

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

CAT ON A QUEER TIN ROOF:

A descriptive study of the process of character analysis and directing

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Panu Mäenpää

Department of English

2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Theatre as means for influencing people	6
1.2 Gay representation in theatre from 1890s to 1950s	17
1.2.1 Time for a change	37
1.3 Tennessee Williams -the man and the playwright	38
1.3.1 Metamorphosis from Thomas into Tennessee	39
1.3.2 Tennessee hits the roof	49
2. THE DIRECTORIAL PLAN	55
2.1 Behind the curtain	55
2.2 The Plan	61
2.2.1 scene I	62
2.2.2 scene II	66
2.2.3 scene III	69
2.2.4 scene IV	72
2.2.5 scene V	74
2.3 Much ado about the finale	82
2.4 Director concludes	87
3. THE QUESTIONNAIRE	91
3.1 The quest for the truth	91
3.2 Method	92
3.3 The questions and the answers	93
3.3.1 Questions on the main themes of the play	93
3.3.2 Questions on the characters of Maggie and Big Daddy	99
3.3.3 Questions on the character of Brick	102
3.4. Discussion of the results	110
4. CONCLUSION	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	116
APPENDIX 1: The Questionnaire	119
APPENDIX 2: The Answers	124

Panu Mäenpää

CAT ON A QUEER TIN ROOF: A descriptive study of the process of character analysis and directing

Pro Gradu -työ

Englantilainen filologia

Lokakuu 2001

118 sivua + 2 liitettä

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on kartoittaa maskuliinisuuden ja homoseksuaalisuuden stereotyyppien muodostumista ja käyttöä angloamerikkalaisessa näytelmäkirjallisuudessa 1800-luvun loppupuolelta 1950-luvun puoleen väliin saakka. Tutkielma selvittää stereotyyppien valheellisuutta ja yksipuolisuutta ja esittää, että Tennessee Williams oli pioneirimainen näiden kahden stereotyyppien yhdistämisessä ja sekoittamisessa *Kissa Kuumalla Katolla* (*Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, 1956) näytelmässään. Erityisesti *Kissa kuumalla katolla* -näytelmän miespäähenkilön, Brick Pollittin, sisäistä maailmaa ja seksuaalista suuntautumista kyseenalaistetaan ja yritetään kartoittaa esimerkkinä pioneerimaisesta homoseksuaalisuuden käsittelystä. Tutkielman ensimmäisessä osuudessa keskitytään myös Williamsin roolihahmoihin ja osoitetaan eri näytelmien samankaltaisia piirteitä ja rakenteita, joita sitten käsitellään ohjaussuunnitelman yhteydessä.

Tutkielman toinen osuus keskittyy ohjaussuunnitelman aukikirjoittamiseen ja lopullisen näytelmätuotoksen esittelemiseen. Näytelmä esitettiin Jyväskylän yliopiston Kampusteatterissa keväällä 2000. Sen rahoittamiseen ja tuottamiseen osallistui Jyväskylän yliopiston Draamapedagogiikan laitos. Näytelmän ohjasi Panu Mäenpää ja näyttelijöinä toimi viisi draamapedagogiikan aineopinto-opiskelijaa. Näytelmä esitettiin suomeksi. Ohjaussuunnitelma pyrkii avaamaan lukijalle Williamsin maailmaa ja näyttämään erilaisten näytelmätekniikkien ratkaisujen motiivit. Toinen osuus nostaa *Kissa kuumalla katolla* näytelmän pääteemoiksi rakkauden kaipuun, intohimon tyydyttämisen tarpeen, rehellisyyden ja oman halun tyydyttämisen tarpeen.

Tutkielman kolmas osuus kartoittaa näytösten yhteydessä tehdyn kyselytutkimuksen tuloksia. Yleisön keskuudesta valittiin kolmessa näytöksessä kymmenen vastaajaa, joiden avulla tutkittiin näytelmän teemoja ja henkilöiden motiiveja ja sisäisiä maailmoja. Edellä esiteltyä ohjaussuunnitelmaan heijastellaan vastauksia vasten ja osoitetaan ohjaajan erheet ja onnistumiset näytelmän sanomaa koskien. Ohjaussuunnitelman onnistuneiksi osiksi mainitaan uskollisuus alkuperäiselle tekstille ja Williamsille, siinä yhteydessä, että yleisön vastaukset Brickin homoseksuaalisuutta kohtaan jakautuivat kahtia. Epäonnistumisena mainitaan Maggien roolihahmon yksipuolinen vastaanotto.

Tutkielma esittelee erilaisen lähestymistavan kirjallisuusanalyysiin ja osoittaa käytännön kautta analysoinnin vaikeuden. Tutkielma antaa myös tarkan kuvauksen teatterin tekemisen prosessista ja tekstin viemisestä paperilta puhutuksi tekstiksi.

Asiasanat: Tennessee Williams, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, masculinity, homosexuality, directing a play, playwriting, theatre, audience response, character work

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to bring forth the power of theatre, its power over the audience and its power over the people serving it; the actors and directors. This is however, not a historical or psychological study on human behaviour, but a thesis that focuses on the ideas and theories of a person, me, over the work of somebody else, in this case, Tennessee Williams. In 2000 I was able to direct and produce *Kissa kuumalla katolla* (2000)(*Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*) in a student theatre. This thesis is a tale of that, whether it is academic enough to be a thesis, is for the reader to decide.

I became familiar with Williams' work during my exchange year in Great Britain in 1997-1998. Even if I was not highly taken in by his work, his spirit and way of writing stuck somewhere in the back of my mind and when it was time to choose a play, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1956), hence forth *Cat*, was my first choice. What pulled me in into its world was the way it deals with family and personal problems, forcing people to face truths that are known to everybody, but as if because of a silent agreement, never spoken of. This is true especially in Brick's supposed homosexuality, which seems to be accepted by the whole family, except Brick, who refuses to even think about it. The audience or the reader never finds out the real truth and it is this ambiguity which makes Williams a hero in my eyes.

This thesis is divided into three parts. I will start off by stating some of the reasons why I think theatre can be an effective medium for representing dissident lifestyles and why it can be used to promote social change. This is important point for this thesis, because I shall argue how theatre has promoted and also hindered the liberation of queer way of life, by branding it just 'queer' and making it something to laugh at, at best. My view is that Tennessee Williams portrayed this dissident lifestyle more accurately and in an unhumorous manner, but still without making it look as a plague. I shall present different writers, who gave in to the establishment and sold out in order to get their plays produced and on stage, a crime that even Williams committed with *Cat*. I will also give example of different theatre theorists,

which links with my directorial plan, for the reader to understand the different construction behind my different directorial decisions. The theorists, such as Brecht also represent the ways in which theatre took more power to itself as a medium for social change.

I shall then present different queer representations in theatre between in the late 19th century into the middle part of the 20th century, concentrating solely on Tennessee Williams and his work in the end. I shall argue that his treatment of masculinity and supposed homosexuality in the character of Brick was more positive than negative for the gay movement.

The second part of this thesis will concentrate on my version of the play *Cat*. It will include my original directorial plan and commentary on how it changed or had to be changed as I studied the play more and more closely. It will also give evidence to support my view of the characters and of what I thought Williams tried to say and/or achieve with this play. It will also compare the different ideas that various critics and theorists have about the play and try to justify my decision, which were mainly based on a 'good feeling'. I will then also return to the theatre theorists and explain the different ideas that I borrowed from them for the production and staging of the play. I shall also bring forth my ambitions for the play and what I thought should have been the message the audience should or should not receive.

The third part of the thesis will deal with the results of the questionnaires, which were distributed to 10% of the audience after each show. I wanted to know their opinions on certain themes that I tried to convey and also what they thought of the characters and which truth they believed in. As we will see, opinions were divided between Maggie's and Brick's truths. I shall compare the audience responses to my own views and aims and try to evaluate how successful I was in communicating my view of the play and its motives. The results were quite surprising to myself, as they show that I was not completely successful in being able to show all the aspects of the characters. On the other hand some of the themes that I had wanted to be noticed were very well received. Finally with the respect to the audience responses I shall try to evaluate my directorial plan as objectively as it is possible.

1.1 Theatre as means for influencing people

When the Revolution that has changed the social and political state of an aristocratic people begins to penetrate into literature, it generally first manifests itself in the drama...The spectator of a dramatic piece is, to a certain extent taken by surprise by the impression it conveys. He has no time to refer to his memory or to consult those more able to judge than himself. It does not occur to him to resist the new literary tendencies that begin to be felt by him; he yields to them before he knows what they are....If you would judge beforehand of a literature that is lapsing into democracy, study its dramatic productions.

(Alexis de Tocqueville 1835
as cited in Grimstead 1968)

I wanted to start off with a quote from a famous social theorist, because I thought that it captured the meaning of this chapter. In this chapter I shall review some of the most influential theatre theorists that were important for the production of this play, such as Augusto Boal, a South American theatre practitioner, how theatre can be used as a political vehicle, for the removal of injustices or just basically as a teaching method, for example to teach illiterate people how to read and write. The reason, why I feel that it is very important to include this chapter in the thesis, is, because theatre has been the most important medium for social change before the power of television and the cinemas. Still, with the emergence of performance art, theatre is far more ground-breaking than television and the cinema in its attempt to find new points of view and giving the audience the opportunity to see different representations on current social moods. Later in this thesis it will become evident that much has not changed in a century, in the way that the small theatres still are the only ones taking the risks and putting on plays by unknown playwrights dealing with risky subjects. The difference in culture between the beginning of last century and this one is, that it is no longer illegal to go and see dissident lives lived on stage. One no longer has to belong to a club to see different lifestyles, in fact it is trendy nowadays, just not in the national theatre, at least in America.

How does the theatre represent itself to the wider audience?

According to Alan Sinfield (1999) theatre has been a particular site for the formation of dissident sexual identities. It is common knowledge that actors have been perceived as odd and capable of all kinds of unmoral practices. The word actress used to be a synonym for a prostitute and especially in Victorian times, the music hall tradition was looked upon as lower class entertainment for lower class people, where no barriers were held for sexual innuendo. Then again, Shakespeare and his tradition was kept in great value, even though modern theorists have told us that the plots were not so far away from today's soap operas.

Theatre has been an institution that has, on the whole, reflected the conditions of its time and with the introduction of great modern theatre theorists and practitioners, such as Bertolt Brecht, Jerzy Grotowski and Augusto Boal, theatre has also tried to change the conditions of the people, or at least the ways less privileged people live their lives. I will return to Brecht and Grotowski and their methods in the second part of this thesis, in connection with my directorial plan, where I will show how their teachings related to my way of staging the play. At this moment I will just show the way in which Boal experienced theatre as means for educating people. Especially in the case of Boal, theatre has been used as a medium for teaching the public how to perceive the injustices within their community and they have been encouraged to revolt and make a change. For example, Boal has used theatre as a medium for teaching people how to read in Peru, where it was important to help the native Indians to cope with the official Spanish. (Boal 1979: 120-156). In his opinion theatre is always political, because all human activities are political and theatre is one of them.

...the theatre is a weapon. A very efficient weapon. For this reason one must fight for it. For this reason the ruling classes strive to take permanent hold of the theatre and utilize it as a tool for domination. In so doing, they change the very concept of what "theatre" is.

(Boal 1979: foreword)

Boal (1979) goes on explaining, how in the beginning theatre was something

that rose out of the people, as they came together and there were not any boundaries as who was doing what. Then came the aristocrats who made the division into who was the actor and who was the spectator and after them came the newly born bourgeoisie who embedded their morals and values within the texts, so that they would reflect what they considered to be right and true and worth going after. Boal has one theory above everything else, a theory, which is based upon the works of Hegel, Marx and Brecht: the social being determines the thought and not vice versa. He gives an example by stating how the aristocrats realized the significance of the above sentence long ago: if you give the workers just enough bread to keep them fairly content, they will not revolt. As a concrete example Boal (1979) cites, how the socialist workers in America are less likely to revolt when they have houses, refrigerators and cars than those socialist workers in Brazil who do not have anything, not even a roof on top of their heads. He also says that he understands the dilemma of the ruling class, as kindness and wealth cannot walk hand in hand. If a rich person is also kind, he/she is most likely to give his/her wealth away. (Boal 1979: 59-65) With all of this Boal is trying, at least as I interpret it, to say that it is not inasmuch the fault of the rich and the ruling class alone that we seem to control theatre in the way we consider ourselves and our morals to be and how they should be represented, but the fault lays in our innate ability to cage ourselves in the patterns of our thinking of what is proper and presentable and the establishment without questioning why or how we do it. It is all a stirring of unmentionable contracts that we do, being afraid of doing something, which would either decrease our share of the loot or more terrifyingly, we would give better opportunities to someone else and thus be left with less than the person next to us. That is why we much rather delimit our choices and the possibilities that we might have. As the saying goes, the caged bird sings, because it knows that it is afraid to do anything else, let alone step out of the cage.

The importance of Boal's thinking ties in with *Cat* on the level of Brick who is the cause of all his and his families anxiety, as I will show and discuss later in connection with my directorial plan. Boal's need for breaking the wall between actor and spectator, creating *spectactor*, was

definitely on my agenda concerning this play. He is quoted to have said that his theatre is 'another kind of theatre that was born out of the fact that a person refuses to accept an image of reality which is offered to him. Just as Shakespeare said, theatre is like a mirror, which is being held in front of the human nature'. (Harju 1998) The whole stage plan and choreography, in my production, of the actors was based on the idea that they would push themselves onto the spectators, by coming, physically, so close that the audience had no other choice but to be drawn in as part of the family. I wanted the audience to sit IN the bedroom and be forced to feel the cage that the characters had build around themselves in this way. I also wanted to apply Boal's principle of teaching the participants of the better conditions to which they could aspire. Boal, for example, taught to land-workers that they could form an union, and thus giving them a chance to experience something that they are capable of changing, if they just choose to realize it. If they do not like it, they can act and revolt. In my opinion Boal is the best contemporary example of what can be achieved with the means of theatre, if one wants to. Rather than preaching, the ideas and ideals are staged in a way, where the audience can see them in action. This and the following example of Brecht are meant to explain to the reader how much can be the theatre can be used as a medium for the enhancement of social change. In the next chapter the reader can see how little the playwrights could do to revolt in the beginning of last century. The faith of gay representation was in the hands of these theorist and practitioners, unfortunately Elia Kazan, mostly in charge of Tennessee Williams' productions, did not feel the need to promote any kind of liberation, as I will discuss later in this thesis.

Boal's predecessor and biggest influence was the German-born director, actor and theatre theorist Bertoldt Brecht. Brecht gave the European theatre a taste of the orient, by implementing old Chinese theatre traditions (Brecht 1957) into the old, sometimes very conservative European theatre. His *Verfremdungseffekt* (Brecht 1957: 101-102), alienation technique, was one that I also used in my production, as a means of bringing the audience's experience from the subconscious level into the conscious level. I will get back to that point in the second part of this thesis. Like Boal, Brecht

understood the potential of the theatre as a means of educating people, but he needed to mend the actor's technique in order to do that. His *Verfremdungseffekt* is famous in offering a scientific approach into acting. In Brecht's opinion we should look at our everyday actions as from a far, observing them, making note of them and trying to find out the causes and roots for all the actions that we do. He wants the audience to participate actively in the actor's work by making the actor take notice of the spectator, by not hiding the fact that s/he is being watched. He wants the actor to show the spectator the method he is using, the way he is thinking, in order for the spectator to abandon the idea that all of this is happening to a character that is only words brought to life for a brief moment, but that this is something that the spectator can consciously work on in his mind, taking in the meaning of what s/he is experiencing and actively form his/her own connection of disconnection to the actions before him/her. Brecht writes about the Chinese method:

The audience can no longer have the illusion of being the unseen spectator at an event which is taking place. A whole elaborate European stage technique, which helps to conceal the fact that the scenes are so arranged that the audience can view them in the easiest way, is made unnecessary.

(Brecht 1957: 92)

Brecht wants to get rid of all illusion, although he is fond of the way the Chinese use symbols on stage, such as patches of different slids sown on to a silk costume to indicate poverty. He also liked the idea of the stage remaining the same at all times, so that actors could bring different objects on and off the stage, while they need them. (Brecht 1957: 91) This bareness was also a method used in bringing the message of the text more clearly to the spectator. Brecht writes about the Western actor:

The Western actor does all he can to bring his spectator into the closest proximity to the events and the character he has to portray. To this end he persuades him to identify himself with him (the actor) and uses every energy to convert himself as completely as possible into a different type, that of the character in question. If this complete conversion succeeds then his art has been more or less expended. Once he has become the bank-clerk, doctor or general concerned he will need no more art than any of these people need 'in real life'.

(Brecht 1957:93)

This way of seeing actors as people and not mutants who transform into different beings for two hours, was the basis for my decision to include a synopsis of the characters in the beginning of the play. They came out as themselves first, announced their own name and then the name of their characters, in order to make the clear distinction between the character and the real person. This was done as to say that the character was simultaneously close and a distant a person to the actor as it is to you, the spectator. The actor underlined the fact that it is was a fictitious character to him/her as it has to be for the spectator/spectator. It was a statement, which put the actor into the part of a spectator as it put the spectator into the part of an actor.

These two examples give evidence so that it can be said that theatre can be used as a tool for the implementation of different theories into practise. Theatre can be used as a laboratory where the actors are guinea pigs, awaiting for the test results to come from the audience who sometimes unknowingly also perform the role of the guinea pigs, reflecting the current social atmosphere towards the subject they are presented with. In this respect, the theatre has had a very important impact on the gay and lesbian community too, giving people the chance to see the different lives lived, on the stage. It is daring to say that the theatre has a big impact on the way people think, but surely it is fair to say that it at least gives a chance for a minority to have its voice heard and if nothing else, is a reflection of the moral attitude of the society it chooses to represent.

I have to mention another point that is made by Sinfield, before I start to list the history of gay and lesbian theatre. Sinfield points out that '...there is no correlation between the (reported) sexuality of the writer,

director or performer and the way he or she represents homosexuality'. This is a point to which I will come back time and again, and a point of which many theorists have very different opinions. For example, John M. Clum, refers (Roudané 1998), that Tennessee Williams was influenced strongly on the people whom he knew to have a similar background and sexual preferences as he himself. Nicolas de Jongh (1992), a gay man himself, perceives that one is almost compelled to bring out one's dissident sexuality, and if one does this in a negative way, as Noël Coward does in his opinion, one must be a very repressed individual. Tennessee Williams' characters have been analyzed as being parts of himself and representing different aspects of gay man's desires, but I will try to keep away from doing too much of this, since I myself believe that a writer can be able to create work, independent of him/her own desires, sexual or otherwise. I am not suggesting that the artist's work is not influenced by his/her sexual preferences, as sexuality makes up a large part of our beings, but I think it is very unfair to start looking at somebody's work, thinking only about his/her sexuality. This often leads to the creation of theories that only have some, if lucky, correlations with the writer and his/her work, when the academic tells us that this has to be true, because it is widely known that the writer is THAT way inclined. It is gross underestimation of the writer to think that his/her sexuality is the only source for his/her imagination. I am certain that Williams' portrayals of fragile people, who are scared of their own emotions and those of others had originated from his own life, as he had grown up in a religious home, where surely his preferences would have been damned. At the same time, Williams could not stand 'sissy' men in his own life and could not keep a long term relationship, because he could not totally accept his own homosexuality. (Spoto 1985: 15-20) The point I am trying to make here is that everyone goes through bewildering emotions about his/her own sexuality in their teens and I am sure that we all feel peculiar emotions, which make us ponder about our own preferences and thus gives us a chance to collect different types of material, which we can use later. The whole purpose of any one study should not concentrate on one issue, making sure that we can find all the elements that prove to us that, for example, Williams' homosexuality aided him to understand the human nature

better, because gay people have to be so sensitive about their surroundings. This sort of theorizing makes me very angry, since hardly ever anyone speaks about the effect that someone's heterosexuality has on the person's work. This can only be explained by the curiosity mixed with fear that those people feel towards non-heterosexual preferences and the need to know about them without knowing them. I will also return to this subject later when I talk about the way gays in theatre and in plays are treated and represented. Sinfield introduces an interesting theory on the relationship between a homosexual writer and his/her treatment of characters with the same sexual preferences:

On the one hand lesbians and gay men have produced hostile representations, because that was how they saw themselves, or that was the best they could manage in those conditions, or they needed the work....We might chart the situation on two axes: in/visibility and un/friendliness, in fact until recently there was a distinct correlation: the more hostile a representation, the easier for it to claim visibility."

(Sinfield 1999: 3)

Later in this section I shall introduce Noël Coward, who was a master in creating camp gay characters, whose main interests in life were flower arranging and gossiping. Coward is the perfect example in his stereotypical treatment of homosexual as 'sissies', a trademark that has lived through the decades and can still be seen in films and television sitcoms. Tennessee Williams lies somewhere between Coward and for example Mark Ravenhill who has been giving the theatre audience glimpses of 'normal' gay people at the end of the 20th century. Ravenhill has tackled the 'normal' life of people, whose sexual practices are considered abnormal. He brought the gay reality on stage, casting away the false image of homosexual being either self-destructive and remorseful or immoral and corrupted.

Theatre's power and influence did not go unnoticed from the legislature either. In Britain, the Lord Chamberlain had the power to make or break the play, as in the 1737 Act of Parliament he had been entrusted by the prime minister the licensing and censoring of plays. If the Lord decided that the play had some unmoral attitudes, it could be banned from the theatre. If

this happened, usually it could only be presented in a private club, to which one had to buy a membership. It has to mentioned that other duties that belonged to the Lord Chamberlain were organising royal garden parties, administering royal homes and examining the credentials of people who wished to be presented at Court or admitted to the royal enclosure at Ascot. (Sinfield 1999: 39) However, as Sinfield points out, the Lord Chamberlain did not really have to trouble himself with the major dramatists. They shared the Chamberlain's opinion about decency and their plays were already toned down. One of Sinfield's examples, in connection with the above mentioned, is Tennessee Williams. (Sinfield 1999:15)

Sinfield also makes a point about the gayness of a gay character. It is very difficult to brand a character gay if in the end he goes on and chooses a heterosexual way, even though he has acted and carried himself in a way that bears all the typical trademarks that we associate with a gay character in the theatre. I personally stumbled across this problem with *Cat*, not knowing what to think about Brick and his sexuality. Sinfield says, in connection with the fact that a character can appear gay, but in the end he is not:

The near miss displays both the conditions in which queerness filters into discourse and the processes of negotiation and denial through which it is controlled.

(Sinfield 1999: 4).

It is a very interesting process, considering whether a character is gay or not. It was quite interesting, when the actor playing the part of Brick came up to me right in the beginning of the process and announced to me that he did not understand why I was having problems with the ending of the play, because in his opinion it was very straightforward that Brick was not gay. It was fantastic to see him starting to doubt his adamant opinion all during the process and ending up as confused as I was right before the opening night. Judith Fetterley (1978) has talked about just this, developing a concept called 'resisting reader' (Mills 1994: 27), as a way of theorizing why different readers take up different positions to texts and why they refuse to take certain position quite adamantly. Susan Geldhill, when talking about women and

popular film, has also talked about this process saying:

Meaning is neither imposed, nor passively imbibed, but arises out of a struggle or negotiation between competing frames of reference, motivation or experience.

(as cited in Pribram 1988:67-68)

Could it be said then that only gay people read gay messages in the plays and texts? If this would be the case it would certainly make Lord Chamberlain seem a bit ...queer. I agree with Alan Sinfield, who says that reader's own sexuality does not rule over how he/she perceives the play. (Sinfield 1999: 21) Sinfield gives an example of Robin Wood, who at the age of seventeen in 1948 saw Hitchcock's *Rope* and was fascinated by it, and who said:

...despite the fact that I knew I was gay myself, it never occurred to me for a moment that the characters in the film might be: it was, at the time, literally *unthinkable*. If I couldn't believe, emotionally, in the existence of other homosexuals in real life, how could I believe in their existence within Hollywood film?

(as quoted in Sinfield 1999:21)

This is probably real life imitating art. If one thinks of the various examples of plays, where there is a homosexual son, but the mother refuses to believe it, since that sort of a thing just does not exist in her frame of reference. This is also why dramatists used the well proven methods in portraying character's dissident sexuality. These included, for example, having a male character dressed extremely well and showing excessive interest in flower arrangement or interior design. I am not saying that sexuality does not play a part in analysis, but it should not be seen as the key element in it. I cannot distinct why I made certain decisions as a director because of my sexuality or anything else.

It is up to the whole of me, my history and experiences how I read Williams and interpret his words. In my project I tried to stay as faithful to Tennessee Williams as I could in my interpretation, though I changed the structure of the play quite radically. I will go through the structure step-by-step in the second part of this thesis. The results of my questionnaire tell me

that my meaning was well received, at least I think so. I did not set out to correct the representation of queer people in the theatre, or otherwise have some higher principles, except that I would not tarnish the name of Tennessee Williams. As Sinfield says, when talking about the affluent and well established population in Britain and America who were in the closet, Williams did not himself want to do much for the homosexual population:

Even dramatists whom we associate with the overthrow of that [conservative and heterosexual] hegemony - writers such as Tennessee Williams, John Osborne and Edward Albee - found discretion convenient.

(Sinfield 1999: 25)

I perhaps wanted to do something that Williams did not dare to do and which was not possible in his days, for example because of the worry of financial success, which troubled especially Elia Kazan, when he directed the play and wanted the changes to be done to the play, but more about that in the second section of this thesis. Their theatre did not set out to build barricades for the revolution, but give a hint of what may exist, if we choose to accept its presence. I was not trying to achieve a cultural revolution either, but I was very aware of the fact that through this medium I could be able to reach people and give them something to think about. I also was looking forward to them solving the mysteries that lay in the text about, for example, Brick's sexual orientation.

In the next part of this section I shall go through the history of gay theatre from the Wildean times to the front porch of *Cat On a Hot Tin Roof* (1956).

1.2 Gay representation in theatre from 1890s to 1950s

In this chapter of the thesis I shall concentrate on talking about the queer influences in theatre and their manifestation on stage from the late 19th century up to the 1950s in Britain and America. I shall introduce different playwrights and directors, sometimes actors too, all in one, who made an impact, and whether the impact was a positive or a negative one for gay theatre, as other theorists see them.

It might seem strange to the reader as he/she will progress through the text that I have so heavily concentrated on English/British theatre, even though Tennessee Williams was an American. The reason for this is that the American theatre was very much influenced by the British theatre. One could even argue that the theatres in America just provided the physical space for British playwrights. Reason for this are numerous, firstly, there really was not a great playwriting tradition in America. Only the big cities had theatres which were dependent on sponsors and were often forced to tour and put on plays that were already proven to be hits in Britain. Further, experimental theatre was definitely out of the question. The lack of tradition was widely discussed in America already in the first decades of its independence. *North American Review* summarized the feelings of the literary circles of its time in 1830:

[...]that all other great nations had their distinguished poetical works, and they resolved that their own land [The United States] would not be without them; if no one else would write them, they would, though they had little leisure for the labor, and for the art itself neither propensity nor vocation.

(cited in Grimsted 1968: 138)

For a while, drama was seen as a wonderful means of creating *Volksgeist*, national spirit, in the settlers, with plays such as *Pocahontas* by George Washington Custis which told a falsified tale of how the inhabitants of the New World liberated the native indians from savagery. Alternatively, they just concentrated on showing how heroic the people who came to the New World really were, leaving an old-fashioned civilization behind them and creating a

new, perfect world. Grimsted (1968) points out, however, that 'soberer moments found American perfectly aware that drama of genius had not as yet been written in the new world'.(1968: 139) Also, the managers of theatres and most of the critics were quite anti-American in their opinion about American plays and preferred English plays, because they had already proven their worth in the old country. One must not underestimate the impact of the background of these people, most of them favoured plays from their own 'mother country'. (Grimsted 1968: 142) James Fenimore Cooper (1828) even blamed the baldness and dreariness of ordinary American life and its deadly hostility to scenic representation for the lack of home-grown literary representation. In his opinion the lack of social variety and contrast made it difficult to write or perform comedy or tragedy, thus rendering mindless melodrama as the only device to lure audience into theatres. For example, in Philadelphia, in 1811 out of 135 plays presented, 30% were Shakespearean comedies and tragedies, 2% plays of American origin and 16% of different American melodramas. These numbers changed quite radically in the next forty years: in 1850 out of 937 plays presented, 44% were melodramas, 14% American plays and only 5% Shakespearean plays. (Grimsted 1968) Similar patterns can be seen in various large playhouses all across the Eastern coast of the United States. Melodramas were loosely based on real events, charting the successes and hardships, which of course were overcome, of the settlers heading to uncharted territories.

It was not until the 1920s, when the United States started producing its own crop of playwrights, such as Eugene O'Neill, who were in the forefront of the American wave that also hit Europe in the 1930s. Many of the playwrights also looked to Europe for influences and this trend did not just concentrate on to the theatre, but also the whole intelligentsia, from poets to painters. Freud became an important factor in America, after he had been well received in Europe. The pattern of feeding information to America reversed in the early 1950s, when Alfred C. Kinsey and his team introduced his report on the sexual behaviour. (Walker et al. 1958: 79-82) The theatrical export from Europe, however, persisted strongly until the latter half of the 20th century and import from America really grew stronger from the late

1960s onwards and especially experimental theatre and performance theatre, which originated from the United States helped to pave the way for the American theatre culture. As I said before, the new world had a lot to thank Europe for and this is why I shall be concentrating on Europe and its theatre theorists and thinkers, who were a great outside influence until the second World War when quite a number of people were lost to the United States as they fled the war and Nazis.

