 (1999): pp. 69-85.
- Sister, Bettina M. "Willy Loman's Brother Ben: Tragic Insight in *Death of a Salesman*." *Modern Drama* 4.4 (Feb. 1962): 409-12. GALE Cengage Learning. 2 Sep. 2011 <<http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CH1420016632&v=2.1&u=lawr16325&it=r&p=LitRG&sw=w>>
- Stacey, Jackie. "Desperately Seeking Difference." *The Sexual Subject: A Screen Reader in Sexuality*. New York: Routledge, 1992. 244-57.
- Stanton, Kay. "Women and the American Dream of *Death of a Salesman*." *Feminist Rereadings of Modern American Drama*. Ed. June Schlueter. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1989. 67-102.
- Starkey, Marion L. *The Devil in Massachusetts*. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.
- Stiles, Eugene. *A Small Book of Angels*. Rohnert Park, CA: Pomegranate Artbooks, 1996.
- Studlar, Gaylyn. "Valentino, 'Optic Intoxication,' and Dance Madness". *Screening The Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Ed. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. New York: Routledge, 1993. 23-45.
- Szasz, Thomas S, M.D. *Law, Liberty, and Psychiatry: An Inquiry into the Social Uses of Mental Health Practices*. 1963. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1989.
- Taylor, Diana. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Thomas, Julia, ed. *Reading Images*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Thompson, Judith J. "Symbol, Myth, and Ritual in *The Glass Menagerie*, *The Rose Tatto*, and *Orpheus Descending*." *Tennessee Williams 13 Essays (Selected from Tennessee Williams: A Tribute)*. Ed. Jac Tharpe. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1980. 139-71.
- . *Tennessee Williams' Plays: Memory, Myth, and Symbol*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Timpane, John. "Gaze and Resistance in the Plays of Tennessee Williams." *Mississippi Quarterly*. 48 (Fall 1995): 751-61.

- Tischler, Nancy M. "The Glass Menagerie." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Tennessee Williams's The Glass Menagerie Updated Edition*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. 5-22.
- . "Romantic Textures in Tennessee Williams's Plays and Short Stories." *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Tennessee Williams Updated Edition*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. 45-64.
- Tomes, Nancy. "Feminist Histories of Psychiatry." *Discovering The History of Psychiatry*. Ed. Mark S. Micale and Roy Porter. New York: Oxford UP, 1994. 348-83.
- Tyson, Phyllis. "The Role of the Father in Gender Identity, Urethral Eroticism, and Phallic Narcissism." *Father and Child: Developmental and Clinical Perspectives*. Ed. Stanley H. Cath, Alan R. Gurwitt, and John Munder Ross. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press, 1994. 175-89.
- Van Duyvenbode, Rachel. "Darkness Made Visible: Miscegenation, Masquerade and the Signified Racial Other in Tennessee Williams' *Baby Doll* and *Streetcar Named Desire*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Tennessee Williams's A Streetcar Named Desire New Edition*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009. 133-44.
- Viagas, Robert. "Pulitzer-Winning Works, Anthems of Equality, AIDS Awareness and Love at the Tony Awards Comprise Broadway's Gay Milestones." *PLAYBILL*. Jun. 23 (2014). 27 May, 2015
<<http://www.playbill.com/features/article/pulitzer-winning-works-anthems-of-equality-aids-awareness-and-love-at-the-t-329816/print>>
- Walker, John A. and Sarah Chaplin. *Visual Culture: An Introduction*. Manchester & New York: Manchester UP, 1997.
- Warshow, Robert. "The Liberal Conscience in *The Crucible*." *Arthur Miller The Crucible: Text and Criticism*. Ed. Gerald Weales. New York: Viking, 1971. 210-26.
- . "Movie Chronicle: *The Westerner*." *The Western Reader*. Ed. Jim Kitses and Gregg Rickman. New York: Proscenium Publishers, 1998. 35-47.
- Watts, Richard Jr. "'A View from the Bridge': Those New Plays by Arthur Miller." *New York Post*. 30 September 1955: *New York Theatre Critics' Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W.

