

A Companion to
Lesbian, Gay,
Bisexual, Transgender,
and Queer Studies

*Edited by George E. Haggerty and
Molly McGarry*

© 2007 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148–5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

The right of George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry to be identified as the Authors of the Editorial Material in this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First published 2007 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

1 2007

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer studies / edited by George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry.

p. cm. — (Blackwell companions in cultural studies)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4051-1329-8 (hardcover: alk. paper) 1. Gay and lesbian studies. 2. Sexual minorities. I. Haggerty, George E. II. McGarry, Molly.

HQ75.15.C66 2007

306.76'6—dc22

2007010756

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10.5 on 12.5 pt Ehrhardt and Frutiger
by The Running Head Limited, Cambridge, www.therunninghead.com
Printed and bound in Singapore
by Markono Print Media Pte Ltd

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
www.blackwellpublishing.com

Queer Love in the Time of War and Shopping

Martin F. Manalansan IV

What's love got to do with it?

Tina Turner

Today I believe in the possibility of love that is why I endeavor to trace its imperfections, its perversions.

Frantz Fanon

It is love that can access and guide our theoretical and political “movidas” – revolutionary maneuvers toward decolonized being.

Chela Sandoval

“A Romance Like Any Other”

Love may be the idea that fuels a good part of this essay but it is a kind of love that is suffused with incongruity and paradox. This essay was finished a couple of weeks before Valentine's Day. I insisted on finishing it to be sure that I would not be accused of being complicit with the vulgar marriage of love and commerce. However, in the spirit of a playful and ironic take on love, I re-emphasize the temporal proximity between this essay and its supposed object of scrutiny and critique.

I write with two interconnected but unequal aims in mind. The initial one is to produce a symptomatic reading of the much heralded and recently lauded movie, *Brokeback Mountain*. This textual exegesis is anchored around a critique of the limits and possibilities of love as a discourse in cultural production and as a political project in progressive social change. This exegesis links the film to a broader context of cultural production under a neoliberal capitalist framework.

This reading of the cinematic text is merely a prelude to and an illustration of the more ambitious project and second aim that exceeds and bypasses the confines of this essay: the critical assessment and expansive analysis of the transformation of the cultural and political landscapes of what most people would call the American LGBT scene. My use of the acronym does not suggest a cavalier deployment of facile alignments of identities and practices. Rather, I am utilizing an umbrella term that masks

the turmoil and complications of a world on the verge of a triumphant watershed historical moment – a kind of second Stonewall – less riotous, more sedate; less urban and more suburban; less queer and more like everyone or anyone else. In short, we see a world transformed through neoliberal mainstreaming, taming or domestication of the radical potentials of queer desires, practices, and institutions.

The title, “Queer Love” is an ironic reference to the advertised “gay love” between *Brokeback Mountain*’s main characters – the ill-fated lovers, Ennis and Jack played by Heath Ledger and Jake Gyllenhaal respectively. Queer Love aims to examine Hollywood’s commodified and banal notion of love portrayed in the film. One film reviewer called it a “romance like any other,” while the film’s ad touts it as “connecting with America’s heart.”¹ Anthony Lane in his review of the film argued that *Brokeback* was less a Western movie or a gay one as it was a love story.²

One of the concerns of this essay is to examine the articulation of love and romance in the film. While it may be said that “love” is the most overused “brand name” in both mainstream and queer discourses, there has been, at least from the early 1990s on, a heightened critical assessment or an intensified “revisiting” of the concepts of love, in particular romantic love, in the humanities and social sciences. Feminists and queer theorists, most notably Lauren Berlant (1998), Laura Kipnis (2003), and Stephen Seidman (1990) among others, have placed love on the spot, creating a not too pleasant or flattering focus on this emotion and cultural practice.³ Following these thinkers, I am interested in the “turn to love,” “taking a cue from the queer cultural geographers Bell and Binnie, at this historical juncture in America.⁴ Why love? Why now? How is *Brokeback Mountain* an instantiation of the current cultural mood or climate? In what ways can we think of the film in relation to the dilemmas of our contemporary time such as war, consumption, and the struggle for rights and justice in the LGBT movement? I locate this work within this context and consider it as an intervention utilizing a critical view of “love” both as ideology and as queer practice with revolutionary potential. Thus I move through the analysis utilizing the range of recent feminist and queer critiques of love from an obfuscating ideology to a possible vehicle for establishing democratic structures and futures.