In England and America, homosexuality was considered a disease by the medical establishment as well as the public, and it could only happen to a very uninformed young man, if a corrupted older gentlemen dragged him to his level. No man, with decent parents, with a 'tolerant, virile and decisive' father and a 'gentle, patient and passive' mother could ever fall into this horrid hellhole, which is homosexuality. In the early days of the 20th century theatre homosexuals were depicted as victims of a disease from which they could be cured or as ruthless villains who tried to corrupt others. The depiction of open homosexuality was forbidden by law in the theatre, so those rare dramatists who wished to challenge the ban had to rely on cryptic signifiers to suggest what they wanted to say. Nicholas de Jongh also writes about this new effeminate character that came to the stage which had roots in history:

The translators of the 1611 Authorised Version of the Bible rendered the Greek word 'which could be associated with homosexuality' as 'effeminate'. Effeminacy had no specific association with sodomy. The figure of the perfumed Elizabethan city gallant, elegantly attired in expensive clothes, who appeared in late-sixteenth-century satires, could be transported to the stage of London in 1929, where he would be naturally accepted as a contemporary stereotype of the homosexual. But for the Elizabethans effeminacy was redolent of a generalised debauchery and of 'luxurious living'.

(de Jongh 1992: 7)

Starting from the late 19th century, one of the prominent theorists on human sexuality was a German sexologist Richard von Krafft-Ebing. His book *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1894) was one of the most important

books on human sexuality till the early 1960s. It was also banned in England for many of the early decades of the 20th century. He upheld the commonplace Victorian wisdom that men are innately aggressive in their sexual drives while women embody modesty and passivity. He considered women's modesty as a product of an evolved civilization. In *Psychopathia Sexualis* Krafft-Ebing makes the distinct impression that the highest form of heterosexual love is menaced on all sides by an epidemic of perverse sexual behaviours. The wide variety of sexual case histories included in his chapters on sadism, masochism, fetishism and homosexuality give evidence on what he considered to be widespread sexual disorders among men. He asserts that homosexuality is an congenital disease, but then goes on giving evidence that it might be an acquired state rather than something that has followed one from birth. He believed that irregular homosexual encounters depended on cultural factors that had gone wrong:

Sometimes the development of higher sexual feelings toward the opposite sex suffers, on account of hypochondriacal fear of infection in sexual intercourse; or on account of an actual infection; or they suffer as a result of faulty education which point out such dangers and exaggerates them. Again (especially in female), fear of the result of coitus (pregnancy), or abhorrence of men, by reason of mental or moral weakness, may direct into perverse channels an instinct that makes itself felt with abnormal intensity. But too early and perverse sexual satisfaction injures not merely the mind, but also the body; inasmuch as it induces neuroses of the sexual apparatus (irritable weakness of the centres governing erection and ejaculation; defective pleasurable feeling in coitus), while, at the same time, it maintains the imagination and libido in continuous excitement.

(Krafft-Ebing 1894:189)

Sigmund Freud started to play a large part in the perception of sexuality in the 1920s. His book had been published in England during the First World War and its ideas about sexuality in general and especially about homosexuality gained ground in the playwriting circles too. De Jongh writes:

The revolutionary nature of Freud's insight lay in his rejection of the idea of the innate heterosexuality of humans: the sexual aim (the form of activity) and the object (to which we are drawn sexually) were not ordained in advance.

(de Jongh 1992: 17)

In Freud's view the heterosexual object choice remained the desired cultural norm, and homosexuality was failing to do this, but it should not be treated as an illness.

Freud had an impact on the British theatre: for example Lawrence Olivier modeled his *Hamlet* according to Freud's biographer, who suggested that Hamlet was suffering from the Oedipus complex and on another occasion the production of *Othello* depended upon the idea that Iago had an unconscious sexual desire for Othello, which turned into hatred and the desire to destroy him. Freud's idea of uninnate sexuality had negative effects too: both in America and Britain people started to believe that if you had to learn to be heterosexual, those who did not choose that path were failures and they might somehow be cured from this false step. Attitudes towards Freud were very strict too. Between 1920 and 1930 it was decided that Freud's books should only be made available to doctors, lawyers and university professors, so that the general public would not be bothered with such degenerating literature. Much of Freud's influence was felt through the generally cruder extrapolations of his followers, according to Sinfield (1999: 122). They fixed homosexuality as clinical entity, presented it as problem of gender identity and thus stated the version of the feminine soul in the masculine body. They related it to narcissism and attributed it to an arrested resolution of the Oedipus complex. It was commonly believed that something terrible had happened in the childhood to the person, who had not taken the heterosexual course. Freud's contemporary, A.G. Tansley even states in his review, one might try out different things, but if the correct stimuli is present in a forthcoming order, one chooses the correct and healthy path. (Sinfield 1999: 74)

In the late nineteenth century fashionable plays were prescriptive and rescriptive in relation to the surrounding society and its codes of behaviour. (de Jongh 1992: 10) They did not present anything new to the

audience, they just wanted to reflect the theatre-going people and their lives. The main function of the theatre was to amuse and to divert, it regarded as taboo any image or discussion that there might be something wrong or unmoral among the ruling class, whose life was put upon the stage. The first turning point for gay theatre and gays in theatre could be said to have happened in the last decades of the 19th century, with the Oscar Wilde trials. At the time, it was a huge scandal that a man of the gentility could have been involved in such a thing. He was caught and convicted of committing 'gross indecency' with other men. Such 'gross' homosexual acts were outlawed, both in public and private by the 1885 Criminal Amendment Act. (Bristow 1997: 14) Wilde was of the class that was expected to show a good example and present itself as the backbone of the Empire. Even though Wilde was known for his effeminate manners and acting like a dandy, nobody of his contemporaries had coined these as homosexual features. Sinfield writes on the effects of the Wilde trials:

But at the trials the entire, vaguely disconcerting nexus of effeminacy, leisure, idleness, immortality, luxury, insouciance, decadence and aestheticism, which Wilde was perceived as instantiating, was transformed into a brilliantly precise image: the queer.

(Sinfield 1999: 28)

Thus effeminacy became a trademark for not the leisure class, but also the queer, which resulted in many ambiguous and often comical representations in the theatre, especially in the comedies of Noël Coward. Wilde's plays were performed despite of and partly because of the scandal, but there were those who did not approve any of his work. Wilde's play *Salome* (1891) was performed in Britain, in private clubs, of course, and in the 1918 production, the editor of a right-wing newspaper Noël Pemberton Billing was present and wrote to the paper as follows:

this social leper, Oscar Wilde, had founded a cult of sodomy in this country, and travelled from end to end of it perverting youth wherever he could. He was not satisfied even that his evil influence should die with him, he left behind his works, so that his crimes may be perpetuated even after he was dead.

(as cited in Hoare 1997: 171)

Maud Allan, who played the part of Salome was accused of having a lesbian affair with a contemporary dancer, but she was never proven guilty of this perversion. Funnily enough, the play does not really have any elements of sexual dissidence, except that Salome, who is promised a kingdom for a dance, refuses this wealth, because she just wants the death of a man who has rejected her. This emancipated woman was probably too much for the contemporary man, at least for Mr Billing. Nevertheless, as Sinfield reports that Wilde had an unremovable impact in the minds of the people in Britain. He quotes a certain theatre student who says that when he told his parents about his career choice in the 1950s, they were horrified that their son would be going to an institution filled with 'the Oscar Wilde types'. (Sinfield 1999: 29) According to Sinfield, from Wilde's times till the 1950s public notice of homosexuals consisted mostly of a sequence of prosecutions, exiles and suicides. (Sinfield 1999: 40) George V was quoted to have said that he thought that men like that shot themselves. (Hyde 1972: 221) Therefore, one cannot underestimate the impact that Oscar Wilde, through his own behaviour, made to the theatre, or to the writers, who wanted in their small way make a difference. In his play *Lady Windermere's Fan*, Wilde put the feelings of homosexuals of his time into words:

You don't know what it is to fall into the pit, to be despised, mocked, abandoned, sneered at - to be an outcast! to find the door shut against one, to have to creep in by hideous byways, afraid every moment lest the mask should be stripped from one's face, and all the while to hear the laughter, the horrible laugh of the world, a thing more tragic than all the tears the world has ever shed.

(Wilde 1894: 57)

Theatre and its homosexuality and its treatment of it came to a new blooming during and after the First World War. The war almost wiped out the

established Society and therefore entertainment in its forms, such as debutantes ball and theatre became even more important for the society to set itself back on to the driver's seat. In the late nineteenth century there had been a new trend surfacing from the upper class youth that started to flourish in their early twentieth century and especially during the war. Pre-Raphaelites could be said to have been the most famous among these people, most of whom sponsored avant-garde theatre and partly accommodated sexually dissident practise. (Sinfield 1999: 49) People started to talk about the Bohemia, referring to the upper class youth, whom Colin Campbell describes as follows:

We may define Bohemianism as an unconventional and irregular way of life, voluntarily chosen, and frequently involving artistic pursuits, of those Romantics who are self-consciously in revolt against what they see as a utilitarian and philistine society, and who find mutual support against its 'corrupting' influence in coterie behaviour.... They tend to form intellectual circles, often around a cafe or a restaurant...where they meet to talk, gossip, recite, or hold verse competitions, get drunk, practise their wit, flirt argue or even brawl.

(Campbell 1987: 195-6)

Bohemia felt close to all the sections of society that the Society could not be involved with. In New York, the Bohemia mingled with the African-Americans of Harlem and made them intertwine the homosexual element. Sinfield (1999) tells us that Harlem was a legitimate refuge for homosexuals, pointing out that black people were often ambivalent about them, though, because they were white. Women also found liberation under the wings of Bohemia. These circles encouraged women to live more independently, sheltering both upper- and lower-class lesbian subcultures. (Sinfield 1999: 51) Sinfield goes on telling that Bohemians were looked upon as queer, by the surrounding society and especially the Society, also associated them with socialism, even though the Bohemians were rejected by the established socialists too. In Sinfield's opinion the effect of the Bohemians should not be underestimated, after all, where else could queer discourse take place in those days? Bohemia allowed space for it to happen, in the livingroom of the

establishment instead of side-alleys to which homosexual had come accustomed to. According to Martin Green those who manifested this temperament were called 'children of the sun'. These were adult children who revolted against the patriarchal system and values that their fathers incarnated and against the orthodoxies of the male archetype. (Green 1977: 186)

However, Bohemia was not altogether detached from Society and respectability. Rather, it was where the bourgeoisie experimented with individual freedom and personal development, stretching its limits. After all, the Society was as important to the Bohemia as Bohemia was to the Society. They needed each other in order to set and check their boundaries and an enemy against which they were rebelling against to preserve or brake the status quo.

Noël Coward was the next important element in gay theatre after Oscar Wilde. Noël Coward had been in contact with theatre all his life, since from a little theatre-hand boy to growing up with the Bohemians, he was well aware of the more freeminded attitudes of the people connected with the theatre. By the age fourteen he had been taken under the wings of Philip Streatfield and with his influence he was able to connect himself with the Bohemians, who dominated the avant-garde theatre scene. In 1923 he published a play, *The Vortex*, which both represents and is itself a product of bohemian. As always, it was rejected by the West End. King George V called it 'disgusting' after he had read the script (de Jongh 1992: 19). It was banned from theatres by the Lord Chamberlain, with the following statement:

The picture of a frivolous and degenerate set of people gives a wholly false impression of Society life and to my mind the time has come to put a stop to the harmful influence of such pictures on stage.

(Sinfield 1999: 59)

It was, therefore, performed at a little theatre off the West End. The play has two main characters, Nicky (played by Coward) and Bunty, who represent the new leisure class, with a hint of homosexuality in their relationship, living in Paris together. Nicky's mother is an actress and if that was not bad enough,

she has affairs, one of which is with a boy that is her son's age.. This boy, Tom, sort of an early version of Brick, a young athlete, who has gender disturbance. The stage directions say that 'one feels that he is good at games and extremely bad at everything else'. He is played with by Pawnie, who is one of the first examples of the stereotypical gay male on stage. He is described as 'an elderly maiden gentleman' who makes 'a "Fetish" of house decoration'. (Sinfield 1999: 60) Coward was also aware of Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* and blamed Nicky's difficulties of the absence of a father and the overt presentness of a dominating mother and in the play Nicky does blame his mother for everything. According to Freud, he would be suffering for the *Oedipus complex*. Nicky, the supposed homosexual, gets what he deserves. He starts to take drugs. However, it is not actually a connection between homosexuality and drugs, though, as it between drugs and Bohemia. This way even Lord Chamberlain agreed that the play could be performed in clubs, since it had a moral lesson, telling where the lifestyle of the young leisure class could end, if they started to allow all kinds of freedom, even to homosexuals.

However conservative and traditional, Coward also had his try in shocking the audience and stretching the limits sewn to him by the Lord Chamberlain. Coward revealed the life of Bohemians in his play *Semi-Monde* (1926), where there were forty-two different characters most of whom did not even have names. Coward's intention was just to let the audience see how the other half (demi-monde) lives. The plot consisted of the characters pairing up with different partners in a French hotel during a period of two years. There are also many queer couples. The point of these people pairing off is to show how they are looking for the same thrill everytime, when they 'fall in love', and when the first attraction is over, they just move on. As always, with Coward, there are the stereotypical hysterical women and camp men. Interestingly, these hysterical and quarrelsome women became a trademark of Tennessee Williams twenty years later. Sinfield (1999: 107) agrees that Coward is actually evoking a far more open-work sex/gender pattern than we have imagined for him and his generation or created for ourselves. In contrast, Philip Hoare makes the point of Cowards own homophobia, even though he

himself was also gay. According to Hoare, as a writer Coward takes up the position of Jerome in the play, both looking upon the Society in the play and being disgusted about it. (Hoare 1997:157) One cannot say that Jerome was a clean-cut character though, he himself used his daughter, by pairing her off with some one else, in order for Jerome to get the women he desired at that particular point.

Still, this proves as evidence of the fact, that Coward might have not been the primary force in pushing the gay cause ahead. However, he laid the foundations to the image of the queer man in the theatre that has persisted till our days: the dandy. Sinfield (1999) tells us, how there are two ways of interpreting this stereotypical gender-inverted men alongside relatively straight-acting types. One way of looking at it is that they may suggest that however bohemian the main characters might be, the real queer are someone else. They are not so important to the story or to the Society inside the story, they are foolish, effeminate, marginal. The other way of interpreting would be that they may suggest that homosexuals do not have to be effeminate. 'Queer impulses' may occur among a range of people, not just the 'obvious' ones. Sinfield goes on saying, how it is hard to regard Coward's inferences progressive. They just imply that the effeminate homosexual is 'despicable and that the better type of queer might evade stigma by disavowing him'. (Sinfield 1999: 105) However, Coward brought two different kinds of audiences together. On the one hand, he was serving the upper-class theatre-goer good, clean family fun, with out any unmoral connotations, but on the other hand, with his knowledge of the gay subculture, he could serve them as well. Coward's audiences were composed partly of gay men and thus turned the theatre into 'gay space' for a brief moment. Sinfield goes on to state, that Coward's plays helped to establish a milieu in which many lesbian and gay people could live with some protection and also with the validation of a certain public presence. The dandy became part of the Establishment, as someone who amused the whole party. Dandy's reign was however short-lived. Its tradition went on during the II World War, but soon became outdated and was considered as a conservative part of the Society, straight after the war.

Noël Coward's contemporary and perhaps soul sister, in the way that she herself also saw the marketing and financial potential of queer representation in the theatre, was actress Mae West. In New York performances of Mae West's plays were sold out, but critics dismissed them as vulgar and exhibitionist and they were constantly raided by the police. Mae West said her own opinion in her play:

"I'm one of those damned creatures who are called degenerates and moral lepers for a thing they cannot help, he helpfully explains"

(West 1927: 32)

However, even though West was hated by the heterosexual community and loathed by the moral lobbyists, she did not have it easy with the gay community either. Her plays received harsh criticism from the gay commentators too, especially because of the drag elements that she put into her plays. Kaier Curtin highlights her homophobic remarks and concludes:

Actually her persistent, mercenary attempts to exploit gay transvestites in the 1920s stirred neither public tolerance or compassion. It [*sic*] reinforced the stereotyping of gay men as vulgar, sex-obsessed effeminates who wear womens clothing at drag parties.

(Curtin 1987:137)

Other times they might be depicted as men who arrange flowers in a vase, or men who pay way too much attention to their clothing. The archetypal homosexual character was tall and slender, an early Fred Astaire - looking gentleman, who had a horrible keen interest in arts and so on.

In the theatre of the 1930s, stereotypes ruled the stage. There were no subtle characters, everyone was as plain as possible. In the 1930s a new trend emerged though, as people started to crave glimpses of the forbidden, immoral lives of others, justified with a good moral cause. This feature can also be found in the characters of Skipper and Maggie in *Cat*, but I'll return to that later. According to de Jongh playwrights now flirted with sexual naughtiness. Adultery and fornication might have threatened both

marriage and family, but a happy ending always waited in the wings for the audience who were expecting it. (de Jongh 1992: 20) The basic story usually involved a wife being seduced by another man, having a passionate affair, of which she feels extremely guilty about and then after going through misery, she realises her mistake and returns to the forgiving arms of her husband with a promise never to think about another man as long as she lives. A husband who went astray was quite acceptable though, of course. A double standard was thus in place. At the same time people wanted to see characters breaking the barriers, but in order for them to have the alibi to go and see that, there had to be a moral argument behind everything.

Martin Green (1977) has established two archetypes of portraying homosexuals at that time. The first one was still the dandy, who was defined by his overt self-consciousness and interest in clothes and exaggeration. The dandy had a self-consciousness that was not regarded as masculine. He regarded his body and personality as bare frames on which he should hang a series of flamboyant and affected designs. (Green 1977: 32-33) The other type was the aesthete, who unlike the dandy was not concerned with superficialities, but appreciated and judged something that was outside of himself. The aesthete might have had the trademarks of style and manner, but his field of expertise was different. While the dandy was interested in creation, the aesthete appreciates and judges something which is outside of himself. Otherwise too, homosexuality gained some recognition in the thirties. With the need for showing something other than the lives of the rich and famous on stage in London, people started gathering to certain theatres which had membership requirements, mostly because they could not show 'the alternative' plays without the assurance to the Lord Chamberlain that nobody could not be corrupted without them knowing the risks. This is not to say that homosexuality would have started becoming an acceptable fact, it was just a circle of literary and artistic people in London who started to see homosexuality as an idiosyncrasy and not a disease.

A secret language was still used on the stage. For example the playwright J.R. Ackerley, who himself was a closet homosexual, used the following to implicate the sexual status of his character:

Men were required to do these things to men on stage: a head of curls was caressed; hands were held too long to count as a wholesome handshaking, or placed heavily on a favoured shoulder, fingers were brought into play, linked in a contact that lasted through several sentences of conversation.

(de Jongh 1992: 26)

In his play an older captain desires the affections of a younger officer and in a scene the form of their relationships is revealed so that when the captain caresses the officers hair, the boy tells him to stop it before somebody sees them. This was enough for the audience to recognize what was going on. The character of the captain in Ackerley's play *The Prisoners of War* (1999) almost had the potential to be the new homosexual character who was no longer effeminate. It portrayed the outside pressures in the masculine person of a military official, but in the end the captain resorts to the same old pattern that every homosexual character stumbles upon: he has a nervous breakdown and shows emotion. It was considered in those days that hiding one's emotions was one of the cornerstone of being a truly masculine man, a fact that has lasted till the early 1990s, before the invention of the soft man. de Jongh has a strong view of Ackerley's representation of the queer Captain Conrad:

For it was one of the most controlling myths about homosexuality, retailed for most of this century, that emotionalism and nervousness were stereotypical signs of homosexuality, while emotion repressed or denied approvingly was reckoned a sign of the ideal male.

(de Jongh 1992:28)

Ackerley himself said that the play showed how the army was just an extension of the life lived in public schools where homosexual love was an established fact. (Sinfield 1999: 84) The irony was that public school had been designed in pre-Freudian era, to keep young men away from the softening influence of women so that they would be able to take their place as controllers of men on landed estates, in industry and the empire. Now these very institutions that were supposed to protect men from effeminacy were

being exposed in plays as the one where inverted practices flourished. A similar kind of closeness continued in the army and in Ackerley's case in the I World War. For example Ackerley talked about the fact how one needed to form an attachment to a fellow soldier, so that one would have a concrete example of a subject, for whom you were fighting for (Sinfield 1999: 46). *The Prisoners of War* was not very successful in the West End or on Broadway, probably because of its idea of condemning condemnation. On the other hand, another play, *Spring Cleaning* (1999), by Ackerley, which came out at the same time, was a commercial success. It had the typical homosexual character who fought with his hosiers and threatened to faint when the group was under the threat of being locked in the drawing room. Once again the one-sided picture of the homosexual, who did not impose any threat to the existing society being too engaged with flower arranging, had won the sympathies of the audience.

An interesting play that could have laid the founding bricks for *Cat* can be found in the 1930s. This was called *Whiteoaks* (1936) by Mazo de la Roche, which was adapted from her novel of the same name. It tells a story of Finch, an eighteen-year-old boy who is described as very sensitive and nervy and who lives for his music. His family is dominated by a portrait of the grandfather in a military uniform. According to de Jongh, his nervousness , his sensitivity, his slimness are obviously intended as signifiers of homosexuality; his musicianship is pointedly contrasted with his sporting brother's aggression. (de Jongh 1992: 44) Finch is forbidden to play the piano until he has passed his exams, but he goes to town to play with a band in a café. He drops a letter from one of his fellows and his brother reads it out, a letter that starts out with the words 'darling Finch'. The brother is disgusted by the letter and wishes that his brother would rather go to a brothel than keep this sort of letters. They end up talking about how manly grandfather and all the men in the family were, or if not, should be. At first Finch does not understand what is wrong with the letter, which suggest that nothing sexual has happened between him and his friend. The audience can see his realisation in mime, he gasps and twists a towel around his neck and sit down, only to immediately get up, showing that he had decided to choose

life, queer or not, he is not going to be ashamed. In the end, Finch receives a large inheritance from his grandmother, who, even though she has always considered Finch a bit odd, loves him and chooses him instead of all the masculine relatives to carry on the family estate. This is worthwhile to notice, because as de Jongh points out, Finch is the first homosexual character in pre-war Anglo-American theatre to be specially 'rewarded' although he is gay. (de Jongh 1992: 45) Finch has to endure his family's pressure, just as Brick in *Cat*, and accept his friends homosexuality, in order to keep on living. This seems to be much easier for Finch than Brick.

Looking back from 1961, Julian Symons (1961) declared that the 1930s were marked by the demand for unlimited personal freedom and that it might be called the homosexual decade, because it was in those years that homosexuality became to be accepted as a personal idiosyncrasy. (Symons 1961: 40) The end of the 1920s and the early 1930s were a time of homosexual flourishing in theatre and literature. As F. Scott Fitzgerald describes in his book *The Great Gatsby*, the leisure class was the 'it' thing and as I have described earlier they were more liberated and open-minded. Queer representations, though for the most part stereotypical, could be seen even in magazines. The fairy and maidenly male were introduced to the American public in the 1920s through gossipy periodicals such as *Broadway Brevities* and men's magazines such as *Hot Dog* and *Esquire*. *Esquire* had the most open attitude, running cartoons that depicted pansies and eunuchs and printing stories about homosexual men such as Cole Porter, tennis star "Big Bill" Tilden, or painter Paul Cadmus, though the stories tended to be filled with homosexual innuendo rather than being open portrayals of the lives of these men. (Sinfield 1999: 78) This open-mindedness did not reach everyone, of course. It can be only talked about in connection with the rich and idle, the common queer man did not see any reason to out his desires. It was reserved for the important people.

Most of the characters that represented the lower class were usually put on stage for projects for the elderly gentlemen. Since it was not until the 1950s, when theatre started to move away from the upper class, this was very expected. It actually was a privilege of the nobility to know about

homosexuality, since that kind of thing did not really have a name among the lower classes, who did not get in contact with it in theatre either. The music hall tradition was very popular among the lower classes and they rarely got the opportunity to see plays by, for example, Oscar Wilde. In the 1930s some theatre groups, such as The British Worker's Theatre Movement (1926-1935) and The American Workers' Theatre tried to put up plays with the common man and woman in mind, but they did not touch on any sexual matters. In the United States, George Chauncey says, it was the middle-class men who first got the idea of being a homosexual, and therefore working-class men, particularly those linked to 'masculine' milieux, such as sailors, labourers, might engage in same-sex activity without having to categorise themselves as queer. (Chauncey 1994: 118-119) Chauncey goes on to say that most of them might be motivated, just as the play portrays, largely by social deference and financial advantage and he states that they were probably married. In my view, this is an over-generalisation. Surely not all the lower-class men, who indulged in same-sex passion, were purely in it for the money. I think it is more of a question of not having a voice or opportunity to write their own history. As I mentioned before, theatre was in the hands of the gentility and all the playwrights, who got the opportunity to put on plays, were coming from among the nobility. While talking about how the lower-class queer would perceive the gay representations on stage, Sinfield suggests an interesting idea:

Lower-class lesbians and gay men who found their way into theatres would presumably be able to wonder about Maugham's bachelors, to recognise a hostile treatment[...]and to decode Noël Coward's innuendos. What they hardly saw is plausible representations of themselves. They say mincing comic servants and mysteriously sinister intruders. It is not that the lower classes didn't figure in the lives of established dramatists and the classes they mainly focused on; if anything, the topic of class and sex was too central to be broached seriously.

(Sinfield 1999: 154)

The time for lower class queer representation was to come much, much later. For the time being, they just had to do with the upper-class images of old

bachelors, who use lower-class boys to satisfy their perversions.

By the time second world war broke out, some kind of a queer theatre had found its beginnings. Obviously, during the war, the gay theatre movement stood still, as there was not space for anything, even vaguely, unpatriotic. However, one of the most important playwright for gay theatre (Innes 1996: 90), even if he was a very closeted one, was Terrence Rattigan and he started to make his mark during the war. His career started at the mid-thirties, had its heyday during the end of the forties and at the beginning of the fifties and just as *Cat* broke into to the European scene, critics and audiences alike turned their backs on him. He continued to pursue writing plays and they were performed to full houses, but he never got back to the golden league, in the eyes of the critics and his contemporaries. He died in 1977 but his work did a comeback in the 80s and 90s, especially among the gay theatre scene. Innes explains the paradoxical relationship between gay theatre and Rattigan's work:

Today, Rattigan's work has gained new significance as a forerunner of 'Gay drama'. But his concern not to alienate the general public that his work was designed for, and which he christened 'Aunt Edna', led him to generalize the underlying homosexual these of his most characteristic plays, turning them into a plea for the sexually outlawed or disabled of all genders.

(Innes 1996: 90)

The fictional lady Rattigan kept in mind while writing his plays was an image of a respectable, middle-class maiden lady, who wanted to see good, clean fun. Rattigan respected this image he had in mind and even though he himself was a homosexual, he did not want to speak publicly on its behalf. Innes quotes David Rudkin (Innes 1996: 92), who says that even though Rattigan did not give a voice to the dissident sexuality, there was a deep need in him to out the feelings of a person who had the psychological necessity to organize and speak about the pain experienced. To give an example, one has to look at his play *Separate Tables* (1954), where there is a character of The Major, who, while living in exile in a hotel in Bournemouth, gets caught while doing a lewd act in a cinema (Innes 1996: 94). The Major's character could almost be said to be a forerunner of Shannon in *The Night of the*

Iguana (1963), where Shannon is exiled from his parish, because he could not keep his sexual drive intact. He gets into trouble, because he cannot keep control over his needs and repeats his mistake in Mexico. Both of these characters have in common the pitiful faith of having to leave everything, because the society surrounding them cannot understand the feelings even they themselves cannot understand. Instead of trying to help these people or give them a chance to justify or/and repent, society condemns them immediately and bans them, because society is incapable of confronting the possibility of emotion winning over reason.

The attitude of the society is exactly the same as it was 50 years earlier, when the famous German sexologist Richard von Krafft-Ebing wrote in 1894 that sexual desirer is a potentially explosive power and that it has been the purpose of civilization to tame it. (Bristow 1997: 26) There had been absolutely no change in attitudes in half a century! Even though it is implied that the other person involved was a female, the element, at least according to Innes, suggest towards the behaviour and society's treatment of a homosexual. Just as Williams depicted strong women in his plays, Rattigan also showed women making choices that the surrounding society could not put up with . In *Variation on a Theme* (1958) the heroine is a woman, who decides to leave her wealthy and abusive husband for a younger, poor man. It also has the new element of insinuating about homosexuality, as the heroine suggests to her younger lover that there might be something going on between him and his flatmate. This is, of course, very elaborately denied. Rattigan had used this same scenario in an earlier play, *The Deep Blue Sea* (1952), except that this time she set herself free from both men. This play got quite hard criticism, which Sinfield describes as follows:

The play[...] features sexual dissidence. It was scandalous for a woman to leave her husband, outrageous for her to declare that she had done so because of an overwhelming sexual passion, and courageous for her to relinquish both men for an independent life.
(Sinfield 1999: 160)

These plays caused quite a stir in their day. However, the boundaries of allowable subject matter had moved a little bit by the late

1950s, so that when plays from America started to arrive in Britain, such as *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, Rattigan started to be seen as old fashioned and out dated and his success started to fade. (Innes 1996: 93)

This new openness to new ideas and representations was due to the new wave of British playwrights, such as John Osborne, who changed the whole theatre scene by creating the so-called kitchen-sink drama, where for the first time the audience could see the everyday life of the lower classes. However, Rattigan remained a favourite among the audience, because of his subtle hints and wonderful storytelling skills between the lines. Sinfield (1999) states that Rattigan belonged to the same category as Aunt Edna, and that he chose the path Coward had taken, by scattering queer influences on the edge of his stories, either encouraging or suffocating them, depending on the public and the public's attitudes and concept of morality at the time that each play opened. (Sinfield 1999: 160) I would say that Rattigan was the British version of Williams in his manner of telling everything without saying anything. They both had very strong women, for example Rose in *Variation on a Theme* (1958) and Maggie in *Cat* (1956), who were not afraid of taking their lives into their own hands and change their conditions. Both playwrights also had male characters, who were tormented by the ideal male icon that the society had built for them to copy and in failing this they were told to disappear or at least fade into the background with their personality, which was condemned queer and thus unacceptable. The difference between them was that where Rattigan used heterosexual covers to deal with the love that dare not speak its name, Williams used heterosexuals to speak about fairies.