- Coffin, 1955, 272. Microfilm.
- . "‘Cat on a Hot Tin Roof’: The Impact of Tennessee Williams." *New York Post*. 25 March 1955: *New York Theatre Critics’ Review* Volume XVI, No.16. Ed. Rachel W. Coffin, 1955, 343. Microfilm.
- Weales, Gerald. "Arthur Miller’s Shifting Image of Man." *Arthur Miller: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert W. Corrigan. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Wertheim, Albert. "A View from the Bridge." *The Cambridge Companion to Arthur Miller*. Ed. Christopher Bigsby. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. 101-114.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.
- Willemsen, Paul. "Anthony Mann: Looking at the Male." *Framework* 16 (Summer 1981): 15-17.
- Williams, Raymond. *Modern Tragedy*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1966.
- Williams, Tennessee. *A Streetcar Named Desire*. 1947. *Four Plays: The Glass Menagerie, A Streetcar Named Desire, Summer and Smoke, Camino Real*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1974. 67-154.
- . *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. 1955. *The Theatre of Tennessee Williams* vol. 3. New York: New Directions, 1971. 1-215.
- . "Introduction: ‘Something wild. . . .’" *27 Wagons Full of Cotton and Other One-Act Plays*. New York: New Directions, 1966. vii-xii.
- . *Not About Nightingales*. 1938. Ed. Allean Hale. New York: A New Directions Book, 1998. 1-163.
- . "Person-to-Person." 1955. *The Theatre of Tennessee Williams*. Vol. 3. New York: A New Directions Book, 1971. 3-7.
- . "Production Notes." *The Glass Menagerie*. 1945. *The Theatre of Tennessee Williams*. Vol. 1. New York: A New Directions Book, 1971. 131-4.
- . *The Glass Menagerie*. 1945. *The Theatre of Tennessee Williams* Vol. 1. New York: New Directions, 1971. 123-237.
- . *Screenplay: A Streetcar Named Desire* (名作映画完全セリフ集スクリーンプレイ・シリーズ

151)曾根田憲三監修、中部印刷、2010年。

Wills, Clair. "Upsetting the Public: Carnival, Hysteria and Women's Texts." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989. 130-51.

Winchell, Mark Royden. "Come Back to the Locker Room Ag'in, Brick Honey!." *Mississippi Quarterly* Vol. XLVIII, No.4 (Fall 1995): 701-12.

Wirth-Cauchon, Janet. *Women and Borderline Personality Disorder: Symptoms and Stories*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2001.

Yates, Candida. *Masculine Jealousy and Contemporary Cinema*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

<Japanese>

安藤清志. 『見せる自分/見せない自分：自己呈示の社会心理学』(サイエンス, 1994)

一之瀬和夫・外岡尚美 編『境界を超えるアメリカ演劇—オールタナティブな演劇の理解』(ミネルヴァ書房, 2001)

内野儀.『メロドラマからパフォーマンスへ 20世紀アメリカ演劇論』(東京大学出版会, 2001)

海老根静江・竹村和子 編『女というイデオロギー』(南雲堂, 1999)

カーン, スティーヴン. 『視線』高山宏 訳 (研究社, 2000)

サリー, サラ. 『ジュディス・バトラー』竹村和子 訳 (青土社, 2005) Translation of *Judith Butler*.

新宮一成. 『ラカンの精神分析』(講談社現代新書, 1995)

高島邦子. 『20世紀アメリカ演劇—アメリカ神話の解剖』(国書刊行会, 1993)

高橋雄一郎・鈴木健 編 『パフォーマンス研究のキーワード—批判的カルチュラル・スタディーズ入門』(世界思想社, 2011)

中山元. 『フーコー入門』(ちくま新書, 1996)

バトラー, ジュディス. 『ジェンダートラブル—フェミニズムとアイデンティティの攪乱』竹村和子 訳 (青土社, 1999) Translation of *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*.

久守和子・高田賢一・中村郁生 編 『英米文学に見る家族像—関係の幻想』（ミネルヴァ
書房, 1997)

メッツ, クリスチャン. 『映画と精神分析—想像的シニフィアン』 鹿島茂 訳 (白水社,
1981) Translation of *Le Signifiant imaginaire : Psychanalyse et cinema*.

ユーウェン, スチュアート・エリザベス・ユーウェン. 『欲望と消費 : トレンドはいかに
形づくられるか』 小沢瑞穂訳 (晶文社, 1988) Translation of *Channels of Desire: Mass
Images and the Shaping of American Consciousness*.

<Media>

A Streetcar Named Desire. Screenplay by Tennessee Williams. Dir. Elia Kazan. Warner Bros., 1951.
Film.

The Crucible (French: *Les Sorcières de Salem*, German: *Die Hexen von Salem* or *Hexenjagd*).
screenplay adapted by Jean-Paul Sartre. Arthur Miller (play). Dir. Raymond Rouleau. Pathé
Consortium Cinéma and Kingsley-International Pictures, 1957. Film.

The Crucible. Screenplay by Arthur Miller. Dir. Nicholas Hytner. 20th Century Fox, 1996. Film.