The mainstreaming of the LGBT cultures and politics anchors this essay and the entire project. In my previous work, I emphasized the ways in which race has become the casualty of gay and lesbian mainstreaming and complicity with neoliberal forces such as the state and private enterprise.⁵ I have elsewhere argued that the disappearance of race is more often than not hidden under the call for color blind objectivity and universality. Today, the critiques of identity politics, the veiled assessments of postmodern theory, and the emergence of the queer liberal have been mostly understood in terms of a natural cultural and political maturation.⁶ Various efforts toward eliminating what has been called “political correctness,” the re-emphasis on the empirical and the “material” may all seem to be unrelated; but I would argue that in fact these transformations, particularly those in the academic factory, can be partly traced to the re-consolidation of white cultural, economic, and political privilege and the parsing out of race, class, ethnicity, gender and sexuality into manageable marketing niches. I do not intend to fully describe the emerging contours of the current intellectual debacles. The insistent demand mostly from the Bush government and conservative university officials for a return to Cold War-like research arrangements,

particularly in the traditional area studies and in American studies, is an indication of this shifting volatile climate.

First, I don my surgical gown and flay open the film's symbolic carcass. In the following section, I focus on the reception and dissemination of the film as well as the internal textual construction of themes, figures, and contexts. Then, I move to a broader consideration of the film in relation to current cultural productions and political contexts. I argue how the film is symptomatic of the neoliberal machinations of the movie industry and the mass media, and how it is part of what Lisa Duggan has called the homonormative transformation of the LGBT movement.⁷ In other words, the film is complicit with the market mainstreaming and domestication of the radical potentials of queer politics through its elicitation of and gestures toward tragic bourgeois love. Finally, as a way of concluding, I suggest a reading of alternative potentialities in the film and briefly reflect on the alternative and more progressive notions of love brought forth by more critical scholars and pundits.

“High Altitude Fucks”: Cowboy Love and the Colonizing of Time and Space

If *Brokeback Mountain* is both a prototypical “romance” or a “romance like any other” (as one reviewer labeled it), then it is also a quintessential textual embodiment of neoliberal doctrines and practices. The fact that *Brokeback* is a typical romance may seem to be a banal assertion as well, but the movie's banality does not make it harmless or uninteresting particularly in terms of how the manipulation of the romance genre makes possible the domestication of difference and the privileging of whiteness in accordance to neoliberal cultural politics.

Set amidst the soaring heights of Wyoming sheep country, the story of Jack and Ennis sheds a curious light on the uses of American icons such as the cowboy. The cowboy as the main figure of the film has been fodder for some minor debate as one newspaper account suggested that the two main characters were in fact herders and not cowboys. Herders? Cowboys?⁸ What's in a name? Perhaps, I suggest, a whole continent. In the original short story by Annie Proulx on which the film was based, there was mention made of a Chilean herder who was tending another flock of sheep in the surrounding mountains.⁹ In the movie, we see the fleeting glimpses of Chilean herders marked by their different dress and their rapid fire Spanish conversations. The two main characters are iconically set apart from these herders not only by their whiteness but by their dress and their paradigmatic frontier masculinity. This iconic separation also gives way, as I will show further below, to a temporal and spatial hierarchy between the white protagonists and racialized others.