1.2.1 Time for a change

We have now reached the 1950s, the decade, when *Cat* came out in America and Europe. From now on I shall concentrate solely on Williams. In the above, I have tried to bring out the main points and theatre makers that had influenced the gay representation in some way, whether bad or good, in the time Williams was starting his career. As I mentioned before, the information I have presented has been very Eurocentric and I still want to emphasize the reason for this being that the theatrical culture was very much Eurocentric. The only other American playwright besides Williams that made an impact as a writer, and who was not content with traditional character descriptions, was Arthur Miller, whose play *The Crucible* (1953) was important in the way it criticised the American way of life, and especially the McCarthy trials. In Europe, the theatrical tradition was beginning to shift from the likes of Coward, who based his plays on the upper class lives into more realistic presentation and in the middle of the 1950s, a new kind of wave hit the theatrical front. It was called the 'kitchen-sink drama' and it dealt with the everyday lives of the less privileged. It took a couple of years before it reached America. A good example of this wave reaching Williams is *The Glass Menagerie* (1945), to which I shall return.

In conclusion it can be said that little was being done to the representation of different sexualities in theatre, in the course of fifty years. The teachings of Krafft-Ebing and Freud were still very much the accepted norm and the more daring experiments in theatre were still being forced to be performed in members only -clubs in shady neighbourhoods, where they did not bother anyone as long as self-censorship was alive and well. If a gay playwright wanted to succeed in taking gayness on stage it had to be done in the literal meaning; the gay characters had to be gay, full of humour, so full that there was no question of them being completely harmless and unthreatening. The best way was still to kill the gay character in the end. Evil had to be punished and rooted out of the society.

1.3 Tennessee Williams -the man and the playwright

The modern Queer was invented by Tennessee Williams. Brando in blue jeans, sneakers, white T-shirt and leather jacket. When you saw that, you knew they were available.

(Sinfield 1999: 189)

I wanted to start this section with that bold statement. I shall be reviewing Tennessee Williams' work in this part of the thesis, mainly in a theatrical point of view, concentrating on his most famous and successful pieces. However, I shall also look at his work with regard to his own life, a mean that has been so well used in earlier presentations of him, and to which I am very critical. I shall try to steer away of theories that suggest that everything he wrote came out of his own life and was thus very subjective. To do that would be to say that Williams lacked any imagination and was unable to create characters that did not have any of his personal traits. It has also been indicated by some feminist scholars that Williams was a misogynist and tried to do everything in his power to show women in a bad light. This is an argument which I want to overthrow immediately. In my opinion, Williams' female characters may appear, at first, hysterical and dependent on men. They were, for the most part, financially dependent on men, for example Maggie in *Cat*, but emotionally it was the women who could survive on their own, even though sometimes it meant that they caused quite a lot of harm to the people around them.

It would be foolish of me not to confess that I hold Williams in quite a lot of esteem, but I hope I still will be able to present him in a objective manner. I shall not present too much criticism on him though, as I do not see it important for the purpose of this thesis. My here aim is to show that there is a pattern in his writing and in the characters he has created, in order to validate the choices I made in my own production of *Cat*, even though in the end, the biggest choices could only be made once the text became alive on stage and in the minds and mouths of the actors.

1.3.1 Metamorphosis from Thomas into Tennessee

The reason why I feel that it is important to know a little bit about Williams' background is very easy: to understand him better. Another, less dignified reason, is simply because I find it very interesting how he has used so much of his family as a starting point for each character. I feel that in a way writing was his therapeutical skill of overcoming childhood traumas. He put them on stage for the whole world to see and in this way reached catharsis in his life. Earlier in this thesis I have talked about the fact how I refuse to read Williams' as a gay writer, just because it is common knowledge that he was a homosexual. I have also criticized every scholar who feels that s/he has a right to categorize Williams as a gay writer. It might seem a bit queer now that I wanted to link plays with the happenings in his life, even though I will not allowed for anybody else. I feel that I can do this, because I am not simply concentrating on the homosexual element in his life. Surely it is true that each artist draws from his/her own experiences, but the experiences do not have to be categorized according to sexual preference, but according to different people. I feel that there has been an injustice done in the case of Tennessee Williams, when scholars attribute too much of his sensitivity to homosexuality, just to give an example. His character was more than just his sexual practices, and into following I will try to show that.

Thomas Lanier Williams III grew up in his grandfather's house in Clarksdale, Mississippi. His grandfather was the reverend in the local Episcopalian church and the atmosphere at home was very religious and suffocatingly tight in moral. Tom was mainly brought up by his mother and older sister Rose, whilst his father was away on business for the better part of the year. His main and perhaps the only companion and friend was his sister Rose, with whom he had only sixteen months apart in age. At seven, Tom and the rest of the family was moved from Clarksdale almost overnight (Hale 1997, in Roudané ed. 1997: 11) to St. Louis, where his father had acquired a position in a shoe factory. This transition traumatized Tom, as he hated the city and called it 'The City of St.Pollution' (Roudané:13) He excelled in writing at school, but did less well at sports and military subjects, of which

his father blamed Tom's mother who had taken him as a confidant early on when Tom's father went on drinking binges and had other women on the side. Tom's mother Edwina could almost be seen as a model to Blanche in *Streetcar*, because she was an old-fashioned Southern Belle, who, though their means did not enable her to do it, wanted to join different tea societies and entertain guests at their home. She believed in the old values and tried to pass on the old traditions onto Rose and later on to Tom. Bigsby describes the character of Amanda, the mother in *The Glass Menagerie* in connection to Williams' mother in the following words:

Memory has become a myth, a story to be endlessly repeated as a protection against present decline. She wants nothing more than to freeze time; and in this she mirrors a region whose myths of past grace and romantic fiction mask a sense of present decay.

(Roudané 1997: 38)

Tom's father tried to 'normalize' his son by putting him into a university and a fraternity, but as he noticed that the son did not fit in, he took Tom out and put him to work in the shoe factory. However, he returned to visit different universities later on and won various prizes for his writings, most important being the Rockefeller scholarship in 1940.

The most important event in Tennessee's life (by now he had assumed the artistic name of Tennessee) was definitely his sister's lobotomy in 1943. Even though Tennessee was not there when it happened, and he was not even told that the operation would be carried out, he blamed himself for failing to protect Rose for the rest of his life. He did a long list of short stories and one-act plays dealing with Rose, most famous being the character of Laura in *The Glass Menagerie*. Williams spoke about the similarities with Laura and his sister Rose after the first Broadway production in 1945 (as quoted in Roudané 1997) and said that the life his family had lived did not essentially differ from that featured in the drama. He recalled that his sister's room was painted white and it was full of shelves containing small glass animals. He also said that '[...]the glass animals came to represent that fragile delicate ties that must be broken, that you inevitably break, when you try to fulfil yourself' (Roudané 1997 :37). In the last part of sentence he is referring

to himself and his alter ego in the play Tom, who both leave their families, runaway, in order to have the space to grow and develop to a independent person, who has the desires for the future that only he wants and is able to fulfil his own destiny. Both Williams and Tom in the play are looking back and writing about their families in order to mend the past so that they are able to go forward.

Most of Tom's plays written as class assignments have a political thrust, especially one on socialized medicine. His experience with the many doctors unable to cure his sister fuelled him to take the medical profession apart.

(Roudané 1997: 18)

Tennessee's opinion on doctors can easily be read in *Cat* too, where the doctor is unable to do anything to Big Daddy except to give morphine, so that he will not feel anything. The only thing he does is to lie to Big Daddy and Mama about the true state of his illness, so that everything would appear normal and happy and give an opportunity to Gooper, the less liked son, to move forward with the plan to take over the farm. The doctor can be seen as a devious conspirator who only carries the medicine bag to appear to possess some wisdom and most of all, a good place in the society.

Williams also felt very strongly about the socialist cause and was very critical about the modern day American values, such as the nuclear family. Those in power did not interest him as he was so adamant about the cathartic powers of the struggle. de Jongh (1992) theorizes that Williams plays are devoted to those 'for whom good news does not arrive', Williams acts on the behalf of the outsiders, the fugitives that are being hunted down and tamed by the ideal that is called the modern man.

It was also in the beginning of the 1940s, when Williams began to accept the fact that he was a homosexual. Williams himself wrote about the development of his sexuality during the time he was confounded to bed for a year due to diphtheria, obviously bearing in mind the existing Freudian ideas of homosexuality:

During this period of illness and solitary games, my mother's overly solicitous attention planted in me the makings of a sissy, much to my father's discontent. I was becoming a decided hybrid, different from the family line of frontiersmen-heroes of east Tennessee.

(Williams 1975: 16)

As such, he never really accepted it, as he hated the idea of camp queerness and tried to steer away from it. However, as Allean Hale argues (Roudané 1997: 21), is important to bear that in mind, when looking at his work at in 1940s 'homosexual was outside the law, outside the Church, branded a pervert by the conventional society'. Williams went through personal turmoil with this fact for the rest of his life and it showed in his characters too. In Hale's words, 'his characters seldom win; in his existential world it is the struggle that counts'. (Roudané 1997: 22) de Jongh (1992:70) writes how Williams' own sex-life was rather 'like popping pills'. He never stayed long in a relationship or rather he only had brief encounters, which were mainly based on sex and not on love. de Jongh quotes a friend of Williams', Paul Bigelow, who described his friend as follows:

[Williams' promiscuity derived from an] essential inability to accept the fact that he was the object of someone's commitment. Friendship he could accept, but sex he distrusted...perhaps because he ordinarily disconnected it from affection in his own life. He never accepted that he was sexually loved...Physical intimacy he tended to distrust even as he needed it constantly.

(de Jongh 1992: 70)

Williams did not believe in unconditional, all-forgiving love. This is very easily seen in his characters, in for example Maggie, who feels that she has to constantly overcome herself and her actions in order to be worthy of Brick's love. Also in the characters of Amanda and Blanche it is obvious that no woman is good enough as she is, but she has to improve her looks step-by-step until she gets into the paradise of marriage.

The atmosphere in theatre circles was not very accepting towards homosexuals at the time. Sinfield (1999) notes how directors used to fire actors, because they were homosexuals, or refused texts if the writer was a

known homosexual, since as the psychoanalytic at the time had proven, 'the homosexual was unable to move beyond an autoerotic, infantile experience'(Sinfield 1999: 194). Williams received same harsh criticism himself, just because it was widely known what his sexual preferences were. A powerful critic, George Jean Norman referred to him as 'a Southern genital-man'(Sinfield 1999: 194). This made Williams very agitated about the whole profession because it demanded him to conceal his own true being in order to succeed. He was quoted to have said that *The Glass Menagerie* would be the last play he would write to the existing theatre.

However, Williams continued to write and produce in small theatres across the East Coast until 1943 (Sinfield 1999: 192), when he was offered a job by MGM Studios in Hollywood, which he gladly accepted, as it would bring in a regular salary. At the same time it caused ethical dilemmas to the socialist writer. Williams felt guilty about the success and the benefits that came with it; the hotel rooms and the staff, which he felt made him treat them as inferior human beings. He found that some sort of a struggle was necessary for his artistic work, because, according to him 'security is a kind of death' (Roudané 1997: 32). *The Glass Menagerie*, however took him to fame, from which he never really returned. It also worked as a perfect example of how Williams used the theatre and writing for it as a therapy. Perhaps seeing the text on stage made him feel a sort of a catharsis about his own past and present. Its honesty and trueness to life may have made it the most performed of all Williams' plays.

The fame that came with *The Glass Menagerie* did not prepare Williams to the storm that broke out with *A Streetcar Named Desire* when it opened in 1947 in New York. C. W. E. Bigsby writes about the pioneering work that *Streetcar* did:

[...] outside of O'Neill's work, this was the first American play in which sexuality was patently at the core of the lives of all its principal characters, a sexuality with the power to redeem or destroy.

(Bigsby 1992: 5)

Sinfield writes about the shock caused by the open gazes that Blanche and Stella made to Stanley, admiring his body and especially Blanche, making it know that they had something else on their minds besides baking. He also says that because this gaze was so unusual for a female character, it was considered perverse and thus gay, as if giving more evidence on the behalf of the theory that Blanche was Williams' alter ego. (Sinfield 1999: 189) Two of Williams' biographers, Donald Spoto and Lyle Leverich, claim that Stanley is the embodiment of Williams' father, Cornelius. The absence of the father in *The Glass Menagerie* is turned upside down by the full force of masculinity that Stanley Kowalski brings into the house in *Streetcar*. It was known that Cornelius tended to be violent when drunk and as it happens, he seemed to be drunk quite a lot, abusing his family the best he could. However, the most damaging evidence giving against Cornelius can be found in Spoto's biography, where he tells the following:

[Rose was shouting] hysterically that her father had come to her room drunk and had spoken and acted in a lewd, provocative way: she insisted, wildly that Cornelius wanted her, his own daughter, to go to bed with him. This was something unthinkable, unutterable for the mother and hence the lobotomy.

(Spoto 1985:59)

Rose's stories were taken as a crazy woman delusions and considered as evidence that lobotomy was the only way for her to go, medically. Williams had often said that he thought that Rose went crazy, because she could not find an outlet to her sexual energy. (Hale in Roudané 1997) It was Williams who believed in what Rose was saying and the last scene (Williams 1956: 217-226) in *Streetcar* echoes the decision that his family made. Stella begins to have second thoughts about committing Blanche into a institution, but as she had said earlier to Eunice, she could not believe Blanche's story about Stanley raping her and still go on living with him. Stella cannot afford to recognize Stanley for what he is, a violent, vicious man, because she has nowhere else to go, now that *Belle Revê*, the family farm, has also been lost. Therefore, it cannot be said that Blanche would be Williams' alter ego, but rather almost an clear image of his sister, Rose. Sinfield (1999) theorizes that

Williams' alter ego in the play might be Allan, Blanche's former husband, who loved poetry and used to fill the rooms with flowers and if it was not clear enough for the audience, Blanche confesses finding him in bed with another man, after which Allan quickly kills himself. Funnily enough, in the West End showing of the play the Lord Chamberlain made it a point to get an assurance from the plays producers that there would not be any mention about whom Blanche had found her husband to be with in the room. One could only mention that there were 'two people in it'(de Jongh 1992).

Stanley can also be seen as the new man, one who is not bothered with the past, but lives for the future and most of all, for himself, not caring about the consequences of his actions, just as Cornelius Williams, who moved the family to St.Louis.

Stanley also has some remains of the main character in O'Neill *The Hairy Ape* (1921), where the man, Yank, working under the docks is being eyed by an ultra feminine passenger, Mildred Douglas, who in her gaze gives the heater of the engines the mark of the hairy ape and the beast that he did not know existed. Mildred is presented in the beginning as a rich woman, who has inherited all of her money and does charity work as a hobby, to find out how the other half lives. Seeing the hairy ape is, however, too much for her and she is unable to hide her contempt. The loathing in her gaze caused Yank to think about his own position in the modernizing world and led him to the conclusion that he was not good enough for the world and this made him furious. He left the boiler room on the ship in search for a better life on shore, but his rise from the bottom of the society did not succeed. In the last scene he is talking to a gorilla, as an equal, after he has been thrown out of everywhere, he tries to bond with the animal to whom everyone are comparing him. However, even the gorilla does not stand for Yank, but after he has freed the gorilla, the gorilla kills him. Yank is made to realize the horrid situation where he is, as if he would be the remains of some other civilization, who has been unable to develop into a useful member of the new society. He might do well now, but in the future he will be too much of a relic. Even if he would be able to support himself, he is too much of an animal to be ever accepted to society as a full member. This is also what

Blanche does to Stanley. In my opinion, Blanche forces Stanley to acknowledge his intellectual inferiority to his wife and the fact that even though he is the bread-winner in the family, he will never be as good in the eyes of the society as Blanche and Stella are, just because of their birth-right. This is also why he wants to bring Blanche down in front of other people's eyes and also why he wants to rape her, use the animal side of him, as if in a darwinian way show Blanche the survival of the fittest. All this show of force is of course undermined by him calling out for Stella when she has decided to leave him. He realizes that he needs her to validate his existence, just as the heater in *The Hairy Ape* needs the loathing of the woman in order to feel his existence.

Blanche has some qualities that make her interesting also in connection to *Cat* too. I've always seen Blanche as what Maggie could become if she stays on living in the same situation. Blanche differs from Maggie in the way that she has not had the schooling of poverty as Maggie has had which made her stronger and more able to survive, but they both have the same quality of assessing themselves and their selfworth through the eyes of other people, especially men. Blanche knows that she is alive when she has admirers around her, bringing her flowers and complementing her on her looks. This is probably why she started the affair with the schoolboy back home and why she was not too bothered about starting a career as a prostitute. On the other hand, Maggie goes out of her way to force Brick to notice her and tells him in the first act how all the men in the city looked after her and how an old schoolfriend of Brick's tried to manhandle her in the bathroom in a party. They are unable to believe in themselves as such and make a point of their appearances and how it is truly the only thing that matters. Blanche cannot believe that Stella does not take better care of herself just as Maggie puts her sister-in-law down for her motherly appearance. It is also very sad how these two women are financially dependent on men, Blanche because she lost her job because of the affair and Maggie, because she married Brick for love and did not get any in return and the wealth is in jeopardy because she is unable to produce an heir due to the lack of loving. It is as if they are being punished for trying to live their lives according to their

feelings. The people who refuse to realize the truth, such as Stella in *Streetcar* and Big Mama in *Cat* are able to survive, because they block out everything that might threaten the view that they have constructed of their lives to themselves. The only way to survive is to live a lie.

It would be wrong to say that Williams did not approve of romantic people, quite the opposite. He talks about them in an interview, in connection to his play *Camino Real* (1947):

The people in my play are romantics confronted by very real situations as they come to the end of the road. It is a real road. The play...is about the indomitability of the romantic spirit. I approve of romantics. They fascinate me.

(Tennessee Williams 1960, as cited in Roudané 1997: 71)

Camino Real was produced for Broadway six years later than it was written. It is said to be Williams' attack on the 1950s McCarthyism and the newly found closet fascism that was practised in the United States. The whole play is presented as a dream, experienced by Don Quixote, who visits the stage in the beginning and end of the play. All the characters in the play are named after famous people, such as Casanova, Lord Byron and Marguerite Gautier and of course the main characters Kilroy and Esmeralda. The play is supposed to be set at the end of the road. It is a place where you are dead, but you still have strong memories of life that you are stuck in a in-between-state, where it is impossible to get out. The town is governed by a strong, violent regime, which hunts the outsiders down and kills them, a symbol of the McCarthy trials. Esther Merle Jackson writes about Williams' ideas behind the play:

His most personal play, *Camino Real* affirms Williams' own philosophy that romanticism is absolutely essential. By romanticism, he means "the ability to feel tenderness toward another human being, the ability to love", a capacity achieved by not allowing the dehumanizing experiences on the *Camino Real* to brutalize one's spirit.

(Jackson 1965: 121)

Williams is probably going through his own feelings about the lack of faith in oneself to be worthy of being loved, a problem I mentioned earlier on.

However, most of all, the play is one of the most political plays that Williams ever wrote. *Camino Real* came out in the same year as Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* (1953), which is also an attack towards the America of McCarthy-trials. *The Crucible* is set in the 17th town in New England, where a woman is ostracized by the society because of her out of wedlock affair and child, whose father she refuses to reveal. The audience knows that the father is the local priest, who also is one of the woman's accusers. The play also caused a huge scandal and the state department even withdrew Miller's passport.

Williams was one of the most vocal to criticize Miller's prosecutors. The play was not a success and it was being criticised because of its blurry structure and the point was being missed by all audiences across the continent.

Camino Real is almost a pre-post-modern play in its ability to present different scenes almost simultaneously in an almost dream-like manner. However, for the purposes of this thesis the play does not offer that much information about the writer side of Williams, but rather the political and personal sides of Williams appear. It also gives evidence on the behalf Williams' romantic side and the fact that he struggled to suppress it, but it is impossible for anyone to try not care about whether he/she is being loved. This point comes across very pointedly in Williams' next play and huge success, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1956).

1.3.2 Tennessee hits the roof

Cat ran for 7700 performances in Broadway from 1955 onwards and was made really famous by the 1958 MGM film adaptation, hated and deplored by Williams. However, this was the play that made Williams rich and secured his income for the rest of his life. After the crushing criticism that *Camino Real* had received, Williams was desperate for some good news and appraisal as a playwright. He wrote about it in the following way:

I can't explain to you or myself or anybody why the reception of this play meant so damnably much to me, why I was so disgustingly craven about it, why the wait for the morning notices to come out was the most unendurable interval of my life...It must stem from some really fearful lack of security, some abysmal self-doubt. Also it takes such ugly odious tangential forms, such as my invidious resentment of Inge's great success[.] Despite my friendly attitude toward Bill and his toward me, I was consumed with envy of his play's [Bus Stop] success...Hideous competitiveness which I never had in me before! But after 'Camino' I was plunged into such depths, I thought I would never rise from. I love writing too much, and to love anything too much is to feel terror of loss: it's a kind of madness.

(Roudané 1997: 97)

Fortunately, Williams had a hit with this play. He had blamed everyone for the flop with *Camino*, most of all he tried to set himself as a repressed working class man, who had been kicked out of the country-club and he desperately needed the place there in order to be able to do his profession. He concluded in a letter to his friend that the most important reason for his vocation, however, was seeing the expressions of sensibilities and longing in the faces of the audience members, when they see them performed on stage in the character of Blanche or Kilroy or whichever of Williams' characters.

(Roudané 1997: 98)

Williams learned two lessons from his failures: first one was that even though you have had successes, one or two failures will bring you down to the level of an aspiring writer. The other lesson was about audience acceptance. If one tries to make theatre for oneself, one can only expect one person to understand it. He had received various notices from friends about

Camino before it opened, but he had been unwilling to change anything in his script, even though the comments suggested that the play was too fragmented for an audience member to be able to follow it without having to stress over it. This time Williams knew that if he wanted a commercial success, he needed to drop a few of his principles and not pay some much attention to the fulfilment of his artistic needs.

According to Williams' agent Audrey Wood (Roudané 1997), *Cat* was a two act play at first. She suggested that Williams should write another scene, to finish the story and give a little peek into what would happen to the characters. Williams did this grudgingly. Later on I shall return to the demands made by Elia Kazan to rewrite the whole ending.

In *Streetcar* Williams had used the Southern theme quite vividly. In *Cat* he was about to exploit it even more in depth. Through out the whole play there are sounds coming off stage indicating the presence of a Southern plantation, with the play starting with an old Southern song and the obligatory Negro servants busily preparing the birthday party. What differed in the view of the South in *Cat* from *Streetcar*, was the lack of romanticism. In *Streetcar* Blanche gives an air of refinement and mystery to the South, a view that Williams himself wanted to portray in his own life too (Roudané 1997), but in *Cat* all the illusions are stripped away. Big Daddy is not a gentleman from a noble family, but a former foreseer, who has struck gold with this plantation. He and Stanley in *Streetcar* have a lot more in common than he and Blanche. Big Daddy and Stanley both believe in hard work being the only way to get through life, and they both make it. Williams' experiences in his grandfather's rectory had given him a good view on Southern plantation owners, or rather the new wave of owners, the ones who had made it through the Civil War and been able to base their farm on something else besides slavery. He also drew his text from the visits to the plantation and on the gossip which moved faster than the wind in the area. Nothing was private in those parts.

Williams had touched on the mutilation theme earlier, in his short story *One Arm* (1948), which tells the tale of a 18-year-old boxer, who turns into a homosexual hustler after he mutilates one of his arms in a motorbike accident. The boxer is described as being indifferent and disgusted

with the world, just as the character of Brick. In *The Roman Spring of Mrs. Stone* (1950) Williams touched the theme of insecurity caused by ageing in the character of Karen Stone. This former actress feels anxiety about ageing and the loss of her looks, just like Maggie, since she thinks there is not anything else in her that she could compete with. She is going through menopause and feels that her womanhood is being drained out of her, leaving her maimed and unworthy of anybody's attention as she has lost her purpose in the world.

Both *One Arm* and *The Roman Spring* were rehearsal pieces, if I may say so, to Williams' *Three Players of a Summer Game* (1952). It is a story of Brick Pollitt, a former athlete, who has been crippled and his wife Margaret, who has become his enemy, in his mind. The story follows Brick's downfall because of forces that are not of his making into alcoholic oblivion

George Lukács defined in *The Sociology of Modern Drama* (1909) the hero of modern drama as being more passive than active. The heroism was more of anguish, despair than of bold aggressiveness. This new hero was not a conquering kind, but a "man as merely the intersection point of great forces, and his deeds not even his own". (Lukács 1909: 149-150) If nothing else, Brick is exactly this kind of a hero. In Act I he gives a sharp contrast to Maggie, who is constantly touching the edges of hysteria with her speech, and he controls the situation with mocking replies, such as

MARGARET: Because they've got no necks! Isn't that a good enough reason?

BRICK: Don't they have any necks?

(Williams 1956: 17)

and

MARGARET[continuing her liturgical chant]: Y'know, I'm *fond* of Big Daddy, I am genuinely find of that old man, I really *am*, you know...

BRICK[faintly, vaguely]: Yes, I know you are...

(Williams 1956: 39)

According to Devlin, "with such measured, alienating speech, Brick deflects the family politics, economic aspiration and sexual allure that Maggie would use to recenter her husband's interest in his patrimony". (cited in Roudané 1997: 109) I will return to the dramatic sides of Brick's character more in depth in the second part of this thesis. It is, however, important to point out that Williams had tried this character in more contexts than one, before Brick Pollitt saw the stage lights in *Cat*. From *One Arm* Williams had stripped the homosexual element to a minimum, to allow it to be performed in big theatres, but he had kept the idea of mutilation, also keeping it visible to the audience and he had also refined the art of silences and pauses, empty stage time, where silence is used as means of power, in *Cat*, power over Maggie, who makes herself weak and vulnerable by letting her feelings to be known. This theatrical means was later used by Harold Pinter, who made it his trademark, in plays such as *Silence and Night* (1966), where there are almost as many pauses as lines. In *Cat*, the function of the silences is greatly dependent on the actor playing Brick, in order to assure that the presence is still visible, even though he is not actively participating on the stage. As Devlin puts it, Williams relied on 'trimmed expressiveness' on stage. (as cited in Roudané 1997: 109)

It remained a kind of mystery, why the play has two endings. Kazan certainly wanted the play to be a success and in the film version of the play he has gone even more out of his way to twist it in a nice family package. Williams added a note of explanation to the last printed version of *Cat*, where he listed the comments Kazan had made about the play:

The gist of his [Kazan] reservations can be listed as three points: one, he felt that Big Daddy was too vivid and important character to disappear from the play except as an offstage cry after the second act curtain; two, he felt that the character of Brick should undergo some apparent mutation as a result of the virtual vivisection that he undergoes in his interview with his father in Act Two. Three, he felt that the character of Margaret, while he understood that I sympathized with her and liked her myself, should be, if possible, more clearly sympathetic to an audience.

It was only the third of these suggestions that I embraced wholeheartedly from the outset, [...]

(Williams 1956: 106-107)

Williams goes on explaining that he needed to do the rewrites, because he wanted Kazan to direct the play, because he was terrified of another failure as an artist and also for financial reason, he needed a hit. Still he makes a point of saying that even though the suggestions were not given as an ultimatum, Williams was afraid that Kazan would lose interest in the play if he did not re-examine the play from Kazan's point of view.

Williams felt that he had failed himself and his own artistic passion in allowing people to touch that character of Brick. Brick can be seen as a symbol of Williams' career and how needed to sacrifice his own ambitions in order to make it. Unlike Williams, Brick however, could not handle it and thus became an alcoholic, a state which was not, however very far from Williams either.

Could Williams be called a coward then? After the examples of writers such as Noël Coward, I think it is safe to say that he was a pioneer, in expressing something other than a stereotypical view of homosexuality. In Brick he created the homosexual victim and his accuser in the same person. Brick reflected the general social view that people had about homosexuals and he acted towards it the way any NORMAL person would have had in his time, in 1950s America. He, however, had a dilemma, when he faced homosexuality in the only person he loved, Skipper. How could he have caused Skipper's death with his homophobia, after they had gone through some much together? It was the guilt that he wanted to forget, alongside with the uncertainty of his feelings, which he was too scared to sort out to find the truth somewhere buried in his subconsciousness. Tennessee Williams tried to show the audience their own discrimination through Brick, who was also potentially the person that was discriminated against, in the real world. Williams also showed a different kind of approach to dissident sexuality in the other characters, mainly in Maggie and Big Daddy, who accepted Brick's supposed homosexuality. I use the word supposed, because Williams was also very careful in the way he did not make clear what the truth about Brick's sexual orientation really was, thus making the play acceptable and accessible to a wider audience. However, because Elia Kazan changed the theme from

homosexuality to impotence in the film version, it is quite obvious to me, that the subject was still too controversial for a major film studio and thus for the general public. Williams moved within the limits given to him, only stretching them a bit further, without being caught red handed.

2 THE DIRECTORIAL PLAN

2.1 Behind the curtain

In this section of the thesis I shall present how my vision became reality of the play and go through the scenes, reporting how it all came together in the end. The purpose of this part of the thesis is to show one, subjective view of the play, which is based solely on my way of thinking and the feelings that rose within me whilst I read the play over and over again. This is the reason also, why I would feel a liar, were I to incorporate different secondary sources, as the primary and only source is me.

I thought I would start off by stating some of the reasons that lie behind my decision to work on Tennessee Williams' *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1956) for my Pro Gradu Thesis. Most of the reasons are quite personal and have absolutely nothing to do with the academic aspect of this project, except one. There has not been too many papers written about and on Tennessee Williams in Finland and I think to the general public he is only known as the person who wrote a play from which a movie was made where Elizabeth Taylor was lovely, to quote my mother. In my research I only found one thesis that was done on Tennessee Williams and his portrayal of masculinity, written by a student of literature in University of Helsinki in 1981. In the theatre world a new trend has now emerged to revive the old classics, for example *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* has been produced in Helsinki and Oulu and *The Glass Menagerie* (1945) has opened in Tampere and Joensuu in the spring 2001. I also got my opportunity to direct in the spring 2000 and I attacked Williams' *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* with vigour that surprised me too.

What is then that intrigues me in Williams? That first play I ever read was *The Glass Menagerie*, which in its own way holds all the elements that appear in all of his plays. It is also the most performed of all of Williams' plays. To put it very crudely, there are certain stereotypical characters in his plays: the hysterical woman; woman, who has for some reason or other encountered incredible hardships in her early life which have moulded her into a semi-bitter person, who is forced to be selfish, but she

does that almost in a martyred manner. In *The Glass Menagerie* this woman is Amanda, who has been left by her husband to take care of two children and who will stop at nothing to be respectable and tries to get her daughter Laura to marry wealthy, so that she doesn't have to worry about money. Laura is another example of Williams' women. She is almost a mental case, not because of the way she behaves, but because of the way she does not understand the laws of the jungle that exist in the world. She thinks everyone is as nice as she herself is and she is therefore more than a perfect target for abuse. A combination of these two can be seen in the character Blanche DuBois in Williams' *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947). Blanche is a daughter of a wealthy landowner family. In the course of time the family loses everything and Blanche is forced to prostitution, which is too much for her delicate mind and she begins to live in a dreamworld, because reality is too much to handle for her. Another example of this escapism can be seen in Brick in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Amanda's other child and Laura's brother Tom, is a typical example of Williams' men. Tom is treated with a delicate touch by her mother, because he is a son, and that is good enough reason for him to be more important than a woman, may the woman be a daughter or not. Tom feels the pressures that are put upon him to make it in life so that his family, especially his mother could be proud of him. He, just like Shannon in *The Night of the Iguana* (1961), is unable to love anybody, because he has not experienced unconditional love, only love that has many clauses in its contract. In the end Tom escapes from the pressures and leaves home to become a sailor. Shannon on the other hand has already escaped from the church, where he did something that a priest is not supposed to do with a young girl and he is on the run, being a guide somewhere in Latin America to a bunch of old ladies from Texas. There again he wants to escape, because one of the nieces of the old ladies is making passes at him, tempting him to compromise his position. He is put in a position, where he would have to refuse himself something that is obviously condemned by the surrounding society and he is too weak to stand against it, and too weak to resist it. His morals are put into question and this is the basic problem that everyone of Williams' characters suffer from. They would have to be independent and

make their own decision and stand fast behind them, but they are not strong enough to believe in themselves. Shannon feels stressed whenever something is expected from him, just as all the Williams' male characters. On the other hand, he cannot live without a woman looking after him, just like Stanley in *Streetcar* and Big Daddy in *Cat*.

After all of this, is it wonder that I am interested in Williams? It may seem that Williams is an easy writer to read, but even though I have stated that there are similar stereotypical characters in all of his plays, let me assure you that Williams is everything but an easy writer to read. That brings me to another point which makes Williams exciting. Everything he says, he says in between the lines. Everything is hinted at for a long time. However sometimes the audience gets the relief, when one of the characters reveals the true emotions and motives. This position is filled by Stanley in *Streetcar*, where he reveals Blanche the true standing of the home community, by Mrs Fellowes in *Iguana*, where he tells everybody why Shannon had to leave his parish and in *Cat* we get a dose of the supposed truth, when Maggie tells us her vision of the relationship between Skipper and Brick.

Another interesting thing about Williams' plays is that he always takes a great deal of time to set up a certain mood and leads the audience to believe that something quite expected is going to happen, but then he pulls the carpet under our feet and takes the plot into a totally different direction. A clear example of this can be seen in *Cat* where Williams makes Maggie's character act in almost a hysterical way, changing moods and emotions from one moment to the next. This goes on for a long time and the audience starts to feel that it cannot let go, it has to stay alert and prepared for another hysterical fit, otherwise it will be shocked again. Stanley is used in the same manner in *Streetcar*. He is also unpredictable, one moment calm and poised and then he just goes on a rampage when whoever says something that remotely could be interpreted as criticism towards himself. It is a fantastic way to use in order to keep the suspense hanging over the audience's heads. This is yet another good example of Williams' devious nature as a playwright.

It is very difficult to state the clear goals that I had for the play, however I shall present four major themes that I found from the text: need to

love and be loved, acceptance from others and of oneself, need to have one's desire and/or passion fulfilled and honesty towards others and oneself. It would be dishonest of me, if I were to say that the portrayals of masculinity and homosexuality were the main topics in my mind, even though it would more than convenient for this study. It is also very difficult, though interesting, to try to put my own feelings and emotions and intuitions on paper in a way that could be called academic. In my opinion it is a theory about a process within a process about a process; first of all I have to locate and separate different emotions from another and their sources within the original text and also take in account that some feelings just cannot be traced to the root in a distinct place, but within the whole context. Then I have to decide how different studies and theorists have influenced me and whether some of my decision are based solely on somebody else or something else besides Tennessee Williams. Then I have to try to put them into words and argue for their behalf in the way that makes it look as if I have spend months in the library studying and exploring the subject before I made my directorial decision. Let me assure everybody that this is certainly not the case.

I studied Williams during my year in England, but as I have come to know now, I only scratched the surface. When I made my original directorial plan, it was for the most part based on the feeling I got when I read it, probably for the fourth time. I tried to think and capture the initial feelings that I had experienced when I read the play for the first time. After that, it is impossible to say when the changes in staging took place, the changes evolved with the play, according to the decision that had to be made in order for the actors to feel more at home with the characters, or because of the resources available to me, such as the lighting, the size of the stage and the financial means that I had. Some choices had to be made in order to keep the project within the budget.

As cruel and unartistic it sounds, some of the basic principles had to be sacrificed in order to get the play on stage. To give an example, originally, I had planned to hang baby dolls by their neck to the ceiling above the audience. This was to serve two purposes: firstly I wanted to emphasize the play's theme of childlessness and child-centred worlds and especially how

children are used as human weapons, which can be very useful in the middle of fights between adults. I also wanted to draw few X's in the backs of some of the dolls to show how some of us are picked to be different, labelled against our own wishes and given a name, which has nothing to do with our inner reality that we have created ourselves. Just as Brick is dragged out of what he considers a perfect and happy life into living the deviant life, I wanted to show how sometimes even if we want to lead the normal life, we are forced to be the deviant. I also wanted to paint one of the heads red, just to emphasize the rage what one feels towards oneself if one is deviant. However, we could not find enough, actually we found none, dolls in the fleamarkets and it would have been impossible to spend the amount of money required to purchase that amount of dolls. Thus I made the decision to leave them out, which in hindsight was a good decision, because I think they would have been too tasteless and too underlining. It did not want the audience to feel that I was force feeding them into thinking exactly the same way as I had thought about the play.

It may sound as if I tried to justify my decisions that was based on the financial side of things as an artistic decision. It is impossible for me to say whether this is true or not. I certainly do hope that I made decision that was for the better and at least to myself, the end result proved me right. It certainly was a journey into myself, having to question all my decisions and motives and actions all the time, while maintaining a calm face in the eyes of the actors. This journey did not end with the falling curtain, but has continued ever since, with this thesis and the work I have put into it. Thus I hope the reader will understand, if there seems to be some paradoxes within the representation of my thinking, choices and the action that follows, as I did not keep a journal during the time and after some time passed, some choices seemed to have been made just on the spot, based on how it looked on the stage, without any reference to any reference books. This is why I am doubtful whether this type of an academic paper is valid, as I cannot present any clear background information regarding my directorial plan. The information I received whilst my stay in Britain came form different sources; my professors, my peers, group conversation, lectures, books. However, as I

was not aware of the future, I did not keep a reference book with me.

Finally, I hope the reader can see the following as one way of interpreting the play, not a representation of the one and true way of how the play should be staged. This is a very subjective view of the themes and people within the play and should not be seen as an objective study of Tennessee Williams' great play. I do hope the reader disagrees, but is still able to see where I was going. If not, then I have truly and utterly failed.

2.2 The plan

I shall present the plan scene by scene, dividing each scene into four different categories: scene, lighting, sounds, wardrobe and staging. This was also the way we had to construct our plans, out of which the four plays that got to be produced were chosen. I will then try to explain the reasons behind my decisions, especially when it comes to music, because my aim was that the music would serve two functions: bring the play more up-to-date, so that the meaning of the play would not be lost in thinking that this kind of thinking only applied in the 1950s and in the 'Deep South' and also that the music would complement the plays aims and characters' motives in a way that would be true to the play and Williams' preferred reading of the play, which in this case is the preferred reading that I think Williams' would have chosen. The original plan will be presented in the form of tables. After each table I will explain the reasons for these interpretations. This will be followed by an account of why some changes had to be made for the final production.

2.2.1 scene I

Scene	Lighting	Sounds	Wardrobe and staging
<p>Brick and Skipper enter from the bedroom door to play American football in front of the audience. After a while two other actors appear to double (i.e. take their places, act as their subconsciousnesses) them, after Brick and Skipper have frozen. When the music starts the doubles begin to embrace each other violently, then return to double Brick and Skipper and exit, after which Brick and Skipper exit.</p>	<p>In the beginning the backgrounds of the audience on both sides are lit with a harsh white light, then the stage is lighted (while the music plays) with a deep red light and in the end is just darkness</p>	<p>The red light is a qua to start playing Ravel's <i>Bolero</i>, which increases in volume towards the end.</p>	<p>Brick and Skipper are wearing American college football jackets on top of their hospital clothes, the doubles are wearing the same.</p>

This whole scene is partly based on the text, but for the most part it is my own, old theory. I have had this theory about men and sports for a long time and it only grew more while I was living in England in 1997-98, where I observed the behaviour of reserved English 'blokes' and their enthusiasm for football. According to my theory, once a man has passed all the obstacles and all the other men and delivered his ball into the huge gap, other men are allowed to jump on him and touch him and hug him and the audience can do that too. After this, a man has proved his manhood, and he can be touched by

other men. It may sound totally naive, but it has made so many footballers angry that I have concluded that men and sports are the only means for men to examine their emotional involvement towards other men and in this way they may find some aspects of themselves which otherwise would have been blocked from their own self-image because of the pressures from society and also because of the pressures they themselves have placed upon their own ways of thinking. This is also how I thought Brick's and Skipper's relationship had found different meanings. For example, when defending the purity of their relationships purity to Big Daddy, Brick says:

BRICK: Frig Mae and Gooper, frig all dirty lies and liars!- Skipper and me had a clean true thing between us! -had a clean friendship, practically all our lives, till Maggie got the idea you're talking about. Normal? No! -It was too rare to be normal. *Oh, once in a while he put his hand on my shoulder or I'd put mine on his, oh, maybe even, when we were touring the country in pro-football an' shared hotelrooms we'd reach across the space between the two beds and shake hands to say goodnight, yeah one or two time we...*(Big Daddy interrupts)

(Williams 1956:79)
(my italics)

This line made me wonder because I always saw it as a line that could have left unsaid. If Brick feels really the way he says he feels about their relationship with Skipper, why does he then have to defend it by stating the obvious. I think there is more behind it and I think Brick and Skipper have felt something between them, and that is the reason they have gone out of their way to stay in the same team. This was the reason behind the first scene and I wanted people to see how the two friends have experienced something uncommon to them realistically, but perhaps unconsciously something very true to their nature, which Brick now tries to deny.

The music that I chose at the time for this scene was *Bolero*, because of its cultural implications. It is considered to be the most famous music for lovemaking and it can be heard in various romantic movies, such as Blake Edward's *10* (1979), where the main character searches for it in order to make the night perfect.

The red lighting complements the piece. It chose it also because

I did not want to make the first scene too heavy. On the other hand, I wanted the audience to start thinking about Brick's past. I also wanted to mellow out the dance sequence, in order for it not to be too artistic in a way that would make me feel that I am doing something, to which I have not got the amount of expertise required to make the dance sequence believable. In other words, I did not want the play to be ruined just because I wanted to project an image of the utmost cultural refinement that the audience would think I supposedly think I had.

The reason behind the hospital clothes was another one of my tactics to inform the audience of my reading. Because I had left out big parts from the second and third act, I was concerned that the relationships between the men and the women in the house would be confusing, especially since the character of Gooper was totally left out. In the first draft that I made I had left out Mae altogether, but because of the size of our whole drama group, I was forced to bring the character of Mae back, so that I could take in another actor. This was a compromise, which really did not make me too happy. In my opinion, the women in the house, although being very hysterical at times, were the caretakers, i.e. the nurses, and the men of the house were patients. This is easily seen in the fact that Brick has a broken leg and Big Daddy has cancer. However, more importantly, both of these men refuse to acknowledge the fact that they are dependent on these women. Even though, on the surface, we see Big Mama as a fuddy-duddy old woman, who cannot concentrate on anything, it has to be kept in mind that for the past three years that Big Daddy had been ill, she has taken care of the whole estate, without any help. On the other hand, Maggie has survived poverty and made a life for herself and has much more street smartness than Brick will ever have. Maggie is fighting for the future for both of them, and whether or not Brick acknowledges it, he surely trusts in it. However, just as with the baby dolls, I felt that the hospital clothes were underlining the message too much and I did not want to underestimate the audience. The actors tried the clothes on and I must say, visually, it was a disaster. They really did not fit anybody and somehow made the play lose some of its magic. I decided against them almost in the beginning.

The music also changed, as I felt that *Bolero* was too long and slow, in order to capture the imaginations and interest of the audience. I tried different songs, but the one that was most appropriate, lyrically and in the way that the band could be seen as gay icons, was Pointer Sisters 1980s hit *I'm so excited*. I also dropped the double players and made the two actors play catch in the middle and then slow their motions as they went to hug each other after a homerun. While hugging their hands reach down and for a moment they were caressing. Realisation of this made them to act quickly again and they ran away, without looking at each other. The lighting stayed the same as in the original plan.

2.2.2 scene II:

Scene	Lighting	Sounds	Wardrobe and staging
The actors come on stage one after the other talking to the audience about the characters in the style of home shopping network, first introducing themselves as themselves	White lights behind the audience and one spotlight in the middle of the stage	Elevator muzak	Brick and Big Daddy in patients outfits, Maggie, Mae and Big Mama in nurses' outfits

This scene survived all the turmoil and stayed the same all the way through. As I mentioned above, this was the point, where the status of the men and women in those towards each other had to come out. I also borrowed the famous *Verfremdungseffekt* (alienation) from Bertolt Brecht, in the way that the actors first introduced themselves by their own names and then started to tell about their ideas and feelings about the character they were playing.

This served two purposes: first of all I wanted to root out the idea that this was all happening in the past and in America, I wanted to free myself, the actors and the audience of the traditional idea of theatre where people go to see things happening to other people and do not think if there would be a chance that the happenings in front of them could actually relate to their own lives.

I also wanted the actors to take the stage to themselves, symbolically building it, leaving something that was theirs on the stage. This idea evolved during the process. I did not want the actors to just walk on stage and pose for a while, but I wanted them to meet the set and make its acquaintance before entering it in their roles. First they walked to the spotlight and said their own name and their characters name. Then they placed something on the stage and in a way became their characters by building up the set. Big Daddy took off his jacket and hung it on the clothing rack, Big

Mama rolled out the zebra patterned carpet, Mae arranged the pillows on the sofa, Maggie left the red stocking on the carpet, which Big Mama picks up in the second scene and Brick took off his pyjamas and leaves it hanging on the clothing rack. It also was an effect borrowed from Brecht, but mostly from the Polish theatre theorist and practitioner Jerzy Grotowski. In his productions the building of the stage was an important part of the process, where the actors physically made the place their own (Grotowski 1968). My other purpose was yet again to deepen the roles, because of the parts that I left out, I was afraid that the audience would not get the whole picture. My idea was to work with the actors on their speeches and have them ready just weeks before the opening night, so that there would also be room for their self-discovery. The reason why I wanted elevator/supermarket muzak and the speeches in the style of home shopping network is because I think that is a major theme in *Cat*. Maggie is constantly trying to sell herself to Big Daddy, Mama and especially Brick. She is used to the fact that she has to prove her importance in order to survive. She tells Brick about her early life in act one:

MARGARET: Always had to suck up to people I couldn't stand because they had money and I was poor as Job's turkey[...]That's how it feels to be poor as Job's turkey and have to suck up to relatives that you hated because they had money and all you had was a bunch of hand-me-down clothes and a few mouldy three percent government bonds. [...]

(Williams 1956:40)

Because she has not produced a child she has to keep on flirting with Big Daddy whom she actually likes, probably because she knows how to deal with him, but she has a very hard job trying to convince Big Mama, especially now that Mae and Gooper have come to show off their five children.

Gooper and Mae do nothing else but sell their family as the perfect candidate to take over the ranch after Big Daddy dies. That is the whole purpose of them being there. Big Mama is also trying to sell herself to Big Daddy and make him understand that she really is the best thing that has ever happened to him and he cannot live without her. Brick is also trying to

sell himself, or rather the image he has build for himself of himself. He is trying to make everybody to buy the image of himself as the blond-haired, blue-eyed American football hero dreamboy, which others have bought until now. He has had no reason to doubt this image consciously, until Skipper said out loud what Brick himself had probably been thinking subconsciously. Brick is selling to the people around him, but most of all, he is selling to himself. Big Daddy is not far from Brick, in the way that he is trying to sell the image of him suffering all these years with Big Mama to Brick and painting a beautiful picture of the future with him living the life of a careless man, surrounded by money and women. He is trying to make everything seem as if it has not been his choice, to become the biggest landowner in the Delta, but that it was forced upon him. As I stated in the introduction, he is a typical Williams-man, who makes himself a victim of circumstances, so that he does not have to admit that he is too much of a coward to take responsibility of his own life and actions. Everybody thus has some sort of an agenda that has to be approved by others in order for their actions, emotions or motives to be valid and reasonable.

2.2.3 scene III:

Scene	Lighting	Sounds	Wardrobe and staging
Brick, Maggie, Big Mama and Mae, the original text's Act I	dim lighting all over the corridor stage, as if Brick's and Maggie's bedroom	carnival music in the background, children's noises from time to time	Brick comes in wearing just a towel, then gets dressed in to the hospital clothes, Maggie is wearing a nurses's outfit open, so that the audience can see a sexy red dress underneath, Mae is wearing a suit underneath her outfit, Big Mama has hers buttoned, with a woollen scarf on top of it.

This scene follows the original script quite faithfully, except of course the stage directions. Maggie was to wear a short white dress made of lace in the beginning, which she then changes into a long, black cocktail dress, when one of the no-neck monsters has ruined the first dress. Brick wore a white pyjamas in order to make the contrast between them. I wanted Maggie to symbolize the subconscious, the dark and the hidden that Brick is forced to see and also I wanted Maggie to be in mourning of her marriage, her life and most of all her unwanted love. Brick on the other hand was in white, because that was the way people saw him and that is what he wanted to make himself look, act and think, pure and untouched by immorality. These were also the two of the three main colours on stage. Besides the dresses on Big Daddy and Big Mama and Mae, everything was either white, black or red. Even the whisky that Brick was drinking was red. Black was for Maggie, white for

Brick and the red was there to symbolize, of course, passion. Passion is very important for the play, as it is the cause of all that is going wrong in the lives of these people. They maybe able to handle everything else, but desire is out of their hands.

I omitted all the children in the play, for two reasons. I did not have any children available to cast. Secondly, and more importantly, children never seem real and natural on stage and I really did not want to bother with coaching some kindergarten groups just to put them on stage for a minute or two. We had some sound effects, though, now and again the audience could hear children screaming in the background, also to give a reason for Maggie to shout to the 'no-neck monsters'. Also Mae's and Big Mama's parts were slightly cut. The point was to show a duel between Maggie and Brick, in a bull fighting ring that was our stage. As I will go through the questionnaires in the last part of this thesis, I will introduce at least one response, which commented on the perversity of being in the bedroom of this couple and being forced to listen to them. I also wanted the actors to feel the staring just as the one half of the audience could feel the other one watching, or then they just imagined it. This was the whole idea of the first act. Even though it was Maggie, who did most of the talking, it was Brick, whom everyone probably followed. His silence grew more and more violent and when he finally snaps when Maggie starts talking about Skipper:

MAGGIE: [...]I've thought a whole lot about it and now I know when I made my mistake. Yes, I made my mistake when I told you the truth about that thing with Skipper. Never should have confessed it, a fatal error, tellin' you about that thing with Skipper.

BRICK: Maggie, shut up about Skipper. I mean it, Maggie; you got to shut up about Skipper.

(Williams 1956: 41)

At this point I did not want Brick to shout on the top of his lungs, yet. There was a great difference in his pitch, though. To this point Brick had only dropped a word or two lazily and only to annoy Maggie even more. This time the audience did not hear his drunken, almost suffocated voice, but a clear,

almost frightful command. It was as if he had been woken up and all the liquor he had been drinking would have vanished from his circulation in an instant. This effect was achieved, in my opinion, when looking at the audience, who looked very disturbed by this new side of him. They did not have for long to digest this new side, though, because from that moment onwards it was pure war. We also hear that Maggie has twisted the truth once again, in order to make herself look like the victim; it was Skipper who told Brick about the unsuccessful consummation of the affair in the motel, between Maggie and Skipper. What made Brick's outburst even stronger was the fact that for the first time he also moved quickly and determinately. To this point he had only dragged himself back and forth in the room, but now he was determined to crush Maggie, the only way he knew best, by force. However, something was keeping him from actually hurting Maggie. Part of it had to do with the fact that he was on crutches, but also I wanted the audience to see the inner struggle within Brick's head between the pain that Maggie causes with her stories or the hurt that will be caused if Brick attacks Maggie, a person that he in some strange way pities and/or loves. They moved back and forth, threatening each other, Maggie by words and Brick with his crutch. Frustration increased and at last it was time for a little release before the intermission.

2.2.4 scene IV:

Scene	Lighting	Sounds	Wardrobe and staging
Maggie and Brick fight physically all over the stage	Flashing lights, so that the audience can only see glimpses of the fight	Marilyn Manson: Beautiful People	Same as above, but Brick's crutches are used as swords in the duel

This scene was yet again one of my own creations. It served many functions. Most of all, it was meant as a release to the pressures that hopefully had been building up inside the audience's minds. As a theatre goer myself, I need and demand the outlet at some point and hoping to achieve a depressing and cruel atmosphere in the first act I thought that the audience would like to see an actual fight. As I don't possess the talent needed to choreograph an actual fighting scene I decided to go for a stylized version, with the help of a strobe light, which slows down the movements in the eyes of the audience. I also wanted to use the crutches, because in my opinion, since the play was influenced by Freud, the crutches can be easily interpreted as phallic objects, one of which Maggie is now using against Brick. The plan changed a little bit, though.

The stage got smaller, as we were putting it up, so it was a health hazard for the audience to have the duel with both of the crutches. We also realized that it would be easier for the actor playing the part of Brick to move around if he only had one crutch, so we decided to abandon the other, which actually was a good decision, since now we had a spare one, which came in very handy, when the other broke in one of the shows. Also the fight for the phallic symbol became even more evident, since now they were pulling it into their own directions. It was once again decision time: who would win the fight? Since Tennessee Williams' ambiguity hit me one more time, I just had to trust my own feeling and how I would like it to go, without too much compromising Williams' intentions. The way I saw it was

that the fight should also reflect the moods of the first act. First Brick on top of the situation with his uncaring attitude, then Maggie had the power with her confrontation and in the end Maggie could be seen as the winner, even though a lonely one, which again makes one question if they were any winners. This was the pattern that the fight followed which I had choreographed with the help of a friend. The music changed too, just by accident I happened to hear a song called '*Suojelusenkeli*' by a band called *Don Huonot* and the lyrics fit the mood perfectly. There was a wonderful contrast between the lyrics and the melody which was heavy metalesque. The last image that I wanted to stuck into people's minds, before they left for coffee and cakes for fifteen minutes, was that of Brick standing on all fours and hurrying away from Maggie and Maggie standing in front of the mirror proving yet again to herself that she is desirable, and that it is not her fault if Brick doesn't see it. This theory was put to a test, when I invited couple of people to come and watch our rehearsals before opening night, and one of them said that it was really nice to see Maggie on the winning side in the end of the first act. It was good to continue after that remark.

After these scenes I decided to have an intermission, for a number of reasons, one of them being the fact that the space was so small that the need of oxygen was great. Another reason was that the original play's act I and II follow the same kind of a pattern, with Big Daddy replacing Maggie and I do not think people would have been able to watch two confrontational scenes back to back. In the original play act II starts with all the characters on the stage celebrating Big Daddy's birthday, but since I had omitted, for example, Gooper out of the play I had cut the scene so that it began with Big Daddy entering Maggie's and Brick's bedroom.

2.2.5 scene V:

Scene	Lighting	Sounds	Wardrobe and staging
Brick, Big Daddy, Maggie, Mae, two figures representing Death	A little bit harsher bedroom lighting, which slowly dims and in the end it is completely dark	jazz music in the background, which dies out, when the Death characters come on stage Kari Tapio's <i>Myrskyn jälkeen</i> begins to play and it goes on even during the darkness, till the positions of the next scene have been taken by the actors	Brick and Big Daddy in their hospital clothes, Big Daddy puts on a suit jacket, when he begins to tell Brick about his plan for the future, Maggie and Mae have similar kinds of cardigans over their nurses' outfits, Deaths (the actors who are playing Maggie and Mae) are wearing black robes with hoods over their faces

This scene deals with bigger issues than just those in Bricks head. Of all the scenes in this play, this one is probably the most challenging to the members of the audience. On one hand, it is a tale of a life never lived, only dreamt about and on the other hand it is a glimpse into the future of Brick Pollitt, if he keeps on going the way he does now. Then it is a story of a man's refusal to let go and admit his weaknesses, his mortality. To put it in one sentence: live your life the way you want it, because by worrying about other people's opinions you will wake up one morning and realize that life has passed you by.

In the original text, the play starts off with all the characters on the stage, celebrating Big Daddy's birthday. Brick is nowhere to be seen and

Big Daddy's eagerness to get him over there seems to cause friction between him and Gooper and Mae. Williams also makes fun of the church, by placing a very materialistic Reverend Tooker on the scene, with his comments on how other parishioners have helped to raise money for other churches and how many people nowadays leave big sums of money in their wills to be given to the church. Even Reverend Tooker is aware of Big Daddy's condition. First part of the scene is spent giving hints of the real truth and putting on an act to Big Daddy. It also establishes similarities between Daddy's and Mama's and Brick's and Maggie's relationships. Big Mama is trying to reminisce the good old days, but everytime she tries to say something nice or tries to get Big Daddy to say something nice to her, he puts her down immediately and Big Mama tries to save the situations by twisting his words around. As the scene moves forward, the audience can see the future of Brick's and Maggie's marriage in the present condition of Big Daddy's and Mama's relationship.

In my version, the scene starts with Big Daddy entering onto the stage, talking to himself about the insincerity of his old life. He walks towards the clothing rack and puts on his jacket, which he has left in the beginning. Brick enters and the beating around the bush begins. We see Maggie escorting Brick onto the stage, Mae pops in for a good bashing from Big Daddy and Maggie. Mama tries to spy the boys but is dismissed immediately. Otherwise, Big Daddy and Brick are on the stage, just the two of them, talking for the next 45 minutes. This caused a problem in the beginning. It was very obvious to the reader that Big Daddy was aiming at making Brick to reveal why he is the way he is, but to the audience members all the talking might seem too much. I cut the text even more, wherever I could, for example I omitted Williams' hate towards Europe, by taking out all the references towards the corruption of the old world in Big Daddy's lines, such as:

BIG DADDY: The hills around Barcelona in the country of Spain
and the children running over those bare hills in their bare and
beggin' like starving dogs[...] how fat the priest are on the streets
of Barcelona[...]prostitution begins at the age of five[...]
(Williams 1956: 60-61)

This goes on and on and he gets back to the subject once or twice. All this is used as means to show how difficult it is for Big Daddy to confront his own son, even though he wants to help him, I think he is afraid to do that, because he might find out things that he really does not want to, even though he tells us how open-minded he is. Then again, he is forced to help Brick, because he does not want him to end up the way he is, not living the life to its fullest until it is almost over. Brick tells him a couple of times that it is useless to have this conversation, because:

BRICK:[...] We talk, you talk, in -circles! We get nowhere,
nowhere! It's always the same, you say you want to talk to me and
don't have a ruttin' thing to say to me!
(Williams 1956: 69)

Another explanation is that Big Daddy just isn't used to expressing his affection to anybody, after bottling up all his feelings for years, and that is also why he wants Bricks to open up, avoiding his destiny. Williams is walking on thin ice, in my opinion, on the extent of talking around in circles, because I was not able to see how to keep the scene interesting enough at some points. Perhaps it is my generation x- attitude, but still, after all the cuts that I made, some people said that I could have shortened it even more.

In this scene, i.e. the original play's act III, there are two climaxes, both come in the shape of Brick breaking down. Big Daddy's pressuring pays off in the end. The whole scene could also be seen as a miniature of Brick's life so far. Different people pressure him to do things the way they want them to be done and Brick gives in on what is expected of him. If you push him far enough, he will break. This is the remedy Big Daddy is trying to apply to Brick's case, and he succeeds. As in the end of scene II, there is a similar kind of battle for the crutch, which obviously

signifies manliness here too. I wanted Big Daddy to steal the crutch from Brick, for several reasons: firstly, the crutch signifies the shreds of masculinity Brick has in the eyes of other people and especially in his own eyes. Just as he tells Maggie in Act I, he could kill her with that crutch. Secondly, therefore, it functions as a weapon, defending him against the rest of the world. Just as the football worked as a symbol of masculinity, just as the sport itself, against the lies and liars around him, he now sees the crutch as the defender and as the back up to which lean on, now that the old one, Skipper, has betrayed him. First sign of opening up can be seen half way through the scene, where Brick tells Big Daddy the reason for his alcoholism:

BRICK: I told you, I said to kill my disgust!
(Williams 1956: 70)

The conversation goes into a direction that irritates Big Daddy. He is a true old fashioned redneck, as Maggie tells us in Act I, and does not understand that anything is really complicated, people just make things complicated. So he gets upset when Brick does not give him a simple explanation and just talks about liars and lies. He reveals something very interesting about himself and something that could be applied to Brick too:

BIG DADDY: [...]What do you know about this mendacity thing?
[...] Well I could, I could write a goddam book on it and still not cover the subject near enough!! -Think of all the lies I got to put up with! -Pretences! Ain't that mendacity? Having to pretend stuff you don't think or feel of have any idea of? Having for instance act like I care for Big Mama! -I haven't been able to stand the sight, sound, or smell of that woman for forty years now!
(Williams 1956: 72)

He goes on telling Brick how he hates Gooper and his family and the church, who tells him what to think about god. In my directorial plan this was the turning point, in my opinion, for Big Daddy character. For the first time we see something else but the obnoxious Southern farmer, who expects life going the way he wants too. We see a man, who has for forty years kept everything

inside of him, pretending to be the man everyone has wanted him to be. Underneath that veneer of self-confidence is nothing but a little Brick, who is lost, but has now realized that he must make himself happy, thanks to his illness. I wanted the audience to realize this too, so I wanted the actor playing Big Daddy to pretend that she was in a lecture hall and that she could look at the members of the audience straight in the eyes, to achieve maximum attention. Brick, as usual minded his own business in the chair opposite. In my opinion, he had never listened to his father and even though this could have been a good opportunity for him to see how much he and his father had in common. However, I think even if he had realized something, he hated this situation too much to see anything. At this point I think Brick is cornered and falls into almost, if not panic, hysteria, because he has just been confronted by Maggie and now Big Daddy. It is all proving too much for him and I wanted this to show in Brick's character, especially in the nervous movements back and forth and on the face, which was preparing to explode.

We don't have to wait for long, for the explosion, which really is needed here, because the atmosphere has thickened, hopefully, to such a state that the audience and the actors, really need a release. The pattern is the same as in the original text's Act I, where the text builds up to the point, where Maggie, for the first time, says Skipper's name. The same effect can be seen here, but even more violent, because Brick is now at the end of his patience and he is up against a man, so he is even more crude now. I wanted Brick to sit and Big Daddy to walk in circles, when he says:

BIG DADDY: You started drinkin' when your friend Skipper died
*[Silence for five beats. Then Brick makes a startled
movement, reaching for his crutch.]*
(Williams 1956:75)

At this point I agreed with Williams' notes (in the italics). I wanted the people to see that Big Daddy knew what he was doing, in a way Brick had forced him into it, with his silence. I also wanted people to see that Brick could not believe that his father, the only one in his family whom he even remotely

loved, could do this to him. The stage directions that follow this dialogue are very interesting and very revealing in a very ambiguous way. Williams writes:

[Brick's detachment is at last broken through.[...]The thing they're discussing. Timidly and painfully on the side of Big Daddy, fiercely, violently on Brick's side, is the inadmissible thing that Skipper died to disavow between them. The fact that if it existed it had to be disavowed to 'keep face' in the world they lived in, may be at the heart of 'mendacity' that Brick drinks to kill his disgust with.[...]]

(Williams 1956:75)

Williams goes on stating that this thing that had to be 'disavowed' could only be a fraction of the causes behind Brick's problems, but it could also be the only reason. He then tells, that in his opinion there should always be something left unsaid about a character, because 'mystery is always left in the revelation of character in life' (Williams 1956: 75), which really does not help a person trying to figure out what Tennessee really meant. It also performs as evidence for the fact that everybody is welcome to treat the text the way they want to. However, in this Elia Kazan went a bit too far, but more about that later.

Even though I have talked about Big Daddy not wanting to know the real truth, there is some evidence to support the idea that Big Daddy is the most open-minded of all the characters. He talks about the male couple that used to own the farm before he took over. Funnily enough, of all the couples in the play, this couple is the only one, which is portrayed in a good light and it seems that there was true love between them. Once again Big Daddy tries to approach Brick indirectly, talking about the male couple:

[...] - Jack Straw an' Peter Ochello took me in. Hired me to manage this place which grew into this one. - When Jack Straw died - why, old Peter quit eatin' like a dog does when its master's dead, and died, too!

(Williams 1956: 77)

This makes Brick furious, which again serves as evidence that there is more to it than just friendship, between him and Skipper. It seems though that Big

Daddy genuinely wants Brick to get better and accept who and what he is, whatever the outcome is. He is willing to accept the fact that Brick is gay, as long as that would mean that Brick would be able to live more peacefully. Earlier in the text it has become evident that it worse come to worse, Big Daddy is willing to sacrifice Maggie, if that would make Brick happy.

Up to this point I had wanted to show physically how far apart and on opposite sides Big Daddy and Brick are. The actors had specific instructions at first, how to situate themselves on stage and as the rehearsals went on, they had more liberty as long as they applied certain rules: if Brick was sitting on the couch, Big Daddy had to be sitting or standing next to the desk, or if one of them was sitting on a chair in the middle of the audience, the other one had to sit on the chair opposite. Big Daddy was walking back and forth on some long pieces of dialogue, but the basic idea was the ones mentioned above. Everything changed during the scene which I mentioned earlier, where Big Daddy starts talking about Skipper and Jack and Peter. There we see, for the first time, Brick and Big Daddy standing, at least, in the same area. I also wanted to show a streak of violence in Brick again, just like in the scene with Maggie. Brick ended up pushing Big Daddy down on the couch and yelling at him straight to his face. From that moment on there were no rules about the sitting order, except that they could sit closer now. I also wanted to emphasize Brick's new attitude of nothing-really-matters, by having him sit loosely on the table, whilst talking to Big Daddy. I also wanted to elevate Brick above Big Daddy, in order to show a shift in power. Brick was back in control, though not in the old way of keeping silent, but realizing that his version of the story would surely win over Maggie's story. However, that is where he went wrong.

The last climax happens right at the end, after a peaceful conversation. Both Williams and myself wanted to lift the plot once more. After being cornered again, Brick blurts out that this will be Big Daddy's last birthday. This was probably the hardest scene for the actor playing Big Daddy. The audience had to see the slow realization on his face and gestures of the fact that he will die soon. I want the audience to see the denial, underneath which the truth was hiding, and Big Daddy knew it. This is where

I made a directorial choice, which was a bit risky, but thankfully went very well. I chose Kari Tapio's *Myrskyn jälkeen* for number of reason. First of all I wanted a surreal scene where Big Daddy's fears of dying come to life in the shapes of two robed persons, whom dance in a slow motion way around him and force him out of the room, the room of denial for Brick, Maggie and Big Daddy. Kari Tapio suited better than well, because first of all, everyone knows him and he is the perfect symbol of an older man who refuses to let go of the past and age gracefully. The lyrics were also perfect, very distasteful, talking in symbols how we all must leave the port and sail to infinity, and as such, as one can imagine a death fearing old man to write. In a way the song is tragically happy and it also suited the atmosphere of sweet tragedy, relief for Big Mama and Brick and especially for Big Daddy, but a tragedy to anyone else, who is not in the will. Big Daddy's life goes on after he is gone, the emotional needs clash with the financial ones. I must say, I am very pleased with my choice, because clashing it with the modern dance caused just the right combination, a combination of chaos that was probably going on in Big Daddy's head too.

2.3 Much ado about the finale

The last scene was probably the one which caused the most problems. Act III in the original play is over 20 pages long, but I shortened it to three pages. I wanted to leave out all the family feud and just concentrate on Brick and Maggie. My scene starts with Mae shouting 'liar' to Maggie's face and then exiting, just to establish the fact that Maggie has lied about the baby and to make some sense of the dialogue following. The basic idea behind my decision was that I wanted to let the ending open. The ending really crystallises the basic idea behind my view of the play: it is just a snapshot of a family or just people who have stranded in a situation from which there is no way out, unless they will be honest to others and most importantly honest to themselves. I see the whole play as a quest for truth, but for a truth that is never the same. The truth is what we want it to be and the conflict begins, when reality does not correspond with our image of the truth or what is real. In my opinion Williams wants to leave the ending open, and just stir the audience's emotions and aid them in thinking whether their present situation really the kind that they want, or is it just the outcome of complying to everyone else's expectations that have transformed in their minds in a way that makes them to think that it is their own wish to live like this?

In a way, I wanted the audience to interpret the ending in three ways; firstly that both Brick and Maggie are just trying to have the child in order to get by. Secondly that Maggie really does love Brick, but Brick still does not believe it because of the enormous self-hatred and, thirdly, that Brick does love Maggie, but does not see any future in it, because he thinks he really is homosexual. There was no simple answer, just like in the whole play. Brick might be a closet homosexual, or then again he just might be a younger version of Big Daddy who does not have the same determination as Big Daddy, in order for him to push aside his personal emotions for the greater good of the family. Maggie is also a younger version of Big Mama, with the difference that she is not prepared to live in silence and lie to herself. So it is just a question of choices. Choices that we make, if we are strong enough to handle the consequences and strong enough to trust

ourselves.

The last scene was also a relief to the audience, as it is the only scene, where the characters do not fight. Then again, I wanted to have the Williams spirit of spoiling the moment present there. He uses Gooper's children as means to ruin the mood of the scene throughout the play, and somehow I also wanted to leave the audience in a puzzled mood, not thinking that it is a happy end, they get each other and so forth. So my biggest problem was to choose the music in the end. I wanted to have some music in the end, because every scene began and ended with a piece of music that reflected the scene we had just witnessed. I had choices ranging from Diana Ross' *I'm Coming Out*, to reflect the coming out of Brick in a very unsuitable, humorous way, to a short piece of Vivaldi. My main problem was that even though I wanted lyrics that would capsule the mood, I had to take in account the people who would not understand English or just were not concentrating on the lyrics. The answer came in the form of The Googoo Dolls. Their song *Iris* was very suitable, because the contrast between the very harsh voice of the singer and a lovely soft melody was perfect and once again, very ambiguous. The lyrics of the song read as follows, the part that the audience actually heard is in bold letters:

Iris

And I'd give up forever to touch you
'Cause I know that you feel it somehow
You're the closest to heaven that I'll ever be
And I don't wanna go home right now

And all I can taste is this moment
And all I can breathe is your life
And sooner or later it's over
I just don't wanna miss you tonight

Chorus:

And I don't want the world to see me
'Cause I don't think that they'd understand
When everything's made to be broken
I just want you to know who I am

And you can't fight the tears that ain't coming

**Or the moment of truth in your lies
When everything feels like the movies
And you bleed just to know you're alive**

Chorus

(John Rzeznik 1999)

Someone could wonder that why I spend so much time finding the song and suitable lyrics, if it was highly unlikely that most of the people would understand it. It was important for me to know that it was carefully chosen and I believe that the lyrics influence the melody and vice versa. The last two lines of the second verse had to be included in the part that the audience, because I thought they represented the desperation that both Maggie and Brick felt at that moment. Maggie was probably feeling a little bit hopeful, because Brick had done something for her, which he had not done for a long time. I still believe that in her hatred she knew that this would not be a beginning for something new and beautiful, but the beauty and happiness would begin and end right then and there. Maggie was just tired and worn out and wanted to feel closeness, even though only physical one, to Brick even for a very brief period. To Brick these lines apply, when he is considered in the same light as Maggie's, as being too tired to resist. I also believe that during the play he has been forced to reckon with the feelings he had suppressed and this union of flesh could also be seen as Bricks's final attempt to prove the world and especially his subconscious wrong. He has also lacked the mental and psychical closeness to another person after Skipper killed himself. He is eager to touch and grab and rip another person's flesh, to drown himself in it in order to forget.

The first verse in the chorus links to, obviously, Brick. The whole play has been both a journey of (forced) self-discovery and also a tale of how a person is unable and unwilling to let his/her guards down and trust someone enough to let his/her feelings show. Maggie makes Brick uneasy not just because she is forcing Brick to face his own feelings, but also because she wants to let her feelings to be known and she is stepping into a field, of which Brick really does not want to know about, because that would make Maggie human and force Brick to consider and treat her as such. This would

make Brick's indifference towards her difficult, as I believe that Brick is, deep down, a very sensitive person, who hides his need for love behind a mask of hatred. Even though Brick's and Skipper's relationship was not physical as such, I believe that what they missed in actual physical contact was compensated in their minds, which seemed to work in unison. As Brick often remarks, for example in the first act, saying:

BRICK: One man has one great good true thing in his life, One great good thing which is true! - I had friendship with Skipper, - You are naming it dirty!

(Williams 1956: 42)

It was something that, at least in Brick's opinion, did not require physical contact. It was Skipper, actually, who blew up the bubble by confessing his love and need for physical intimacy and it was Brick himself, who named it dirty. Brick is, however unable to hate Skipper and to suffocate his self-loathing he drinks, so all that is left is Maggie.

The last verse refers yet again to both of them. The moment of truth has come to Brick, in his realisation of all of his betrayals towards himself, regardless of the fact, whether he is gay or not, he has come to terms with the fact that Maggie exists and will not go away. Perhaps he wants to give her a child, as compensation, or maybe he needs to make love, to feel ecstasy, in order to know that he is alive. On the other hand, he could just be drowning himself into the image, the vision, that he has had about her, a great athlete and all-American homecoming king, should be.

On the other hand, Maggie does anything to make the lie just spoken true, for many reasons. She wants to feel the intimacy once again and I think, even though she knows that she will never get close to Brick, she at least wants his body, something that she has felt a great physical need for. She also wants to secure her place in the household and most of all, I think, she just wants a little-brick to love, who will love her back that way that Brick is not able to.

The final scene that the audience saw, consisted of Maggie lying on top of Brick, caressing his chest, professing his love to Brick. There was a

long pause, after which Brick says:

BRICK [*smiling with charming sadness*]: Wouldn't it be funny if that was true?

THE CURTAIN COMES DOWN

(Williams 1956: 105)

I wanted the long pause there, before Brick said his final words, because I wanted the audience to sit back and sigh a relief, because they thought that there could be hope for the unfortunate couple. In a true Williams' style Brick's words sweep the carpet under the feet of such romantic delusions. The idea behind it is, I think, that even though Brick could consider that he is worth loving, he does not believe that Maggie truly loves the person that he is. He believes that Maggie too is in love with the idea of loving Brick, the perfect man. Brick does not take into account that Maggie has stayed on with him through his slow alcoholization, but he dismisses her, perhaps as a money hungry bitch, like the rest of the household. Whatever the cause, he is determined to murder all of his and Maggie's romantic feelings towards each other. The last look we got of them are two lonely people seeking refuge in each other from themselves.

2.4 Director concludes

What was then the purpose of my interpretation and was it called for? If nothing else, I needed it, for number of reason. First of all, I think this the best play Tennessee Williams ever wrote. It is full of desperation, heartache and unfulfilled dreams and fantasies. The play really does not have a catharsis, but it gives you one, in the way that it does not try to convince you in the end that even after all the troubles, the sun will shine tomorrow. It does not absolve you from the troubles it has caused and it does not give answers to the questions it has asked. It does not offer any solutions to the characters or to the audience, it just shows that sometimes life is barely worth living and it is always a struggle.

After having said all that, I want to make a point of saying that *Cat* is not thoroughly depressing play. On the contrary it is a celebration of love, passion, desire and a true testament to the human need to love and be loved. There is not a character, besides the negro servants and other minor characters, in the play, who do not desire to be loved by the people around them and especially the people they love. They love unconditionally, but they do not believe that they are good enough or worthy enough to be loved unconditionally back. They feel that there are obstacles and tests to be crossed and passed in order for them to become people that could be loved. Just as Maggie thinks she needs to bear children and remain sexy and good-looking and as Brick feels that he cannot be loved, because there might be a possibility of homosexuality, which does not coincide with his perfect image, they create a wall around them to protect themselves from disappointments and in the end they do not even try to let anybody in.

Another significant theme in the play is just acceptance, of self and of others. Maggie, Brick, Mae, Big Mama and even Big Daddy are all dependent on the acceptance of others. This ties in very closely to the need to be loved, in they way that none of the characters are able to love themselves unless somebody else proves their worth by confessing and showing and even telling to them that they are loved and thus accepted as human beings and members of society. Big Daddy tells Brick about his plans for the future, how

he is (Act II in the original script) going leave all of this behind him and go and spend his fortunes on a woman, a woman, whose affections he is going BUY with expensive gifts and whom he will put into a situation, where she has no other choice but to accept and love him, because she is financially dependent on him. Big Mama has become a threat, since she has been able to manage the estate by herself, when Big Daddy was ill and she has proven that she is able to continue on her own. This independence puts Big Daddy into a situation where he cannot trust that Big Mama's affections will stay strong, but that there is a possibility that Big Mama could do the same to Big Daddy, treat him bad, as he does to her. He is, therefore, scared that he might be hurt and his desire to be loved and cared for would be out on the open.

The need to have one's desire and passion fulfilled is another big theme in my version of *Cat*. I feel that Maggie aches to be touched by Brick as Big Mama aches for physical closeness with Big Daddy. The passion/desire between Brick and Skipper grew so strong that the occasional touches could not satisfy it any longer, but the next step had to be taken in order to fulfil the burning, in at least Skipper. If love would be measured by the amount of the burning need that these people felt towards each other, there would not be any question about the purpose of them being together. I fear though, that even if Brick does feel for Maggie, his emotions are not as strong towards her as they were for Skipper, and this is the primal reason for his fear for himself and his feelings. Maggie does, I believe, harbour a strong physical desire for Brick, but her voice of reason does not forget the money either. It is a constant battle between reason and need, whether it be physical or mental.

The last and in my opinion the most important theme in the play is honesty and the need for it. Both Act I and Act II deal with the search for honesty and confession, first Maggie tries to squeeze the truth out of Brick, about his relationship with Skipper and his thoughts on loving Maggie and then Big Daddy tries to force the same things out. The result in the second act is, that Brick blurts out the truth about Big Daddy's condition, a truth he cannot handle. He is faced with a similar kind of personal hell as Brick is with the truth about Skipper. Once again we can see a true Williams touch,

the hysterical women are the ones who can deal with the unexpected and unfortunate situation and they rise from their desperation to comfort and carry the men through their turmoil. Big Mama has long since accepted the truth about her and Big Daddy's relationship and she has decided to turn in into a joke, in order to survive. It is as if there was a silent agreement between them, which kept them both happy, until Big Daddy is faced with a reality that cannot be swept under the carpet, he is terminally ill. The remind me of the couple in Edward Albee's play *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1962), where the main characters, Martha and George, play a game with an imaginary son, which they have created to hide the truth about their childlessness. The game is played until Martha breaks the rules and George lets the couple visiting them know the truth and the game is finished, forever. The same way Big Mama lets Big Daddy to make plans and think that he can live without her, but I believe that he would be unable to survive without comforting arms of Big Mama, or without the knowledge that the arms will always be welcoming him home, no matter what. Maggie is only still training for it, asking Brick to change, which he will never do. Even if Brick tries to refuse Maggie's love, he knows that she will always care for her, if nothing else. The two pairs are once again two different points of the same process.

There was a funny incident during the process. The movie, *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1958), by Elia Kazan, was on the television. I pondered for a long time, whether or not to watch it, because I was afraid that I would lose to Elia Kazan and feel that there was no reason to go on with our production. I could have not been more wrong. One has to remember the time the film was made in, but still, Kazan had changed the script quite a bit. Brick was not a supposed homosexual, but impotent. The impotence had stemmed from the fact that his best friend had tried to seduce Maggie, who was portrayed has a helpless victim, who almost got raped. If this was not enough, the film ended by Brick warming up to Maggie and the last scene was Brick throwing his pillow back to their back, as a symbol of the impotence gone by. I felt furious and totally understood, what was meant by compromising one's artistic integrity. Of course Kazan had to strip the dissident imagery from the film, when thinking that the McCarthy era was

alive and strong. Kazan himself was one the actor/directors, who were more than willing to give names of known communist in his field to the McCarthy commission. I felt the need to give people another view of the play.

In the last part of this thesis I shall concentrate on the audience response and measure how my intentions were received. Personally I felt and still feel that I was successful in presenting the play through these four main themes. Masculinity and homosexuality was studied through these four themes in the way that the two subjects are rarely spoken of and if questioned from outside of a person, never from within, at least in Brick's case. The stakes of self-discovery were too high for him to even consider it. The old truth about loving oneself first in order to be capable of loving anybody definitely applied to Brick and thus made him a figure, to which anyone can easily identify with. Maggie's self-deception about her life and marriage are also familiar things to all of us, in some form, I am sure. However, all of these negative emotions were felt by some people, who forced themselves upon us, but also, who stayed on stage and were left there, after the audience went home, still hopefully thinking about the feelings they got. I know I have not been able to shake the emotions off.

3 THE QUESTIONNAIRE

3.1 The quest for the truth

As I have explained earlier, this questionnaire served two purposes: firstly, I wanted to have a second opinion about the play itself and secondly, I wanted to measure my directorial skills, i.e. I wanted to know whether I had brought out those themes that I stated in the second part of this thesis, clearly enough, thus getting my point across. I will divide the nine questions into three categories, which deal with three aspects of the play: the main themes, the character of Brick and the character of Maggie. I shall introduce the questions and try to explain the reason for choosing each particular question for the questionnaire. The original questionnaire can be read in the back, as appendix 1. I shall not include all the answers into this section, but they can be read in the appendix. I shall only quote one or two per section, trying to give an overview of the whole selection. Even though 27 test subjects may seem a small group, it has to be remembered that the theatre had seats for 98 people and all the shows were sold out, so it can be said that 10% of the audience was tested. All the answers can be read in Finnish in the end as appendix 2.

Most of the results confirmed my ideas and how I had interpreted Williams, which means that I was also succeeded in directing the play the way that presented the themes I have put forth in the second section of this thesis. For example, the theme of honesty was well received and understood. On the other hand, it was obvious from the answers that I had made some decisions and choices that had had an impact that I had not intended, as was in the case of Maggie, of whom the audience had obviously gotten a very one-sided view. Most of them saw her as a shrewd manipulator, which, in my opinion, was not the whole truth. In this respect I had failed to do justice to Williams' character work.

3.2 Method

I did not use any explicit method in how the questions were devised or presented on the paper. However, I tried to scatter the question around, so that it would not be obvious what I was after. The questions were on themes, with which I had spend endless hours trying to find an answer in the text. The test group were selected randomly from the ticket holders by the volunteers who were selling the tickets. This way I wanted to make sure that I did not select people to participate in the questionnaire that I thought looked like the people whose answers would fit the purpose of this thesis. They were picked as they bought the ticket and immediately after the performance was over they were taken in to a separate room and handed out the questionnaires, before they had a chance to talk about the show. There were four shows and the survey was carried out in three of them. In total there were 30 questionnaires, out of which 27 were returned. Ten people out of each show answered to the questionnaire. Besides the nine questions, the test group also answered to three background questions: their age, education and gender. They were given free refreshments during intermission as a reward for doing the questionnaire. The questions and thus the answers were in Finnish, as the play was also performed in Finnish.

3.3 The questions and the answers

3.3.1 Question on the main themes of the play

First of all I wanted to know some general information about the play and how it was received. The three questions were intended to concentrate on how I had succeeded, as a whole, to create the kind of performance that I wanted in my directorial plan. I wanted to know, if any of themes had particularly reached the audience. I will introduce the questions about the themes of the play:

1. Mainitse pari mieleenpainuvinta kohtausta/teemaa näytelmästä. Miksi nämä jäivät mieleesi?
2. Miten nämä teemat tuotiin esille näytelmässä?
9. Miten luulet Brickin ja Maggiein suhteen jatkuvan tästä eteenpäin?

- [1. Write down one or two scenes/themes from the play that you remember most vividly? Why do you think these stuck in your mind the most?
2. How were these themes presented in the show?
9. How do you think the relationship between Brick and Maggie shall continue from here?]

The first question was the one that bothered me and still does, what was the purpose of the play and what did Williams want to say with it? Surely the play was more than just about coming to terms with homosexuality and at least I wanted my version to have more sides to it. Here is what was said:

Parhaiten jäi mieleeni toisen pojan vaimon (Saija) käynti isoisan luona, jossa hänet tyrmättiin täysin. Hänen ystävällisyytensä ja hyvää tarkoittava lähestymisensä teulattiin muutamalla sanalla ja katseella. Se liittyi mielessäni vahvasti odotuksiin ja asenteisiin joita ihmisillä on vuorovaikutuksessa keskenään. Ymmärtäminen ihmisten kesken tuntuu silkalta mahdottomuudelta!

Toinen tähän teemaan liittyvä kohtaus (tai kohtaukset) oli Maggiein lähestymisyriytykset suhteessa mieheensä. Vain pieniä säröjä saatiin aikaiseksi, jotta kohtaamisen aloittaminen on edes mahdollista.

(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

3. Lisäksi kohtausta jossa Brick todella korottaa äänensä Maggieille, koska se on yllättävää hänen rauhallisen käyttäytymisensä jälkeen.
(mies, 21, yo)

Valheellisuus, Kaikki valehtelivat toisilleen koko ajan ja kaikesta. Ahneus. Kaikki halusivat rahaa, tilaa, jne. Elämänhalu (Big Daddy, Maggie) Elämänhalun puute (Brick)
(nainen, 27, myös englantia+muut, opiskelija)

[What I remember the best, was the visits that the other wife (Saija) made to the bedroom, mostly in order to see Big Daddy. Her kindness and amicable approaches were crudely refused with few harsh words and/or looks. In my mind it connected strongly with the attitudes and expectations that people have in a communicative situation towards each other. Understanding other people seems to be practically impossible!

Another scene connected to this theme (or scenes) were the attempts made by Maggie to try to get closer to her husband. Only small cracks were made to his surface, in order to try to make these two people to meet on a deeper level.

(woman, 35, MA, drama instructor)

3. In addition, the scene where Brick really raises his voice to Maggie, because it was so surprising after he had acted so calmly up to that point.

(man, 21, high school graduate)

Mendacity. Everyone was lying to each other all the time and about everything. Greediness. Everyone wanted money, the ranch, etc. Will to live (Big Daddy, Maggie), the lack of willingness to live (Brick)

(woman, 27, student of English)]

The theme of miscommunication was present in the most part of the answers. It seemed that many people turned it into a gender issue rather than the problem of two people, or maybe only one person (Brick). I certainly never saw it as a gender issue, but rather an issue between two colliding wills and personalities. For me, blaming it on gender would be too easy and in my opinion, it would be underestimating Williams to say that he wanted it either. However, many people also mentioned remembering the scene from act I in the original play, where Brick raises his voice for the first time, just as I had hoped for. The second quote above refers to just that. The other point of reference mostly mentioned in the answers was the time when Brick tells Big

Daddy about the true state of his health and one even said that the song, *Myrskyn jälkeen*, was just perfect for the feeling that he had got, when looking at Big Daddy's struggle.

Mendacity, the word used in the original text, was also in many answers. People seemed to get my meaning, or rather the meaning of Williams, about the lying and cheating that happens in every relationship, may it be between two people or just with oneself. Big Daddy talks about this in act II:

[..] What do you know about this mendacity thing? Hell! I could write a book on it! Don't you know that? I could write a book on it and still not cover the subject? [...] Having to pretend stuff you don't think or feel or have any idea of? Having for instance to act like I care for Big Mama! [...] Pretend to love that son of a bitch of a Gooper and his wife Mae [...] *I've lived with mendacity! - Why can't you live with it? Hell, you got to live with it, there's nothing else to live with except mendacity, is there?*

(Williams 1956: 72)

In his speech, Big Daddy goes through every aspect of his life, including the pretending that goes on in church too, Williams' own voice ever present. This speech, in my opinion served two purposes, for one it showed the state of Big Daddy's life and how, even when he had done everything as expected, he was not happy. It was also given as an example to Brick that either he does something with his life and deals with his problems, whatever the outcome may be or then he just pulls himself together and starts to live the life that the society has prepared for him, he should start pretending. The easy way in this would of course be choosing the expectations and fulfilling them, in order to become the expected member of the community. When looking at the answers and how in them the people talked about the struggle with pretending and cheating each other and oneself all the time, it can be said the the audience had understood Brick's problem.

The second question was purely directorial in the way that I wanted to know what decisions and means had worked in order for the audience to understand my point of view. In the following quotes it can be seen that I succeeded in some levels:

Teemat tuotiin esille pikkuhiljaa, ne selkeytyivät koko ajan niin ettei lopuksi teemojen rajaus ollut ollenkaan hankalaa. Teemojen käsittelyssä päällimmäisinä oli keskustelut.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Näytelmän henkilöiden väliset suhteet olivat täynnä valheellisuutta. Asioita ei asianomaisten läsnäollessa tuotu rehellisesti julki, tosin piikittelyssä vihjaistiin.

Puhumattomuus ja paskanjauhaminen olivat selkeä osa näytelmää ja kuvasivat mielestäni läheisyyden kaipausta, aidon kohtaamisen tarvetta. Maggie "tiesi" asiat Brickin puolesta, kuten muutkin roolihenkilöt toistensa puolesta.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Vahvasti ja yllättäen; erityisesti Brickin raivostuminen yllättäen.

(mies, 24, opiskelija)

[The themes were introduced slowly, they became clearer and clearer as we went along so that in the end it was not hard to define the themes. The themes were dealt with different conversations between the characters.

(woman, 24, MA, teacher)

The relationships between the different characters were filled with mendacity. Issues were not brought out in the open when the subject in question was present, they were just hinted at, crudely.

Silence and talking bullshit were a clear part of the play and were used to describe the need for affection, the need for a genuine, honest interaction between the people. Maggie "knew better" than Brick, about his own life, just as all the other characters seemed to know what was best for the others.

(woman, 22, university student)

Strongly and surprisingly; especially Brick getting furious took by surprise.

(man, 24, student)]

Williams had constructed the play in a way that there was always some surprise lurking in the end of each act and this was a pattern that I wanted to follow. In scene III there was the revelation about Skipper and Brick's outburst, in scene IV there was Big Daddy's fight against the fear of death and in the final scene there was the desperate attempt by Maggie to make a child to cover the lie. Also the need for affection and closeness of another person had been taken in from the play, a theme that I also pointed out in the second section of this thesis. The second quote above said it best, the excess

in talking was only there to cover up the resistance to talk about the REAL problems. What was interesting was the point about everybody else knowing best, what one really needed and wanted. I had never thought about that, but it is a very important issue in the play. As I have said time and time again, everybody else was ready to accept Brick's deviance, but was there anything to accept? Perhaps it was true that his problems were partly caused by the fact that everyone was so willing to categorize him as a homosexual, which he was not, this we will never know. I still cannot honestly say, whether Brick Pollit is a homosexual or not.

The last question in this group and in the questionnaire referred to my own problem and that of Elia Kazan too, how to project for the future. Unlike Kazan I did not want to give the audience hope. As I explained in the second section of this paper, it was very hard to interpret what Williams' motives. The answers were divided in half:

Luulen, että pientä lämpenemistä saattaisi tapahtua, mutta paljon töitä olisi edessä. Ehkäpä he saavat lapsen.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Samalla tavalla. Ei lasta. Itsemurha. Ero. Jaa-a?

(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

[I think there might be some reconciliation in the future, but there is still a lot to be done. Perhaps they will have a child.

(woman, 22, university student)

In the same way. No child. Suicide. Divorce. Who knows?

(man, 24, university student)]

Half of the people believed that Brick and Maggie will have a child, but most of them did not believe that there would be any major changes in their relationship. What was interesting, was the fact that many people thought that Brick's alcoholism was the cause of trouble in their relationships. This was not my intention at all. I saw the alcoholism more of a results than a cause and this made me wonder if I had emphasized that drinking too much when directing the actor playing the part of Brick. It seems that the bottles on the

table played too great a role. Half of the people believed that they would not conceive a child, but that they would still stay together, ripping each other apart. Only one person out of 27 believed that the couple would separate and thus make a change in their lives. I must say that this was a bit of a disappointment, as my intention was divide the opinions in two, hoping it would remain as unclear to the audience whether the couple will divorce or not, as it was a problem for me after I had read the play over and over again. It is safe to say that in this respect, I failed.

3.3.2 Questions on the characters of Maggie and Big Daddy

Besides Brick, to whom I will return later, the character of Maggie was one of Williams' mysteries, whose intentions never really opened up to me. The following two questions were to find out about her and Big Daddy:

- 4. Miksi Maggie halusi lapsen Brickin kanssa?
- 7. Miten Maggie ja Isoisä suhtautuivat Brickin mahdolliseen homoseksuaalisuuteen?

[4. Why did Maggie want to have a child with Brick?
7. How did Maggie and Big Daddy feel about Brick's supposed homosexuality?]

With all of her hysteria and demands for Brick to open up and love her, I was confused whether she was totally genuine in her motives. On the other hand she had decided not to be poor ever again and she was willing to do anything in order to inherit Big Daddy, but then on the other hand I felt that she really wanted Brick to love her, as unconditionally as she loved him. Or at least sometimes I thought that she loved him unconditionally. That is why I also wanted to find out how the audience felt about Maggie's feelings towards the supposed homosexuality. I also wanted to know if my theory was correct on how easy it was for Maggie and Big Daddy to accept Brick's deviance, as long as he would be happy.

Question number four was designed to collect information on how many people believed Maggie to be honest in her need to have a child because she thought it would mend the relationship.

Jotta saisi perinnön eikä kuolisi köyhänä. Voihan tietysti olla että hän uskoi Brickin selviävän ja heillä olisi lapsia.

(mies, 21, yo)

Perinnön ja yhteiskunnan paineen takia. Ehkä lapsi olisi pönkittänyt hänen itsetuntoaan, jonka hän piti koossa ulkokuorensa avulla

Hän halusi taata avioliittonsa ja kelvollisuutensa ulkopuolisten silmissä. Ehkä myös huono omatunto pettämisestä oli yksi syy.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

*koki tulevansa hyväksytyksi vain siten - perinteinen naisen rooli
*keino saada Brick itselleen
(nainen, 21, yo)

[To get the inheritance and not to die poor. Of course, it might be that she believed that Brick will make it through and they would have children.

(man, 21, high school graduate)

Because of the pressures of inheritance and the society. Perhaps a child would have given her more self-esteem, which was solely depended on her looks.

She wanted to secure her marriage and her worthiness in the eyes of the outsiders. Perhaps the guilt stemming from her committing adultery was also one reason.

(woman, 24, MA, teacher)

*she felt that would be the only means for getting accepted- the traditional role for a woman

*means of getting Brick all to herself

(woman, 21, high school graduate)]

I always thought that I was being fair in thinking that Maggie truly loved Brick, but that she was equally worried about the inheritance. When looking at the answers to this question, I cannot help but feel that I turned Maggie into a money-hungry bitch. All the answers state that Maggie wanted the child mainly in order to secure her position in the family and in the inheritance question. She also wanted to commit Brick into the marriage, so that he could not leave her. A couple of the answers also suggested that Maggie needed the child to give her more self-confidence in the living situation. I was quite surprised by this response, because I did not intentionally want give a view of Maggie that did not include the idea that she was just a scared little girl, who desperately wanted to be loved. I am not very happy about her role turning into this one-sided, as I felt that in the original play she also had a softer side. I feel that perhaps I made a too big a contrast between Brick and Maggie, which caused that Maggie's continuous talking made her look like a predator, while Brick's silence made him the helpless victim. Also the omission of all the family gatherings, where Maggie was harassed by Mae, Gooper and the children also contributed in the view that she was a coldblooded opportunist. I must say, that I disappointed myself

and probably Williams in this respect.

Question number seven was designed to find out if it was Brick himself who caused the problems to himself with his negative attitude towards homosexuality, while the surrounding environment was ready to accept it in him. The audience felt as follows:

Maggie kadehti Skipperiä (ja Brickiä) koska heidän välillään oli jotain aitoa. Hän rakasti Brickiä eikä saanut rakkaudelleen vastakaikua ja kuihtui. Hän uskoi mielestäni vahvasti Brickin homoseksuaalisuuteen, halusi uskoa, sillä se selitti miksi Brick ei (enää) halunnut häntä, vaikka hän yritti kaikkensa.

Isoisä oli yllättävän rento, tahtoi ehkä vaan, että hänen poikansa paranee alkoholismista, muulla ei niin väliä.

(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Maggie käytti hyväkseen Brickin rakkautta Skipperiin, koska menemällä sänkyyn Skipperin kanssa M saattoi loukata verisesti fyysisesti vahvempaa Brickiä.

Isoisä kehotti Brickiä myöntämään tosiasiat ja olemaan sinut itsensä kanssa.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Maggie koki asian normaaliksi, puhtaaksi, isoisä suhtautui myös suht rauhallisesti, mutta heidän keskusteluissaan Brick kuitenkin liioitteli asian ongelmallisuutta, latasi huonoja/negatiivisia asioita esille...

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

[Maggie envied Skipper (and Brick), because there was something genuine between them. She loved Brick and did not get anything in return and she/it withered. In my opinion she believed that Brick was gay, she wanted to believe, because that explained why he did not want her, even though she tried everything. Big Daddy was surprisingly relaxed about it, he just wanted his son to recover from alcoholism, nothing else did not matter.

(woman, 21, student)

Maggie abused Brick's love towards Skipper, because by going to bed with Skipper M could deeply hurt the physically stronger Brick.

Big Daddy urged Brick to face the facts and find a peace with himself.

(woman, 24, student)

Maggie found it to be a normal, pure, Big daddy took it also quite calmly, but in their conversations Brick made exaggerated the problem, brought only the bad and negative sides on the surface...
(woman, 23, parish youth activities co-ordinator)]

The answers to this question were more divided than in any of the others. Some people felt that both Maggie and Big Daddy were willing to accept it, which was the way I also interpreted it. Others felt that Maggie could live with it, but Big Daddy could not stand it, while others felt that Maggie felt Brick's affections to Skipper as a threat, just as in the quote in the middle above and Big Daddy accepted it, because he wanted his son to be happy and stop drinking. It is a shame that I did not mark the questionnaires to know from which performance the people got their ideas so that I could know, whether their opinion depended on the performance, or on the play itself. It would be easier to blame the performance, that some night the actor emphasized the wrong things too much, but perhaps my direction was not consistent enough. I must say that I was quite taken back especially when talking about Big Daddy, because I always felt that he was even more willing to accept his son's homosexuality than Maggie ever was. The last quote above is the only one that reflects my feelings exactly. I felt that the cause of all Brick's problems was himself and if there was any outside pressure, it was in the case that Brick was not a homosexual and he was being forced into it. I always felt that his family only wanted what was best for him and he was the only obstacle in his own road to happiness and self-fulfilment. It was obvious that I failed to get that across to the audience.

3.3.3 Questions on the character of Brick

The following three questions were designed to find out about how the audience saw the character of Brick and what they thought was the truth about him:

3. Mikä oli mielestäsi Brickin alkoholismien syy?
5. Mitkä olivat mielestäsi Brickin tunteet Maggieta kohtaan?
6. Millainen oli mielestäsi Brickin ja Skipperin suhde?
8. Miksi Brick suhtautui niin kielteisesti vihjailuihin?

- [3. In your opinion, what was the cause for Brick's alcoholism?
5. In your opinion, how did Brick really feel about and towards Maggie?
6. In your opinion, what kind of a relationship did Brick and Skipper have?
8. Why did Brick react to the insinuation so fiercely?]

As I mentioned above, in my opinion the alcoholism was more a result than a cause. This question also ties in with the theme of mendacity, because as Brick says in the play (Williams 1956: 70), he drinks to forget, to forget the lying and liars, others and himself. He is disgusted with everything and everybody around him and in order to survive, he drinks. The audience thought the following:

Itsesyytös siitä, että hän oli lyönyt luurin Skipperin korvaan, minkä jälkeen Skipper tappoi itsensä.
Brick siis luuli aiheuttaneensa Skipperin kuoleman tai ainakin syytti siitä itseään.

(mies, 21, yo)

Brickin alkoholismien syy oli oman itsensä ja rakkautensa ja kaipauksensa kieltäminen, inho itseään ja valheellista elämistä kohtaan.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Yleinen yhteiskunnan paine. Tarve työstää omat tunteet piiloon, häpeää sitä, mitä on koska niin ei kuulu olla

(nainen, 21, yo)

[Self-abuse over the fact that he had hung up on Skipper, after which Skipper had killed himself.
Therefore, Brick thought he had caused Skipper's death or at least he blamed himself for it.

(man, 21, high school graduate)

The cause for Brick's alcoholism was in his denial of himself, his love and longing, hatred towards himself and his life in lie.

(woman, 22, student)

The general pressure from the society. The need to hide his own feelings, the shame of feeling the way he did, which was not generally acceptable.

(woman, 21, high school graduate)]

All the answers mentioned the mendacity again and also the guilt that he felt about Skipper's death. What is interesting, especially if one compares these answers to those to questions 9, people are willing to think that Brick is a homosexual and that is why he is drinking, but then in the last question all except one think that the couple will stay together. Obviously the audience is willing to believe that Brick will go on hiding himself behind the alcohol. However, the point about Brick having difficulties with himself, because he stopped being the perfect all-American boy seemed to have been well received. Also it is interesting to see that people did not see the alcoholism as a cause for all the trouble when answering this question, but in the last question they blamed it for the breakup in the marriage. Perhaps they were as confused about Brick as I was, and am.

Question number five was designed to find out whether the audience thought that marriage with Maggie was just a front or Brick had married her because that was the expected thing or whether he really loved her. After reading the questionnaires, I felt that everyone had understood it differently and the answers were divided between the three possibilities that I had pondered:

Mielestäni Brick rakasti Maggiea, mutta liian paljon oli tapahtunut, että lähestyminen olisi mahdollista, ainakaan kovin nopeasti ja tuskastomasti. Ne ihmiset, joita rakastaa eniten, pystyvät aiheuttamaan sen suurimman pettymyksen, raivon ja vihan kuten Brickin ja Maggiein tapauksessa.

(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

*periaatteessa melko halveksuva ja välinpitämätön mutta välittää hänestä pohjimmiltaan...syvällä sisimmässään...

*toisaalta hän oli ottanut Maggie'n vaimokseen myös siksi, että hän oli simpsakka pimu, jollainen, joka jokaisella miehellä tulisi olla
*oli tilanne mikä hyvänsä -paineet ulkopuolelta...

(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Varmaan joskus Brick oli rakastanut (tai ollut ihastunut tai luullut rakastaneensa) Maggie'ta. Brick inhosi nyt Maggie'ta, koska hän oli liannut Skipperin ja Brickin suhteen, laittanut Brickin sanojen mukaan homoseksuaaliset ajatukset Skipperin päähän, ja pilannut kaiken. Brick halveksi Maggie'ta, eikä heillä ollut mitään yhteyttä. Brick ei voinut myöntää, että Skipper oli ollut hänen tosi rakkautensa, joten välinpitämättömästi roikkui suhteessa mm. perheen takia. Ja siksi, että Brick oli jo kuollut Skipperin mukana.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

[In my opinion Brick loved Maggie, but too much had happened for a reconciliation to be possible, at least in the near future and without any pain. Those people, whom one loves the most are the ones who cause the biggest disappointments, rage and anger, just as in Brick's and Maggie's relationship.

(woman, 35, MA, drama instructor)

*basically very much full of despise and non-chalant, but still he cares about her deep down inside

*on the other hand he had married Maggie just because she was such a babe, one that every man should have

*in any case - the pressures from outside...

(woman, 25, MA, kindergarten teacher)

Surely Brick had loved (or at least had a crush or thought that he loved) Maggie. Now Brick hated her, because she had tarnished the relationship between Skipper and Brick, and in his own words she had put the idea of homosexuality into Skipper's mind and thus ruined everything. Brick despised Maggie and they had no connection. Brick could not face the fact that Skipper had been his one true love, so he hung on to the marriage without caring, for example, because of the family. And because Brick had already died along with Skipper.

(woman, 24, student)]

In a way, everyone felt that Brick had married Maggie, because it was expected of him, and Maggie looked good beside an athlete, being gorgeous as she was. I also feel that Brick had genuinely thought that he loved Maggie, the way he felt that a man and a woman had loved each other. He was just

taken back, when he compared the feelings he had for Maggie with the strong emotions he felt for Skipper, especially after Skipper had killed himself. I also agree with the point that too much had gone between Brick and Maggie in order for them to mend their relationship totally. I also feel that Brick blamed Maggie for Skipper's death, for seducing him into bed, where the truth about Skipper's deviance was revealed. If it had not been for Maggie, maybe things could have stayed the same, or at least that is the way Brick's thinks about the matter. What was wonderful to read, was that no one believed that Brick really, whole-heartedly loved Maggie. They had been sucked into the mendacity way of thinking and agreed with me that Brick just could not go on pretending to love Maggie anymore. He was tired of pretending and one of the biggest pretences was their marriage and lovelife.

As I have also mentioned before, Brick was very adamant about denying that there was anything sexual, or *dirty* about his and Skipper's relationships. I have put forth an idea, that Brick's strong opposition and explaining about the little matters in their relationship, such as necking and touching each others hands after a game (Williams 1956: 79), put the idea of deviance in my head and I wanted to see, whether I had been able to put the same doubt in other people's head too. I worked, as we can see in the following:

Se jäi hieman avoimeksi. Luulisin, että heidän välillä oli muutakin kuin vain platoninen ystävyysuhde. Ei platoninen, vaikka he taistelivat sitä vastaan. Tai ehkä Brick puhui totta, ehkä vain Skipper oli hänestä kiinnostunut, ehkä Brick ei kyennyt sitä hyväksymään. Tai sitten ei kyennyt hyväksymään omaa homouttaan.

(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

-vahva ystävyys, jossa he pystyivät jakamaan kaiken
-ihmisiä, jotka arvostivat toisiaan, joilla oli helppoa ja luonnollista olla toistensa seurassa
-heillä ei ollut mitään ulkopuolisia paineita, odotuksia toistensa suhteen
-jotain todellista elämää, ei pinnallista liittoa kuin perheen touhu
(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Brick piti Skipperiä ystävänä, Skipperillä oli muunlaisiakin tunteita, joita Brick ei niiden selvittyä voinut hyväksyä. (nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

[It was left a bit open. I think that there was more to their relationship besides a platonic friendship. Not platonic, even though they fought against it. Or maybe Brick was telling the truth, maybe Skipper was the only one interested moving the relationship into a different level, and maybe Brick just could not accept it. Or then he just could not accept his own homosexuality. (woman, 21, student)

- strong friendship, where they were able to share everything
- people, who appreciated each other and who were able to get along easily
- they had no outside pressures or expectations of each other
- something real unlike the life in the family, which was very superficial

(woman 25, MA, kindergarten teacher)

Brick thought of Skipper as a friend, Skipper had other feelings too, which Brick was unable to accept once they came out. (woman, 24, forestry engineer)]

All the answers were divided into two parts. Firstly everyone thought that only Skipper loved Brick in a physical way, but most of the answers went on to state that PERHAPS there were some homosexual feelings also on Brick's side. Everyone was fantastically confused, which was my goal, as I never could find out the truth either. The only answer that did not talk about homosexuality was the one that I quoted above, in the middle. It also states the most important fact: the friendship was the only real, genuine thing in Brick's life, which did not have any mendacity in it, or so Brick thought until Skipper revealed his feelings. Also a part of the answers credited the deviance solely on Skipper's shoulders and blamed him for Brick's troubles, but that was a very small amount of the audience. The best answer to this question was one sentence long: 'it remained a big question mark for me'. That was exactly what I wanted the audience to feel.

Question number eight referred to my theory that Brick was homophobic, or at least very afraid of any homosexual feelings in general and especially within him. I wanted to see, if the audience felt the same way as I

did, that all of this negativity also suggested that either he was so stuck in his own idea of his ideal self that he could not bear the thought that there would be something *bent* in him, even though there was no homosexual element in him or then this negativity suggested that he really did feel some romantic emotions towards Skipper and could not stand the idea that he had lost the love of his life just because of his own narrowmindedness.

Joko hän oli niin punaniskajuntti, että se oli hänelle kuin potku nivusiin, tai sitten hän itsekin epäili omaa seksuaalisuutta ja halusi kieltää kaikki mahdolliset vihjaukset siihen, että olisi homo.
(mies, 21, yo)

Koska hän ei voinut myöntää missään tapauksessa, että vihjailut olisivat totta. Miesten maailmassa homoseksuaalisuus on likaisinta ja iljettävintä mitä on olemassa.
(mies, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Ehkä hän oli kyllästynyt siihen. Vihjailu rumensi aiota ystävyyttä, ystävyyttä, jonka kuolema oli vienyt pois. Brick tavallaan puolusti Skipperiä ja suuttumuksellaan halusi pitää tämän maineen puhtaana.
(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

[Either he was such a red neck that it was like a blow to his crotch or then he himself doubted his sexuality and wanted to deny all possible hints towards him being gay.
(man, 21, high school graduate)

Because he could not, under any circumstances, admit that what was hinted at might be true. In a man's world homosexuality is the dirtiest and most disgusting thing that exists.
(man, 24, student)

Maybe he was tired of it. All that talk made the friendship look bad, the friendship that had been taken away by death. In a way Brick stood up for Skipper and with his anger he wanted to keep Skipper's reputation clean.
(woman, 24, MA, teacher)]

The first two quotes summarize the general feeling of the test subjects and the feeling that I also had about Brick. He just could not handle the situation that he might be different and not the norm man he thought that he represented. The last quote was the only one that wholly supported the idea that Brick's

deviance was forced upon him from outside and he just suffered from the fact that their relationship and Skipper's reputation was being tarnished. It is also interesting to see that in the other answers the issue of gender did not play any role, but in this one all the men were experts on how horrible it is, if one gets labelled as a deviant. It was also intriguing to see that one woman said in her answer that 'is there a man who would not be horrified by these kind of accusations', which I thought stated quite well her own way of thinking about the world. Obviously she was very fond of *the norm*. However, if one looks at the answers, it can be said that more people were inclined to say that Brick's strong opposition was the result of him not being able to experience the homosexual side of himself. Whether or not he was actually gay, that remained a mystery to everybody, including me.

3.4 Discussion on the results

When reading my own writing and seeing the results, I cannot help but feeling the same confusion that I have felt ever since I got introduced to this play. It can be read in so many ways and it can be directed in some many ways. Now that some time has passed, I am more than willing to tear myself apart for cowardice.

It is obvious that I failed to be strong enough to take a stand. I refused to set myself in a certain route that would have led to a clear conclusion. Did I want to make a play about homosexuality? No, I obviously did not. Did I want to make a play about the hardships within a marriage? No, I did not. Did I then want to concentrate on how difficult it is to accept and love oneself. No, I did not concentrate on that one either. Instead, I wanted to make a play about all of the above. I was too scared to take a stand and shout that this play is simple a tale about...Perhaps it was my naive, almost religious-like worship towards Tennessee Williams that held me back from making radical decision about his work. It was hard enough for me to omit some of his text from the show, let alone create whole new scenes. Also it was my first time directing and I did not feel that I had the confidence to commit the whole project into one sentence. Still, it seems also strange, because I had a strong feeling in the back of my mind what I wanted to do.

Even if I want to scold myself more, I still feel that somehow my indecisiveness was also my strong point. The play was allowed to live and move around and find its place. The actors were free to experiment within limits. I wanted certain elements to be ever present, for example, I wanted Brick and Maggie to stay on the opposite sides of the stage at all times, till it was time for Brick to explode. The actors had to be aware of each other at all times, so that if one of them got closer, the other one had to move away.

Even though it now seems that I mixed too many ingredients together, I am still very content with one thing, mendacity. If everything else divided opinions, the idea of mendacity could been seen in each one of the answers. It was very important for me to get the audience to think about the

lying that goes on in our everyday life, between friends, let alone with our loved ones. It is important to think about the little white lies and how important they really are. Would the truth hurt as much as we think, or perhaps we just use it as a justification for keeping secrets from those people who trust and depend on us the most. It is also nice to see that self-deception was in people's minds. That was one theme that I felt very strongly about and I wanted to raise it on top, so that we would start to think how much time and energy we spend each day covering up and making sure that we do not feel anything even slightly negative. This way we can reach the state of non-emotion, where we completely shut off every sensor in our body, in order to protect ourselves, thinking that feeling nothing at all is better than giving pain a chance.

Did I then contribute to the gay theatre movement? Is it really important to state Brick's sexual orientation? I did not rally for the movement, but I wanted to show how something that had been writing half a century ago, could still be applied to the modern day. After all the liberation movements and pride marches, how much has been accomplished? It is all in the mind of the individual. Where does the learning come from then and are we able to decide what is correct and free knowledge? Is there any such thing as a liberal or liberated? All these questions are still waiting for an answer. The answer did not come with the directing of this play or reading the results. Everything happened as I think Williams wanted it: he left us all guessing, making sure that we could never check for the right answer.

4 CONCLUSION

The title of this thesis might as well been 'director on a queer tin roof' or 'university student on a queer tin roof'. This journey that I have made in the past two years has been educational, surely, but the results of this learning process are yet not visible or in any way applicable to everyday life. I know I know, but I do not know what I know.

The whole concept of masculinity is a never-ending object for research. What really made me interested in Williams' work was his constant research and exploration into the psyche and life of a man. In our modern world it is interesting to think about the status that a man has and how it has changed radically especially in the past fifty years. At the time Oscar Wilde wrote his plays, the place a man occupied in society was clear and unquestionable. Man was the provider and protector and of course the breeder. It was commonly accepted that a man's duty was to take care of his country, his family and his wife, who could not survive without her husband.

This strong man remained the hero on and off stage for the next fifty years. However, this hero needed somebody to give him contrast, to make him even more glorious. The effeminate man was invented. He showed the audience how things could go wrong, a man could possess the same hysterical personality traits as a WOMAN. It is interesting to think why an effeminate man can cause such a scare in the eyes of a 'normal' person. It could be thought that he is a threat to the society as we know it, as this effeminate man does not breed, he is useless to the world order, because he is unable to produce loyal subjects to the leaders. He also serves as evidence that 'the weaker sex' is not necessarily just the women. The same kind of opposition can be seen in the way women's liberation movement has been treated, especially after the II World War, when women had proven that they are capable of supporting themselves and their country without the men. It was unthinkable that the women would have stayed on working in the factories, because that would have meant that they are as able as the men. The same way the effeminate man scares the norm man, the queer does not care for the masculine trait of power and submission, he rather let other

people do the dirty work for him. According to the norm man, in my opinion, the effeminate man gives an example to women, that the man is not necessarily infallible and he also gives a bad example to other men, inducing them into thinking that they are not the natural rulers of the kingdom.

It is also interesting to think that these queer men are punished, because they have feminine traits. Therefore, it could be said that femininity is punishable, according to the people who set the norms. This could have also been a good point of view from which to look at *Cat*.

What made Williams different from his contemporaries was that fact that he dealt with the issue of homosexuality in a non-humorous way. His queer character was not put on stage to amuse or to give contrast to the hero. Williams' queer character was the hero in the play. He was not condemned by the surrounding society, he condemns himself. The society has trained him so well that he causes problems for himself all by himself. The society does not have anything. Williams dealt with the problems men faced in their lives because of pressures from outside, but Brick was a queer exception. What all of these characters have in common is the impossible relationship between their desires and the real world. Like Shannon in *Iguana*, Brick too is faced with unexplicable desires, which are condemned by the society and by himself and still he feels that he is unable to take control of his life. These two characters both become alcoholics in order to live with themselves. However, Brick was an athlete, who symbolized the American Dream, and by even insinuating that there was a homosexual element in him, was revolutionary. This is why Williams was, in my opinion, brave in breaking the boundaries of 1950s theatre movement's relationship towards queer lifestyle. Unfortunately this revolution did not extend to the film business. As I have stated before, Kazan's adjustments made the film safe and very much by the rules of the existing society. In this respect, Williams fell into the same hole as all the other playwrights before him: compromising his work for the sake of commercial success.

I had already started on this thesis when I got the chance to direct *Cat*. I saw it as an opportunity to make something different, not just a traditional literary analysis. I do not know how many times I have regretted

that decision. I have realized time and time again that purely literary thesis would have been much simpler and more over, it would have been finished ages ago. The reason why this thesis took two years to finish is very simple. For two years I have thought and doubted every decision I had made in the process of directing to play, dissecting each decision and trying to find reason behind them. It has been a very long process of self-evaluation and criticism. More than once I have stopped writing for weeks, because I was so tired of thinking about the same thing and constantly questioning myself. During the process I got used to questioning my decisions, since I directed for the first time and really did not have any idea what I should do.

The questionnaire was definitely a good idea. It was intriguing to see how the audience saw the play and the characters relationships. I was quite satisfied with the result and felt that I had, for the most part, succeeded in putting forth my ideas of the play, the ideas that I felt were originally Williams'. In some respects the answers surprised me and as I noted earlier, it would have been interesting to analyze the answers in connection to different performances. It would have been worth a study if some answers, which differed much from each other were from different performances.

When I commenced this project I never thought it would have drained me of so much energy. It has definitely been a learning experience about myself. More than anything I have had to think about my own morals and attitudes towards, for example, homosexuality. The concept of masculinity still remains a mystery to me. I do not know what is meant by a modern man and what is my place, as a man, in this society. There has not been enough attention paid to the men's liberation movement. Have men been liberated or is it just that we have been robbed the position in this society and not given anything back. Men can no longer be that providers, but we have not been given a new position. Men just have to balance between being masculine, but still soft and understanding, firm, but not restricting. Very confusing, which, in my opinion, explains why mental problems are increasing in our society.

After reading all the material and concentrating on the history of gay liberation movement, I thought that nowadays attitudes are so much different and better. At the moment, in autumn 2001, the Finnish Parliament

is debating on whether gay couples should have the right to marry or make their relationship legally binding. The comments that I read in the press or hear on the radio have totally made me depressed. Attitudes have definitely stayed the same for a hundred years. I hope that thesis could give evidence that there is still people, who are not afraid of the different, the dissident, the queer. Gay means happy, in the dictionary too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Ackerley, J. R. 1999. *Prisoner of War*. London: Penguin.
- Ackerley, J. R. 1999. *Spring Cleaning*. London: Penguin.
- Albee, Edward 1962. *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*. London: Penguin Plays.
- Bigsby, C. W. E. 1992. *Modern American Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloom, Harold ed. 1987. *Tennessee Williams*. New York: Chelsea House.
- Boal, Augusto 1979. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. London: Pluto Press.
- Brecht, Bertolt 1957/1990. *Brecht on Theatre. Development of an Aesthetic*. London: Methuen Drama.
- Bristow, Joseph 1997. *Sexuality*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, Colin 1987. *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit in Modern Consumerism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chauncey, George 1994. *Gay New York*. New York: Basic Books.
- Clum, John M. 1994. *Acting Gay*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cooper, James Fennimore 1828. *Correspondance*. in Grimstead, David 1968.
- Coward, Noël 1925. *Three Plays*. London: Benn.
- Curtin, Kaier 1987. *We Can Always Call Them Bulgarians*. Boston: Alyson.
- de Jongh, Nicholas 1992. *Not in Front of the Audience. Homosexuality on Stage*. London&New York: Routledge.
- Fetterley, Judith 1978. *The Resisting Reader*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott 1969. *The Great Gatsby*. London: Penguin Books
- Freud, Sigmund 1997. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. New York: Random House.
- Gledhill, Christine 1988. *Pleasurable Negotiations*. in Pribram, E. Deidre 1988, *Female Spectator*, London: Verso.
- Green, Martin 1977. *Children of the Sun*. London: Constable.

- Grimstead, David 1968/1987. *Melodrama Unveiled. American Theater Culture 1800-1850*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Grotowski, Jerzy 1968. *Towards a Poor Theatre*. London: Methuen Drama.
- Hoare, Philip 1996. *Noël Coward*. London: Mandarin.
- Hoare, Philip 1997. *Wilde's Last Stand*. London: Duckworth.
- Hyde, H. Montgomery 1972. *The Other Love*. London: Mayflower.
- Innes, Christopher 1996. *Modern British Theatre 1890-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, Esther Merle 1965. *The Synthetic Myth*. in Bloom, Harold ed. 1987. Tennessee Williams. New York: Chelsea House.
- Kinsey, Alfred C. et al. 1948. *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Krafft-Ebing, Richard von 1894/1977. *Psychopathia Sexualis*. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis.
- Mills, Sara ed. 1994. *Gendering the Reader*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester.
- Nelligan, Murray 1950. *American Nationalism on Stage: The Plays of George Washington Parke Custis, 1781-1857*. in Grimstead, David 1968.
- O'Neill, Eugene 1921/1992. *Anna Christie/The Emperor Jones/The Hairy Ape*. New York: Vintage Books/Random House.
- Pribram, E. Deidre ed. 1988. *Female Spectator*. London: Verso.
- Rattigan, Terrence 1952/1999. *The Deep Blue Sea*. New York: N. Hern Bks.
- Rattigan, Terrence 1954/1999. *Separate Tables*. New York: N. Hern Bks.
- Rattigan, Terrence 1958/1985. *Variation on a Theme*. New York: Methuen.
- Roudané, Matthew C. ed. 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Tennessee Williams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinfield, Alan 1999. *Out on Stage. Gay and Lesbian Theatre in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Spoto, Donald 1985. *The Kindness of Strangers*. London: Bodley Head.

- Symons, Julian 1975. *The Thirties*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Tansley, A. G. 1922/1985. *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Walker, Kenneth & Peter Fletcher 1955/1958. *Sex and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Wilde, Oscar 1894/1980. *Lady Windermere's Fan*. London: Benn.
- Williams, Tennessee 1945/1992. *The Glass Menagerie*. London: Penguin Books.
- Williams, Tennessee 1947/1992. *A Streetcar Named Desire*. London: Penguin Books.
- Williams, Tennessee 1948/1950. *One Arm*. New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation.
- Williams, Tennessee 1950/1999. *The Roman Spring of Mrs. Stone*. London: Vintage.
- Williams, Tennessee 1952. *Three Players of a Summer Game*. New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation.
- Williams, Tennessee 1956/1993. *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. London: Penguin Books.
- Williams, Tennessee 1963/1992. *The Night of the Iguana*. London: Penguin Books.
- Williams, Tennessee 1975. *Memoirs*. New York: Bantam.

APPENDIX 1: The Questionnaire

Hei! Olet juuri osallistumassa pro gradu -tutkielmaani, jota teen Jyväskylän yliopiston englantilaisen filologian laitokselle. Tämä kysely tulee olemaan yksi osuus gradussani ja vastauksesi tulevat toimimaan heijastuspintana omille aatteilleni. Kaikki vastaukset käsitellään nimettöminä ja jo senkin takia, että kirjoitan graduni englanniksi, vastauksia ei varmaankaan tulla suoraan sisällyttämään teoseen. Kiitän mielenkiinnostasi jo etukäteen ja kunnioitan apuasi tässä tieteellisessä urakassani.

Oletko _____mies
_____nainen

Ikäsi _____

Koulutuksesi _____

Ammattisi _____

Vastaa seuraaviin kysymyksiin niin pitkästi kuin haluat. Jatka tarvittaessa toiselle puolelle.

1. Mainitse pari mieleenpainuvinta kohtausta/Teemaa näytelmästä. Miksi nämä jäivät mieleesi?

2. Miten nämä teemat tuotiin esille näytelmässä?

3. Mikä oli mielestäsi Brickin alkoholismin syy?

4. Miksi Maggie halusi lapsen Brickin kanssa?

5. Mitkä olivat mielestäsi Brickin tunteet Maggietä kohtaan?

6. Millainen oli mielestäsi Brickin ja Skipperin suhde?

7. Miten Maggie ja Isoisä suhtautuivat Brickin Mahdolliseen homoseksuaalisuuteen?

8. Miksi Brick suhtautui niin kielteisesti vihjailuihin?

9. Miten luulet Brickin ja Maggien suhteen jatkuvan tästä eteenpäin?

KIITOSKIITOSKIITOSKIITOSKIITOSKIITOSKIITOSKIITOSKIITOS

APPENDIX 2: The Answers

1. Mainitse pari mieleenpainuvinta kohtausta/teemaa näytelmästä. Miksi nämä jäivät mieleesi?

Parhaiten jäi mieleeni toisen pojan vaimon (Saija) käynti isoisän luona, jossa hänet tyrmättiin täysin. Hänen ystävällisyytensä ja hyvää tarkoittava lähestymisensä teiltiin muutamalla sanalla ja katseella. Se liittyi mielessäni vahvasti odotuksiin ja asenteisiin joita ihmisillä on vuorovaikutuksessa keskenään. Ymmärtäminen ihmisten kesken tuntuu silkalta mahdottomuudelta!

Toinen tähän teemaan liittyvä kohtaus (tai kohtaukset) oli Maggie'n lähestymisyriytykset suhteessa mieheensä. Vain pieniä säröjä saatiin aikaiseksi, jotta kohtaamisen aloittaminen on edes mahdollista.

Henk. koht. kannanottona: näytelmässä oleva miesten ongelmien vavvominen ottaa päähään. Naiset saavat keskenään houraila hormonikierteissään, mutta miesten ongelmat ovat vakavasti otettavia, tärkeitä ja painavia asioita. Nainen edelleen ymmärtää (tai ainakin valtavasti yrittää), kuuntelee ja välittää.

(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

Isoisän ajatukset elämästä, koska ne on niin totta. Kakki kuolevat joskus ja ihminen on ainoa eläin joka sen on tiedostanut.

Vaikuttavaa oli myös [st]robovalokohta, tappelu, ehkä koska siinä aisteja ärsytettiin niin paljon. Hyvin toteutettu, aito vaikutelma.

Teemana ylipäätään ihmiselo, mitä me siltä odotamme, mitä se oikeasti on. Ihmisten kyvyttömyys puhua asioista joilla oikeasti on jotain merkitystä. Tunteistaan. Tunnevammaisuus, muiden toiveiden mukaan eläminen.

(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

1. Maggie vaihtamassa vaatteita. Puolialoston hyvärunkoinen nainen kiinnittää huomion helposti.

2. Kohtaus jossa Brick kertoi isoisälle tämän kuolevan. Jäi mieleen luultavasti sen vuoksi että isoisän tietoisuus omasta kuolemastaan ja sen aiheuttama epätoivo koskettivat. Lisäksi mielestäni hirveän laulun "Myrskyn jälkeen on p.sää..." yhdistäminen kohtaukseen teki siihen hienon kontrastin.

3. Lisäksi kohtaus jossa Brick todella korottaa äänensä Maggielle, koska se on yllättävää hänen rauhallisen käyttäytymisensä jälkeen.

(mies, 21, yo)

välinpitämättömyys, katkeruus (esim. Brick), kateus (esim. Maggie), uteliaisuus, ivallisuus

nämä jäivät hyvin mieleeni, sillä näyttelijöiden tulkinta oli vahvaa ja vaikuttavaa.

(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Brickin ja Maggien tappelu -erilainen muuhun näytelmään nähden, tosi pirstävä ja hyvin tehty. Valotehosteet tekivät kohtauksesta rajumman oloisen. Kovan hetken. Kohtaus korosti avioliiton raakuutta riidan hetkinä.

Elämän valheellisuudesta puhumisen isoisän kanssa. Teksti oli niin totta ja siksi se kosketti. Kohtaus piti ajattelemaan, haluaako itse vanhana myöntää itselleen, että on elänyt valheellisuudessa koko elämänsä.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Valheellisuus, Kaikki valehtelivat toisilleen koko ajan ja kaikesta. Ahneus. Kaikki halusivat rahaa, tilan, jne. Elämänhalu (Big Daddy, Maggie) Elämänhalun puute (Brick)

(nainen, 27, myös englantia+muut, opiskelija)

Maggien ja Brickin "keskustelu" 1. puoliajalla, Kovin todelliselta tuntui: nainen kälättää, mies kuuntelee, myötäilee.

Loppukeskustelu Brickin ja isänsä välillä oli myös vaikuttava. Varmasti on moni isä-poikasuhde tuossa kunnossa.

Teemoja olivat valheellisuus, yksinäisyys, ihon kaipuas ja rakkauden, todellisen sellaisen, nälkä ja jano.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

miehen puhumattomuus-naisen ja miehen maailman epätoivoinen yhteentörmäys

(nainen, 21, yo)

Mielestäni näytelmä sisälsi vain "yhden kohtauksen"; Aggression. Taisotn, joka söi itseään, koska aggressio söi itseään koko ajan.

Maggien katkeruus vs. Brickin inho olisivat olleet tehokkaampia, jos ne olisi irrotettu kliseisestä "huutamisesta" esim. tiedostamattomampaan tai piilo-muotoon.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

- Mikä: 1. Brickin "kilahtaminen" Maggien otettyua Skipper puheeksi
2. Isoisän paljastukset omista mielihaluistaan sdekä inhostaan omaa vaimoiaan kohtaan
3. Isoisän itsevarmuuden murtuminen epätietoisuudebn ja kuolemanpelon edessä aivan näytelmän lopulla
Miksi: 1. yllättävä kontrollin menetys, joka ei antanut ennakkovaroitusta
2. Miksi moinen "macho-sankari" ei kuitenkaan ollut uskaltanut jättää inhoamaan vaimin ja/tai haleurtua pukille jonkun haluttavan pimun kanssa.
3. Loi melkoisen vastakohtan isoisän pitkälle oman elämän hallintaa

korostavalla monologille ja näytti ulkoisesti vahvan henkilön tosellisuudessa olevan kuitenkin vallan muuta.

(mies, 24, opiskelija)

alkukohtaus/esittely (kohtaus)

-erikoinen ratkaisu erottui muista selkeästi

-se sai kiinnostumaan hahmoista

teema: rauhattomuus; viha/hätä

-kokonaisuutena se oli rauhatonta ja hieman raskasta

-vastakohtapari puuttui

(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

-taistelu strobo-valoissa

-kuolemantanssai, erottuivan kokonaisuudesta

(nainen, 24, yo-opiskelija)

Brickin juominen, koska se oli koko näytelmän ehkä yksi "pääteemoista".
Isoisän "alkupauhaaminen". Hän totisesti varasti näyttämön itselleen...

(nainen, 22, yo)

*Stropovalot~oli pakko pistää silmät kiinni~pitkän pitkä tuokio~hidastetulla
liikehdinnällä tappelukohtaus

*alun spottivaloesittelyt oli mainio! antoi odottaa paljon

(nainen, 26, hum.kand., opiskelija)

-Brickin jäätävä kylmyys..Koko näytelmän ajan mietin, mikä saakaan miehen
tuollaiseksi.

-Brickin ja isukin välinen suhde oli myös mielenkiintoinen. Katkera ja
kuitenkin välittävä.

(mies, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Kohtausta:*ekapuoliajan loppukahnaus. Tuntui, ettei istunut kokonaisuuteen

*isoisän ja pojan keskustelu oli intensiivistä ja latautunutta

*ekapuoliajalla pitkä hiljaisuus pätkä ja sen jälkeen rynkytystä, toimi hyvin

Teemoja: kuolema, homous alkoholismi

(mies, 20, ylioppilas, opiskelija)

Alun jalkapallokohtaus pysyi taustalla mielessä koko ajan.

Kun Brick kertoi isoisälle suhteestaan Skipperiin ja Maggieen.

(nainen, 24, yliopisto, opiskelija)

Brickin ja isoisän valheellisuudesta ja Brickin ja Skipperin välisestä suhteesta. Noihin teemoihin on itsekin yrittänyt etsiä vastauksia ja miettimään oman elämänsä suuntaa ja rakennuspohjaa. Varsinkin sitä, miten kaksi ihmistä voi kohdata toisensa ilman teeskentelyä ja siten, että voisi tuoda omat näkökantansa rehellisesti esiin, pelkäämättä kasvojensa menetystä muiden ihmisten silmissä. Se, että on rehellinen itselleen, mutta kuitenkin välillä sortuu itse omiin entisiin valheellisiin rakennelmiinsa, on niin helppoa ja vanhoihin uumiin.

Ja eka jalkapallokohtaus, siinä oli jotain koskettavaa. Itseasiassa näytelmässä oli monia khotia, jotka koskettivat ja välillä vähän itkettivätkin.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

-Toinen kohtaus, joka oli tavallaan Maggiein monologi Brickin ollessa läsnä. Maggie oli hysteerinen ja toi levottomasti esiin teemoja, jotka jäivät vaivaamaan mieltä.

-Brickin tilitys isoisälle siitä, mitä todella tapahtui. Jäi mieleen koska se oli sairaan hyvä (hyvin näytelty) ja valaisi asioita, miksi Brickin ja Maggie välit olivat sellaiset, mitä Skipperille oli tapahtunut, jne.

-Viimeinen biisi. Kristalliso.

(nainen, 24, yliopisto, opiskelija)

Yleensä vaikutelma/kohtaus (ennen väliaikaa) Maggiein ja Brickin välien selvitystä. Vaikuttavia kohtauksia/keskusteluita välienselvittelystä, avioliitosta, ongelmista, uskomattomat roolisuoritukset positiivisessa mielessä! Suoraa puhetta asioiden oikeilla nimillä, jes!

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Kohtauksista jäi parhaiten mieleen Brickin räjähdys isälleen (peljästyyn vallan itteki) ja ehdoton suosikkini oli ennen väliaikaa ollut Brickin ja Maggiein hidastettu pikku taistelu. Se oli superhjuva.

Skipperin ja Brickin suhde ei ihan heti paljastunut tai siis se, että mikä se juttu nyt oikeen oli mikä siihen Skipperiin liitty. Toimii hyvin tällaiselle katsojalle, joka näki näytelmän ensimmäisen kerran, eikä tiennyt, mitä näytelmä käsittelee.

(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

-Aivan alku. Hidastettu jalkapallokohtaus. Siinä oli latausta kerrakseen.

-Ensimmäinen kerta, ku Brick suuttu Maggielle. Pelkäsin ihan tosissaan, että kohta joku saa turpiin ja lujaa.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-seksin häviäminen/puuttuminen parisuhteesta; omat hlö-kohtaiset syyt!

-Brickin ja Skipperin mahdollinen homosuhde; en muistanut, että se olisi

elokuvaversiossa näin vahvasti esillä!
(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Vaikeista asioista puhuminen isän ja pojan kesken
Homous
Ensimmäisen näytöksen loppu musiikin ja valojen suhteen
(mies, 25, FM, ulkoballistikko)

Brickin ja Maggien alun keskustelu- mahtava parisuhde "selonteko" toisen roolista ja tunteista parisuhteesta ja siitä miten toinen voi tappaa toista henkisesti hiljaa
Brickin ja isoisäm keskustelu Skipperistä ja Skipperin ja Brickin suhteesta.
(nainen, 24, yo, lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Mieleen jäi parhaiten lähinnä suurin osa ensimmäisestä näytöksestä, jossa Maggie purkaa katkeraa elämäänsä Brickille.
Yksi syy tähän on Maggieta esittäneen näyttelijän hyvä ja moni-ilmeinen roolisuoritus.
(mies, 31, opiskelija)

2. Miten nämä teemat tuotiin esille näytelmässä?

Teema näyi valtavana puheen määränä, jota kukaa ei kuunnellut, alkoholin juomisena, lasten kautta elämisenä. Kaikissa mahdollisissa selviytymisrooleissa toimimisena, mitä ihminen voi elämässään käyttää ettei kipu näy.
(nainen, 35, Km, draamaopettaja)

[Miten?=Millä keinoin, vai millä tapaa?] Vuorosanoin lähinnä, tapahtumien kautta, eleiden kautta. Pistää ajattelemaan, tajuamaan, niinhän se on. Se on hieno tunne kun saa väläyksiä tajuamisesta.
(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

1. Maggie otti vaatteet pois.
 2. Brick kertoi isosisälle tämän kuolevan.
 3. Brick huutaa.
- (mies, 21, yo)

-kärjistämällä

-huumoriin sekoitettuna
-vahvana tulkintana
-tilanteiden äkillisinä vaihteluina, äänenpainoillas, ilmeillä, eleillä, asennoilla,
äänen voimakkuuden vaihteluina jne...
(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Teemart tuotiin esille pikkuhiljaa, ne selkeytyivät koko ajan niin ettei lopuksi teemojen rajaus ollut ollenkaan hankalaa. Teemojen käsittelyssä päällimmäisinä oli keskustelut.
(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Sanomalla suoraan sekä osoittamalla epäsuorasti teoilla.
(nainen, 27, myös englantia+muut, opiskelija)

Näytelmän henkilöiden väliset suhteet olivat täynnä valheellisuutta. Asioita ei asianomaisten läsnäollessa tuotu rehellisesti julki, tosin piikittelyssä vihjaistiin. Puhumattomuus ja paskanjauhaminen olivat selkeä osa näytelmää ja kuvasivat mielestäni läheisyyden kaipausta, aidon kohtaamisen tarvetta. Maggie "tiesi" asiat Brickin puolesta, kuten muutkin roolihenkilöt toistensa puolesta.
(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*ahdistavasti
*realistisesti tavallaan, vaikka ääritilanne
(nainen, 21, yo)

Inho, katkeruus tuotiin esille jatkuvalla, ja suoralla aggressiivisella puheellam, ilmeillä, eleillä, asennoilla, ja huutamisella. Lopulta tulos oli ratkeamaton ristiriita, sillä teho loppui kesken.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Vahvasti ja yllättäen; erityisesti Brickin raivostuminen yllättäen.
(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Rauhattomuus purkautui kovana äänenä ja tepasteluna. Keskustelut huudettiin.
(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

-keskutelussa, tunteiden osoittamisessa
-isoisän kohtalo, Skipperin kohtalo, Maggien ja Brickin ja isovanhempien väl. suhde
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Juominen ainakin varsin korostuneesti.
(nainen, 22, yo)

alku artoi odottaa paljon~keveyttä olisin kaivannut, siis samaa otetta, joka oli alkuesittelyssä
(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

-Brickin esittäjän suoritus oli vakuuttava, hän oli oikeasti katkera..Ja kuitenkin niin välinpitämätön
(mies, 24, kasv.yo,opiskelija)

Henkilöiden elämäntilanteita puimalla.
(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Skipper oli ollut Brickille tärkeä ihminen ja kuului tärkeänä osana sekä hänen jalkapallouraansa sekä julkisuuden ja urheilun ulkopuolella Brickin rakastettuna. Skipperin esiintuominen keskustelussa kuohutti Brickin mieltä ja Maggie käytti Skipperia myös lyömäaseena Brickiä kohtaan. Brickin avautuminen isoisälleen paljasti koko salatun totuuden.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Aika selkeästi rakentamalla teemaa kohti loppukliimaksia.
(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

(kts. 1 kysymys) Jos ymmärsin kysymyksen oikein, niin teemat epätoivo, inho, rakkaus, kuolema, jen. toistuivat väreissä, valoissa, musiikissa, lavastuksessa, tekstissä ja ilmaisussa kautta linjan toisiin tukien loistavasti.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

kts. edellinen vastaus, asia otettiin esille ns. suoraan sanottuna...selvästi ymmärrettävissä, ajatuksia herättäviä..
(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Taisin runoilla jo tonne ykköskohtaan.
(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

HYVIN. Musiikki oli vaikuttavaa ja hyvin valittua. Täydensi teemoja. Tykkäsin myös tansseista. Ne täydensi tekstiä...Vaikia kysymys.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-lavastuksessa (sänky) ehkä myös värien käyttö lavastukselle
-vuorosanat (tietysti!)
-vihjailu, ahdistuneisuus
(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Erittäin mahtavissa ja "raivoisissa" keskusteluissa!
(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Vaikea eritellä kaikkia 1. näytöksen teemoja, mutta kun ihminen on ahdistunut hän käyttää kaikkia keinoja saavuttaakseen haluamansa, niin kuin Maggie näytelmässä teki.
(mies, 31, opiskelija)

3. Mikä oli mielestäsi Brickin alkoholismin syy?

Tuskin alkoholismiin on yhtä syytä. Brickin, Maggieen ja Skipperin tapahtumat vaikuttivat monella tavoin: luottamus, menestyminen sekä miesten ja naisten väliset suhteet kulminoituvat petokseen, epäonnistumiseen ja rakkaudettomuuteen. Ihminen voi juuri yhtä hyvin/huonosti kuin hänen läheisimmät ihmissuhteensa voivat. Brickillä pahan olon helpottamiseksi auttoi viina, tilapäisesti tosin ja vain jos joi riittävästi.
(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

En ole asiantuntija. Miksi jeppe juo? Täyttääkseen tyhjän olon sisuksissaan. Mistä tyhjä olo syntyy? Rakkaudettomuudesta, petetyistä lupauksista, siitä ettei saavuta sitä mitä haluaa, siitä ettei tiedä edes mitä haluaa. Ei jaksaa miettiä, kohdata itseään. Ei tiedä kuka on.
(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Itsesyytös siitä, että hän oli lyönyt luurin Skipperin korvaan, minkä jälkeen Skipper tappoi itsensä.
Brick siis luuli aiheuttaneensa Skipperin kuoleman tai ainakin syytti siitä itseään.
(mies, 21, yo)

*katkennut side pelikamuun (Skipperiin), todellisuuteen, aitouteen, jota ei voinut saavuttaa Maggieen kanssa, jolla arvot ja tavoitteet ja ajatukset aivan

muut kuin hänellä itsellään...

*paineet ja odotukset ulkopuolelta, etenkin perheen taholta

*hajanainen elämäntilanne, paikalleen jumittuneisuus, tunnelin päässä ei vielä valoa...

(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Hän pakeni valheellisuutta ja teennäisyyttä. Hän pelkäsi omaa itseään ja sen aitoa olemassa oloa. Hän oli ehkä tajunnut itsestään asioita, jotka olivat ristiriidassa hänen "entisen" minänsä kanssa. Ehkä hän myös syytti itseään Skipperin kuolemasta.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Kyvyttömyys tunnustaa homouttaan, syyllisyys Skipperin kuolemasta.

(nainen, 27, myös englanti+muut, opiskelija)

Brickin alkoholismin syy oli oman itsensä ja rakkautensa ja kaipauksensa kieltäminen, inho itseään ja valheellista elämistä kohtaan.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Yleinen yhteiskunnan paine. Tarve työstää omat tunteet piiloon, häpeää sitä, mitä on koska niin ei kuulu olla

(nainen, 21, yo)

Kohtaamattomat tunteet, epäonnistuminen, kykenemättömyys kohdata heikkouttaan, parisuhdeongelmat, tunteettomuus, joka toimi puolustusmekanismina.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Katkeruus Maggieta kohtaan hänen ja Skipperin suhteen rikkomisesta.

(mies, 24, opiskelija)

En tiedä. Epäonnistunut ura. Homouden pelko. Ystävän menetys.

Epäonnistunut ihmissuhde. Ärsyttävät elinolosuhteet. Tai niiden sekoitus.

(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

pettymyksen unohtamisen halu

pettymys:ystävän kuolema

huonosti toimiva suhde

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Hän piti itseään syyllisenä Skipperin kuolemaan. Hän ei nähnyt elämällään mitään varsinaista päämäärää.

(nainen, 22, yo)

Jos akka huutaa koko ajan kun hullu niin ryyppäisin minäkin.

(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

Syyllisyys Skipperin kuolemasta. Olisiko hän kenties voinut tehdä jotain pelastaakseen parhaan ystävänsä.

(nainen, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Ystävän menetys, pettymys omaan avioliittoon, oma valheellisuus. Ei pysty hyväksymään itseään sellaisena kuin on. Liika ongelmien kasaantuminen eikä pysty puhumaan niistä. Brick tunsi myös syyllisyyttä Skipperin kuolemaan

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Brick halusi sumentaa itseltään ympäröivän todellisuuden ja unohtaa menneisyyden. Hän ei halunnut myöntää itselleen tosiasioita sitä että hän ei ollut "hyvä" aviomies, hänellä ja Maggiella ei ollut lapsia.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Menetetty unelma muiden henkilöiden painostuksesta ja se, että Brick ei kuitenkaan uskaltanut kohdata itseään sellaisena kuin oli.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

Brick joi tunteensa. Esim. toisessa kohtauksessa hän otti tyyneästi vastaan Maggien tilityksen ja joi. Skipperin tuominen keskusteluun sai Brickin kiihdyksiin, koska hän koki syyllisyyttä Skipperin kuolemasta. Brick ei voinut myöntää omaa rajallisuuttaan ja inhosi itseään siitä, että ei voinut enää urheilla. Ehkö hän koki, että ilman urheilua ja mitä siihen liittyy (Skipper) hän ei ole mitään. Brickin inho ja syyllisyys saivat hänet juomaan, eikä hän itsekään ehkä ymmärtänyt ja myöntänyt kaikkia sen juuria. Kuoleman pelko ja suru Skipperin kuolemasta.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Kykenemättömyys myöntämään hänen ja Skipperin välistä "ystävyyttä, ärsytys muiden puheista, luuloista, kieltäminen homoutta kohtaan...

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönhoaja)

Aivan selvä juttu (kait). Hän syytti itseään ystävänsä Skipperin kuolemasta sekä siitä ettei pystynyt hyväksymään tästä paljastuneita asioita, vaan piti niitä

Maggien aikaansannoksina.
(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Onnettomuus parisuhteessa. Elämäntarkoituksen puuttuminen.
(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-joko suhde Maggieen kanssa tai Skipperin kanssa, en osaa sanoa kumpi!
-ehkä yleisesti vain: selvittämättömät asiat
(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Homous ja se, että hän oli syypää Skipperin itsemurhaan
(mies, 25, FM, ulkoballistikko)

Sisälle padotut tunteet siitä mikä on totuutta parisuhteessa ja mikä on
normaaliutta muiden silmissä.
(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Ollako siträ mitä haluaa olla vai sitä mitä muut haluavat. Brick ei välttämättä
pystynyt itsekkään hyväksymään sitä mitä hän todellisuudessa oli tai tuns.
(mies, 31, opiskelija)

4. Miksi Maggie halusi lapsen Brickin kanssa?

Ehkä Maggie luuli niin kuin useat tuntevat luulevan että lapsi, yhteinen,
molemmista syntynyt, voisi pelastaa suhteen, jota ei oikeasti edes ole
olemassa. Että sitten voisi elää lasten kautta.

Tai sitten vain koska kunnan avioliitossa on lapsia, ympäristön
paineen edessä: elä kuin kaikki muut.

Vai halusiko hän ihmisen jossa yhdistyvät hän ja Brick, jolle hän
voi osoittaa hellyyttä, mitä Brick ei ottanut vastaan.

(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Jotta saisi perinnön eikä kuolisi köyhänä. Voihan tietysti olla että hän uskoi
Brickin selviävän ja heillä olisi lapsia.

(mies, 21, yo)

*saadakseen sisältöä elämäänsä, jotain sidettä Brickiin, joka oli välinpitämätön
häntä kohtaan

*halusi paremman aseman/valtaa perheessä tuottamalla perillisen
*ei siis lasta lapsen vuoksi
*itsekkäistä syistä siis...luuli lapsen korjaavan tilanteen...
(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Perinnön ja yhteiskunnan paineen takia. Ehkä lapsi olisi pönkittänyt hänen itsetuntoaan, jonka hän piti koossa ulkokuorensa avulla
Hän halusi taata avioliittonsa ja kelvollisuutensa ulkopuolisten silmissä. Ehkä myös huono omatunto pettämisestä oli yksi syy.
(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Todistaakseen, ettei ole huonompi kuin Mae. Yrittääkseen pitää Brickin.
Saadakseen Big Daddyn testamenttaamaan heille tilan.
(nainen, 27, myös englanti+muut, opiskelija)

Maggie halusi näyttää siskolleen ja varsinkin isoäidille, että pystyy samaan kuin muutkin "perheen" naiset. Maggie halusi ehkä myös saada Brickin kuiville ja rakastumaan itseensä uudelleen. Maggie halusi jollain lailla rankaista Brickiä.
(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*koki tulevansa hyväksytyksi vain siten - perinteinen naisen rooli
*keino saada Brick itselleen
(nainen, 21, yo)

Jäi jotenkin epäselväksi. Kateudesta siskoaan kohtaan, kuvitellusta rakkaudesta miestään kohtaan. Todellisuudessa suhde näyttäytyi riippuvuussuhteena.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Hän halusi liittää itsensä perheeseen konkreettisesti ja ehkä uskoi saavansa myös miehensä lapsen kautta puolelleen.
(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Askel johonkin suuntaan sekin olisi. Tulevaisuus yhdessä.
(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

-sosiaalinen paine
-turvallisuudenhakuisuus: lapsi olisi ollut vakuus suhteen jatkumisesta, vakuus rakkaudesta Brickiin ja Brickin rakkauden vakuutuksen saaminen
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Hän halusi muiden hyväksynnän, päästä sukuun. Lapsi olisi auttanut perinnön saamisessa.

(nainen, 22, yo)

hyväksyntää tuskaisesti janoava nainen
lapsi olisi vahvistanut hänen naiseuttaan
kälyn lapset piilotetun kateuden kohteena

(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

Varmistaakseen perintönsä Isoisän omaisuudesta...

(nainen, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Että saisi hyväksyntää Brickin suvun puolelta ja pääsisi käsiksi Brickin isän perintöön,

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Hän halusi saada vahvemman jalansijan suvussa ja pyrkiä tasoihin Maen kanssa. Hän halusi myös pitää kiinni Brickistä.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Jatkaa valtataistelua heteromaailman odotusten ja roolien kautta.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

Halusi rahaa, perinnön. Halusi epätoivoisesti pitää kiinni Brickistä ja sitoa lapsella Brick itseensä. Näyttää pystyvän Maen kanssa samaan, olevansa yhtä hyvä. Maggie halusi ehkä olla muutakin kuin haluttava, halusi olla myös äiti ja elämän jatkuvan sitä kautta. Maggie ajatteli lapsen olevan ratkaisu kaikkeen, että kaikki muuttuu hyväksi lapsen avulla ja että Brick "pysyy pinnalla" ja "kiinni" lapsen avulla, ja että Maggien oma elämä selviää myös.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Turvatakseen perinnön saannin...

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Pelkäsi perinnön menetystä, ei jaksanut enää kuunnella suvun juttuja hedelmättömyydestä ja ennen kaikkea halusi syyn pioträä Brick luonaan.

(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Luulisinpa, että ainoastaan hehtaarien takia, vaikka taisi kuitenkin rakastaakin Brickiä omalla oudolla tavallaan.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-isoisän perinnön takia tai ehkä myös, kun Brickillä oli pullo niin Maggiein halusi jotain ja ehkä Maggie toivoi myös suhteen paranemista lapsen myötä
(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Hän halusi varmistaa perinnön saannin.
(mies, 25, FM, ulkolistikko)

Pitääkseen Brickin itsellään ja todistellakseen homoseksuaalisuutta vastaan.
(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Puhdistukseen oman ja Brickin "maineen".
(mies, 31, opiskelija)

5. Mitkä olivat mielestäsi Brickin tunteet Maggieta kohtaan?

Mielestäni Brick rakasti Maggiea, mutta liian paljon oli tapahtunut, että lähestyminen olisi mahdollista, ainakaan kovin nopeasti ja tuskastomasti. Ne ihmiset, joita rakastaa eniten, pystyvät aiheuttamaan sen suurimman pettymyksen, raivon ja vihan kuten Brickin ja Maggiein tapauksessa.
(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

Vaikutti ettei tunteita juuri ollut, tunteettomuus on paljon pahempaa kuin se että tuntee edes jotain, kun tuntee, tietää edes olevansa elossa. Maggie rasitti Brickiä koska ei jättänyt häntä rauhaan, koska pakotti hänet keskustelemaan. Silti Maggie ei saanut Brickiä avautumaan.

Miksi Brick makasi lopussa Maggiein kanssa? (vai makasiko edes) Kaipasiko hänkin läheisyyttä, tuskin. Vai tahtoiko vaan olla Maggielle mieliksi. Tuskin hän Maggieta vihasi.
(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Halveksunta siitä mitä Maggie oli tehnyt Brickille ja etenkin Skipperille. Lopussa Brick kuitenkin ikäänkuin vihjasi toivovansa että Maggie rakastaisi häntä oikeasti. Eli pohjimmiltaan hän (ehkä) rakastikin Maggieta.
(mies, 21, yo)

*periaatteessa melko halveksuva ja välinpitämätön mutta välittää hänestä

pohjimmiltaan...syvällä sisimmässään...

*toisaalta hän oli ottanut Maggien vaimokseen myös siksi, että hän oli simpsakka pimpu, jollainen, joka jokaisella miehellä tulisi olla

*oli tilanne mikä hyvänsä -paineet ulkopuolelta...

(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Brick oli inhon vallassa itsensä kanssa ja siksi hän inhosi ja oli välinpitämätön myös Maggieta kohtaan. Ehkä Maggie oli myös asia, joka herätti kaikki Skipperin kuolemaan liittyneet kipeät tunteet. Siksi hän kohteli Maggieta todella ala-arvoisesti.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Viha ja syytös Skipperin kuolemasta. Kai Brick kuitenkin jollain tavalla raksti Maggieta, oli riippuvainen tästä, halusi häntä, mutta kosti.

(nainen, 27, myös englanti+muut, opiskelija)

Hänestä kuvastui inho Maggieta kohtaan ja toisaalta itseään kohtaan, että oli nainut Maggien. Brick oli selvästi kyllästynyt Maggien jauhamiseen ja nalkutukseen. Toisaalta Brick piti jollain tasolla Maggiestä.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*Maggie oli kulissi - tilanteen hirveys muistutti aikaisemmasta onnesta

(nainen, 21, yo)

Välinpitämättömyys. riippuvuus. Kykenemättämyys irrottautua totutusta, turvallisesta kotiasetelmasta.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Katkeruus. Tahtoi kostaa olemalla välinpitämätön.

(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Ärsytti lähinnä. Vanha himo.

(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

Kiintymys jossain syvällä, mutta turhautuneisuus, halveksunta peittivät sen.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Hän tunsi Maggieta kohtaan lähinnä sääliä ja halveksuntaa.

(nainen, 22, yo)

Turhautuneet, turtuneet, kuitenkin oli onnellinen Maggien huolenpidosta.
(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

-Inho, halveksunta, välinpitämättömyys. Osittain myös pelko siitä, että Maggie näkee juomisen taakse.

(nainen, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Hän ei justinsakaan rakastanut Maggieta.

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Inho, koska Maggie ei ollut se henkilö, jotra kohtaan hänellä oli syvimät tunteet. Toisaalta Brick oli myös alistunut asemaansa aviomiehenä, koska ei voinut myöntää itseleen todellisia tunteitaan.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

-välinpitämättömyys

-pelko

-viha

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

Varmaan joskus Brick oli rakastanut (tai ollut ihastunut tai luullut rakastaneensa) Maggieta. Brick inhosi nyt Maggieta, koska hän oli liannut Skipperin ja Brickin suhteen, laittanut Brickin sanojen mukaan homoseksuaaliset ajatukset Skipperin päähän, ja pilannut kaiken. Brick halveksi Maggieta, eikä heillä ollut mitään yhteyttä. Brick ei voinut myöntää, että Skipper oli ollut hänen tosi rakkautensa, joten välinpitämättömästi roikkui suhteessa mm. perheen takia. Ja siksi, että Brick oli jo kuollut Skipperin mukana.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Toi ilmi inhoa Maggieta kohtaan, mutta oliko inho sittenkään Maggiesta johtuvaa, lopussa tilanne kuitenkin läheisempi heidän välillään...

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Hän inhosi tätä, tai ainakin luuli inhoavansa, koska syytti tätä asioista, jotka olivat osin hänen omaakin syytään.

(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Kai lähinnä ystävyyttä - kiintymystä. Brick oli tottunut Maggien läsnäoloon.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-rakkaus/viha suhde
(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Välinpitämätön.
(mies, 25, FM, ulkoballistikko)

Pakkoavioliitto, koska Brick ei voinut tuoda julkisesti ilmi oikeita todellisia tunteitaan, jotka liittyikin Skipperiin.
(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Brick ei varmaan tarkkaan itsekään sitä tiedä.
(mies, 31, opiskelija)

6. Millainen oli mielestäsi Brickin ja Skipperiin suhde?

Koska en ole mies, en voi tietää miltä tuntuu kahden miehen syvä ystävyys. Naisena tiedän, että ystävyys naisen kanssa voi olla 'turvallisesti' myös fyysistä. Miesten lämpämpiä keskinäinen ystävyys on pakko naamioida 'selkään hakkaamiseen', 'futishalailuihin' tai 'käännitunnustuksiin'. Ehkä Skipper ja Brick eivät itsekään osanneet määritellä suhdettaan ja olivat epävarmoja yhdessä ja erikseen suvun painostus niskassaan.
(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

Se jäi hieman avoimeksi. Luulisin, että heidän välillä oli muutakin kuin vain platoninen ystävyyssuhde. Ei platoninen, vaikka he taistelivat sitä vastaan. Tai ehkä Brick puhui totta, ehkä vain Skipper oli hänestä kiinnostunut, ehkä Brick ei kyennyt sitä hyväksymään. Tai sitten ei kyennyt hyväksymään omaa homouttaan.
(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Lievästi "normaalia" miesten välistä ystävyyssuhdetta syvempi. Hienoista homoseksuaalista latausta. Riipuen tietysti ihmistyypistä. Eihän kaikilla miehillä ole koskettelukammos miespuolisia ystäviään kohtaan, mutta sitä on vaikeaa uskoa kahdesta jalkapalloilijasta.
(mies, 21, yo)

-vahva ystävyys, jossa he pystyivät jakamaan kaiken

-ihmisiä, jotka arvostivat toisiaan, joilla oli helppoa ja luonnollista olla toistensa seurassa
-heillä ei ollut mitään ulkopuolisia paineita, odotuksia toistensa suhteen
-jotain todellista elämää, ei pinnallista liittoa kuin perheen touhu
(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Aito, vaikea ja erilainen. Mielestäni se oli syvä ystävyysuhde.
(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Todennäköisesti aika normaali, mutta kuitenkin hieman homoseksuaalissävyytteinen. Asiasta tuli ehkä isompi kuin se olikaan, kun kaikki alkoivat siitä puhua.
(nainen, 27, myös englantia+muut, opiskelija)

Ilmeisesti heillä oli luottamuksellinen ja läheinen suhde, myöskin fyysinen suhde.
(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*läheinen, ei B. varmaan itsekään ollut enää selvillä, mikä se oikein oli
*naisille hyvin läheinen suhde olisi tuolloin ollut normaalimpaa - miehillä heti kieroutunutta
(nainen, 21, yo)

Ystävyys, jonka ympäristö määritteli "väärin". Tuomitsevasti. Mielestäni näytelmässä ei paneuduttu oleellisiin kohtiin ihmissuhteissa...toisto lisäsi turhautuneisuutta loppua kohden.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Rakkaussuhde, mutta ei seksuaalisessa mielessä.
(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Syvä ystävyys, johon liittyi urheiluun usein liittyvä fyysinen ihailu.
(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

Ystävyys, jossa on koettu AITOJA tunteita, AITOA kohtaamista. Ei silti sulje pois homoseksuaalisia tuntemuksiakaan.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Skipperin tunteet olivat ilmeisesti enemmän kuin pelkän ystävän tunteet.

(nainen, 22, yo)

Syvä ystävyys, johon on saattanut kuulua seksuaalistakin virettä ja mikäs siinä. Ei vaan sopinut baseball-pelaajan pirtaan, eikä liioin näytelmän kirjoitusaikaa~suuri juttu aikanaan.

(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

Parhaita ystäviä, aina yhdessä. Skipper tunsu vetoa myös kaveruutta vahvemmin. Ehkäpä myös Brick joskus (joissain tilanteissa) epäili omaa seksuaalisuuttaan.

(mies, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Jäi jonkinlaiseksi kysymysmerkiksi itselleni.

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Skipper oli Brickin todellinen rakastettu. Skipper ei ollut ehkä suhtautunut Brickiin yhtä vakavasti, joten ehkä Brick oli hieman pettynyt suhteeseen.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Syvä ystävyysuhde, joka juonsi alkunsa ajasta, ennen kuin naiset ilmestyivät kuvioihin. En tiedä oliko se välttämättä homosuhde. Ehkä se muiden mielestä oli tai heidän kontrolloikeinonsa Br icken tai kenen tahansa muun hieman sosiaalista "poikkeavaa" käyttäytymistä kohtaan. Brick ehkä oli pakotettu suhteeseen, johon hän ei ollut valmis tai ei edes halunnut, liian aikaisin.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

He rakastivat toisiaan, mutta eivät halunneet myöntää sitä. Skipper kuoli ja sitten oli liian myöhäistä. Brick analysoi hommaa vasta liian myöhään.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Läheistä ystävyyttä, ehkä enemmänkin Skipperin suunnalta, negatiivista latausta Brickin suhteen asiaan...

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Brick piti Skipperiä ystävänä, Skipperillä oli muunlaisiakin tunteita, joita Brick ei niiden selvittyä voinut hyväksyä.

(nainen, 24, metsätalouinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Syvä ystävyysuhde - rakkauttaa...sielunveljeys.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-vaikea sanoa, aika epäselvä, ilmeisesti kiellettyjä tunteita ja asioita, joita olisi pitänyt selvittää

(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

He olivat hyviä ystäviä.

(mies, 25, FM, ulkolistikko)

Enemmän kuin ystävyys. Jotain todellista, puhdasta kiintymystä toiseen, rakkautta.

(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Rakkaussuhde, jossa myös seksuaalista latausta.

(mies, 31, opiskelija)

7. Miten Maggie ja Isoisä suhtautuivat Brickin mahdolliseen homoseksuaalisuuteen?

Maggie kadehti Skipperiä (ja Brickiä) koska heidän välillään oli jotain aitoa. Hän rakasti Brickiä eikä saanut rakkaudelleen vastakaikua ja kuihtui. Hän uskoi mielestäni vahvasti Brickin homoseksuaalisuuteen, halusi uskoa, sillä se selitti miksi Brick ei (enää) halunnut häntä, vaikka hän yritti kaikkensa. Isoisä oli yllättävän rento, tahtoi ehkä vaan, että hänen poikansa paranee alkoholismista, muulla ei niin väliä.

(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Isoisä ainakin kuulutti olevansa avarakatseinen. Maggie suhtautui siihen negatiivisemmin, uhkana.

(mies 21, yo)

Epäolevästi, ehkä hieman katkerasti, Maggielle etenkin se oli kova pala, häntä vahvasti loukkaava.

Isoisä suhtautui ennakkoluulottomasti, hieman ymmärtäväisestim kuitenkin epäonnistuen.

(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Isoisä tuomitsi, mutta Maggien motiivina vastustaa oli ennemminkin se, ettei hän itse ollut keskipisteenä. Hän halusi olla se yksi ja ainoa, jota Brick

haluaa. Isoisä ei ehkä siksi hyväksynyt, että sellainen olisi ollut häpeä hänelle.
(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Maggie oli kateellinen Skipperille koska halusi Brickin itse. Big Daddy ei tuntunut paheksuvan sitä niin paljon kuin olisi voinut odottaa. Enemminkin hän inhosi juomista. Mutta kuitenkin "kaikki ei ollut aivan kunnossa" tms. toteamus todisti ettei se ollut hänestä ihan ok.
(nainen, 27, myös englanti+muut, opiskelija)

Maggie vaikutti siltä, että halusi toisaalta auttaa Brickiä, toisaalta hän inhosi Brickiä.

Isoisä halusi ymmärtää Brickiä, mutta oli aika kyvytön ilmaisemaan tunteitaan.
(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*Maggistä varmaan kaikki olisi ollut ok, jos vain olisi oma kulissa ollut pystyssä ja olisi saanut Brickistä oedes vähän
*isoisä tuntui uskovon avoimuuteen ja rehellisyyteen
(nainen, 21, yo)

Tuomitsevasti. Halveksuen.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Kohtuullisen neutraalisti, joskin Maggie jyrkemmin. Tosin onhan hän Brickin vaimo. Koki ehkä moisen mahdollisuuden kilpailija.
(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Sanoivat, että se olisi ok, mutta liian alleviivaavasti. He ehkä pelkäsivät sen mahdollisuutta.
(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

Isoisä halveksuu, Maggie? ainakin se vaivasi häntä, siitä (Skipperistä) piti puhua. M ei silti suoranaisesti näin ajatellut.
(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

He halveksivat sitä, Maggie enemmän kuin isoisä.
(nainen, 22, yo)

Isoisä oli "voittanut" "sen", joten kuoleman rinnalla homous lienee

pikkujuttu. Homousteema ylipäättään kertoo näytelmän kirjoitusajankohdasta, alkoholismia & homoutta olisi ehkä voinut hiukka tuoda tähän päivään?! Maggie oli epätoivoisesti hyväksyntää ja läheisyyttä janoava nainen ~ kaipasi Brickin hyväksyntää. Taustalla varmaan sekä Maggie, että isoisä ovat epäileviä temasta.

(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

Maggie ei myöntänyt, hänen mielestään vain Skipper oli homo. Isoisä ei välittänyt?

(mies, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Maggie käytti seikkaa Brickin kiusotteluun ja kiristämiseen. Isoisä suhtautui välimittämättömästi.

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Maggie käytti hyväkseen Brickin rakkautta Skipperiin, koska menemällä sänkyyn Skipperin kanssa M saattoi loukata verisesti fyysisesti vahvempaa Brickiä.

Isoisä kehotti Brickiä myöntämään tosiasiat ja olemaan sinut itsensä kanssa.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Maggie halusi kieltää ja "korjat Brickin.

Isoisä oman rajallisuutensa ja kuoleman läheisyyden kohdattuaan hyväksyvämmän.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

Isoisä yritti puhua Brickin kanssa siitä, mutta Brick hyökkäsi heti vastaan ja isoisä meni mukaan kieltämiseen. Maggie käytti sitä aseenaan ja puukotti Brickiä aiheella. Kiristi, että suhde pysyisi kasassa.

(naine, 24, opiskelija)

Maggie koki asian normaaliksi, puhtaaksi, isoisä suhtautui myös suht rauhallisesti, mutta heidän keskusteluissaan Brick kuitenkin liioitteli asian ongelmallisuutta, latasi huonoja/negatiivisia asioita esille...

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Maggie ei ehkä loppujen lopuksi uskonut sitä todeksi, hän halusi vain saada Brickin myöntämään Skipperin homouden.

Isoisä taisi siihen jopa uskoakin, mutta suhtautui siihen kuten sanoi: avarakatseisesti. Ei ainakaan paheksunut poikansa mahdollisia taipumuksia.

(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Mun mielestä hyvin. Ei mitenkään paheksuvasti eikä vanhoillisesti. Kumpikin kuitenkin rakasti Brickiä kaikesta huolimatta.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-Maggie koki sen uhkana, tietysti

-isoisä ainakin puhui, että se oli normaalia

(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

He hyväksyivät sen.

(mies, 25, FM, ulkoballistikko)

Kielteisesti, mutta suurin syy tähän oli varmasti yhteiskunnan asettamat paineet (ainakin isän koldalla).

(mies, 31, opiskelija)

8. Miksi Brick suhtautui niin kielteisesti vihjailuihin?

Katso kohta 6. Hän oli varmaan itsekkin epävarma ystävyystään Skipperin kanssa: sen tasosta ja muodosta. Epävarmuus ja muiden määrittely koskivat kipeään paikkaan. Brick oli epävarma siitä, mirtä saa ja mitä hänen kuuluu tunrtea, samoin siitä, mitä Skipper lopulta ajatteli.

(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

ks edellä. En usko Brickin itse antaneen itsensä löytää itseään. Siis hän ei itsekään tiedä, mitä Skipperin ja hänen välillä oli muuta kuin että se oli jotaikin erikoista ja aitoa.

(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Joko hän oli niin pnaniskajuntti, että se oli hänelle kuin potku nivusiin, tai sitten hän itsekkin epäili omaa seksuaalisuutta ja halusi kieltää kaikki mahdolliset vihjaukset siihen, että olisi homo.

(mies, 21, yo)

*koska hän ei itse ollut kokenut asiaa niin, koki sen loukkaavana

*hän ajatteli toisten vihjailujen pilaavan sen ainoan asian joka oli aitoa...

*kukapa mies ei aluksi torjuisi moisia vihjailuja...

*tai ei halunnut itse uskoa sitä todeksi ja sulatteli vielä itse mahdollisuutta...

(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Ehkä hän oli kyllästynyt siihen. Vihjailu rumensi aiota ystävyyttä, ystävyyttä, jonka kuolema oli vienyt pois. Brick tavallaan puolusti Skipperiä ja suuttumuksellaan halusi pitää tämän maineen puhtaana.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Asia oli hänelle liian arka, hän ei ollut selvittänyt/tunnustanut sitä itselleen.

(nainen, 27, myös englantia+muut, opiskelija)

Hän ei ilmeisesti kestänyt homoseksuaalisuutta itsessään ja toisaalta hän kaipasi Skipperiä ja halusi unohtaa tämän.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*ei halunnut itsekään myöntää itselleen mitään

(nainen, 21, yo)

Totuus oli ehkä juuri se että suhde sisälsi homoseksuaalisuutta.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Pelkäsi niiden olevan kuitenkin totta.

(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Henkilöt ärsyttivät, tippa totuutta, ystävyuden vääristelyä. Tai vähän kaikkea.

(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

Skipper oli ollut hänelle niin tärkeä ihminen, ehkä ainoa luottoystävä. Ehkä hän toisaalta halusi peittää itseltäänkin sen, että oli kokenut myös tällaisia tuntemuksia.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Ehkäpä niissä oli enemmän perää mitä hän antoi ymmärtää... Hän ei halunnut myöntää niitä edes itselleen.

(nainen, 22, yo)

homoseksuaalisuus oli ongelma hänelle itselleen - hänen miehelle egolleen, yhteisön/yhteiskunnan odotuksille

(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

Koska hän ei voinut myöntää missään tapauksessa, että vihjailut olisivat totta. Miesten maailmassa homoseksuaalisuus on likaisinta ja iljettävintä mitä on olemassa.

(mies, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Hän ei välttämättä ollut itsekään varma suhteestaan Skipperiin. Eikä varma omista tunteistaan.

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Hänen mielestään ei ollut "normaalina" että kahden miehen välillä olisi vahva henkinen side ja että hänellä oli vahvat tunteet Skipperiä kohtaan.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Hän ei ollut prosessoinut ystävyysuhdetta loppuun ja tavallaan pelkäsi omaa 'hintteyttään', jos sitä nyt oli.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

Brick ei halunnut myöntää syytösten totuutta. Koska Skipper oli kuollut, hän ei enää edes välittänyt.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Ei halunnut myöntää olevansa homoseksuaali, tunsu syyllisyyttä Skipperin kuolemasta...

(naine, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Koska ei halunnut myöntää itselleen, että ihminen, joka oli aina ollut hänen hyvä ystävänsä heidän suhteestaan olisi jotain enemmän ajatellut.

(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Kai se oli niin arka paikka, varsinkin ku suuri rakkaus oli jo kuollut. Tuntui varmaan turhalta "ponnistella" ansian takia tai tavallaan vaikeuttaa elämäänsä.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

-hän miehisyytensä kyseenalaistettiin mutta ehkä vihjailujen taustalle oli jotain totuuden siementäkin (?)

(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Hän ei itse hyväksynyt homoseksuaalisuuttaan.

(mies, 25, FM, ulkolistikko)

Ehkä pelko siitä ettei kukaan ymmärtäisi hänen totuuttaan.
(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Hänellä oli vaikeuksia hyväksyä oma naisellinen puoli.
(mies, 31, opiskelija)

9. Miten luulet Brickin ja Maggien suhteen jatkuvan tästä eteenpäin?

Haluaisin olla optimisti ja uskoa parasta. Kyyninen luonteeni saa kuitenkin epäilemään suhteen kestävyyttä - lapsi ei taastusti ainakaan paranna asiaa. Näytelmässä oli muistaakseni lause "Haluan lahjoittaa sinulle lapsen", se saa kaikki karvani pystyyn. Skipperiä Brick ei tule unohtamaan, koska suhde jäi ikään kuin selvittämättä. Ensirakkaudet sekiä saavuttamattomat kohteet saavat mielikuvituksen kultaamaan kaikki muistot ja täyttämään jos-aukot omalla toiveharmonialla. (esim. James Dean-Kurt Cobain osasto). Eivät asiat ainakaan yhteen riitaan ja yöhön ratkea, lapsen tekoon kaikkein vähiten.
(nainen, 35, KM, draamaopettaja)

Kun haavat on revitty auki, voiko tulla enää parempaa?
En usko, että paljon mitenkään. Koska loppujen lopuksi Brick ei tiedä, kuka on. (Kuka sitten tietää kuka on? Harva.)
(nainen, 21, yo, opiskelija)

Jos Maggie onnistuu hankkiutumaan raskaaksi, hän ehkä raihoittuu vähän ja jättä Brickin rauhaan. Brick luultavasti jatkaa ryyppäämistä ja saa tehdä sen rauhassa.
(mies, 21, yo)

ideaali: saavat lapsen, tilanne korjaantuu, kaikki on taas hyvin...
rodellinen elämä: Brick jatkaa juomistaan, kunne kuolee maksakirroosiin, Maggie jää katkeraksi lapsettomaksi leskeksi, eivätkä he eroa ennen Brickin kuolemaa...
(nainen, 25, KM, lastentarhanopettaja)

Samanlaista on niin kauan, kunnes Brick pääsee yli Skipperin kuolemasta ja ottaa elämän otteeseensa...jos ottaa. Maggie jatkaa skitsoiluaan ja Brick koittaa selvittää jokaisesta päivästä yksitellen. Jos Brick lopettaa juomisen, suhde tuskin koskaa on onnellinen. Taustalla jyllää luottamuspuola ja

katkeruus.

(nainen, 24, KM, luokanopettaja)

Voiko se jatkua? Voiko noin elää? Ehkä jos Brick selviää elämästään, suhde saattaa normalisoitua??

(nainen, 27, myös englantia+muut, opiskelija)

Luulen, että pientä lämpenemistä saattaisi tapahtua, mutta paljon töitä olisi edessä. Ehkäpä he saavat lapsen.

(nainen, 22, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

*Samalla tavalla.

(nainen, 21, yo)

Riippuvuussuhteella ei ole tulevaisuutta. Ainakaan onnellista. Siinä voi pysyä, mutta kasvuun ei ole mahdollisuutta.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Brick ja Maggie rakastelevat, Maggie tulee raskaaksi ja saa lapsen, Brick jatkaa ryyppäämistä ja Maggie nousee lapsen kautta johtohahmoksi.

(mies, 24, opiskelija)

Samalla tavalla. Ei lasta. Itsemurha. Ero. Jaa-a?

(mies, 24, fil.yo, opiskelija)

Jos B suostui rakasteluun, ehkä jotain liikettä johonkin päin oli tulossa. Riippuu varmaan siitä, luopuuko Brick ollenkaan juomisestaan ja kohtaako rehellisesti omankin vastuunsa suhteesta ja miten kauan Maggie kestää lapsettomuuden paineen.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Ehkä Maggie saa tahtonsa läpi ja he tekevät lapsen.

(nainen, 22, yo)

Samaa paskaa hamaan loppuun saakka

(nainen, 26, HuK, opiskelija)

Samanlaisena..

(mies, 24, kasv.yo, opiskelija)

Melkolailla entisellään. Brick ehkä avautuu keskustelemaan enemmän ja osallistuu hanakammin riitelyyn. Molemmat ovat tyytymättömiä suhteen laatuun.

(mies, 20, yo, opiskelija)

Samanlaisena, eivät eronneet. Brick ehkä alistui kohtaloonsa.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Luultavasti kylmän platonisena, jos lapsi syntyy, niin teeskentely ja valheellisuus jatkuu ja Brick saattaa jatkaa juomistaan ja sama sukupolvien yli periytyvä ahdistus jatkuu. Brick ehkä tajuaa tilanteen taas vanhoilla päivillään uudestaan.

(mies, 28, HuK, kirjoittaja)

Luulen, että se jatkui samanlaisena. Maggie kiristi, oli hysteerinen ja Brick välipitämätön ja alkoholisti. Jatkoivat toistensa repimistä kappaleiksi.

(nainen, 24, opiskelija)

Ehkä yrittävät perheenisäystä, keskustelevat enemmän rakentavasti ongelmistaan, yrittävät yhteiseloja paremmissa puitteissa...I hope so.

(nainen, 23, kirkon nuorisotyönohjaaja)

Tekevät lapsen, sietävät toisiaan loppuelämänsä ja joskus kopa suoriutuvat aviollisista velvollisuuksistaan. Perivät omaisuuden, mutta eivät missään tapauksessa elä onnensa kukkuloilla.

(nainen, 24, metsätalousinsinööri, METE-kartoittaja)

Jotenkin jäi sellainen olo, että se vois jatkua parempana. Haluaa kai uskoa onnelliseen loppuun.

(nainen, 25, diakoni, nuorisotyönohjaaja)

ehkäpä se paranee, kun asioista on nyt puhuttu edes hiukan avoimemmin ja selibaattikin loppui

->läheisyys suhteessa lisääntyi

->suhde paranee

(nainen, 28, yo, opiskelija)

Samoin kuin tähän saakka.

(mies, 25, FM, ulkoballistikko)

Kenties Maggie upeana yksinhuoltajana ja Brick toivottavasti irti Maggiesta ja eläen onnellisena totuuden kanssa.

(nainen, 24, yo-lähihoitaja, opiskelija)

Samaa rataa, ellei eroa tule.

(mies, 31, opiskelija)