The distinction made between herder/shepherd and cowboy in the popular reception of the movie sets the stage for the naturalizing and racializing of difference, the valorization and gendered coding of whiteness, and the temporal marginality of people of color. This was clearly marked in the marketing of the film. Indeed the cowboy has long-standing valence in the American popular imagination and its deployment, rightly or wrongly, in the film is nevertheless an instrumentalist one as it

inscribes an always already “natural” masculinity onto the two main characters. The word and figure of the “herder” was rarely if at all used for these characters particularly in the advertisement – a “herder” or “shepherd” love story does not sell tickets nor tug at America’s heart more than a “cowboy” one.

Much has been made of Ennis, the Heath Ledger character whose taciturn ways, concise and measured gestures establish an uber-remote, forlorn yet ultimately attractive manliness – an ideal personality for the rough terrain and landscape. It is this measured stance and icy nobility that smooth the edge of the high altitude amorous tussles of Ennis and Jack. Their unquestioned masculinity coupled with their geographic and temporal isolation renders the story palatable by framing it within a traditional romantic trajectory.

The social theorist Anthony Giddens suggests that romance is about colonizing of time, particularly the future. Giddens suggests that the realization of romance is through women’s (who are romance specialists) manipulation and attempts to control the trajectory of the love process and project it to some foreseeable future of happiness and bliss.¹⁰ Giddens argues that this is an instrumentalist strategy on the part of women to enable them a measure of autonomy in a world that has otherwise marginalized them. I depart from Giddens’ narrow notion and deploy colonization with its original and more expansive imperial connotation – of subjugating minoritized colored subjects and spaces. It is precisely this idea of colonization in its broadest sense that reins my analysis.

In the film, the romance between Ennis and Jack is framed as being “private” business between two men. Protected by landscapes of bubbling brooks and majestic vistas, the scenery gives way to timelessness emblematic of popular romance stories as well as to privatized notions of intimacy. Literally and figuratively, Ennis and Jack are away from it all, from the turmoil of everyday life (including women, family, and colored people) and from the messiness of history. This historical and cultural isolation is at the core of the narrative. Ennis and Jack’s romance is rendered first as a private struggle to go about their own business, albeit eventually futile, then it reverts to a fairy-tale shunning of worldly time.

The shielding of the story from the bedlam of history is clear when the film marks the beginning of each phase of the lovers’ story with calendar years. It starts with the early 1960s and moves toward the 1970s in this mindless slow crawl, avoiding such historical landmarks as the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, explorations of the moon, and the sexual revolution, among others. Indeed, it is as if Brokeback’s geological formations made it possible for Jack and Ennis to wage their private yet bucolic war without regard to the challenges of history and at the expense of difference.

The idea of colonizing time is crucial to the romance narrative because it enables audiences to see these two cowboys as universal figures in love as well as a “palatable” pair who have no regard to the historical underpinnings of their actions. However, Ennis and Jack are not unique in their situation. I think of other lovers less fortunate who are located in other sites and times. Consider the fact that men “loving” men, or at least having sex with each other, who do not identify as gay have existed long before and even long after the fabled Stonewall moment that ushered in an era of politicized gay identification.

Queer Love in the Time of War and Shopping

In the 1980s, during the height of the AIDS pandemic, the Centers for Disease Control after being influenced by activists and scholars established a category called MSM or men who have sex with men; a group that has disentangled practice from identity was seen to be quite anomalous in relation to the prevailing idea of that time. In most cases, these men were from immigrant and/or communities of color. More recently, there are a lot of alarming and sensationalized accounts of African American men, mostly working-class and masculine or straight-acting who indulged in sexual relations with each other. They are called DL or down low. Both groups of men – the MSMs and the DLs – are marginalized men who have been lumped by the popular media into a category that portrays them as anachronous beings, subjects out of time and out of synch with the modern world. Oftentimes, they are seen to be vestiges of tradition, lagging behind in the march toward sexual and gender cosmopolitanism. At best, they are victims of cultural norms in need of education and rescue. At worse, they are internally homophobic, self-hating imposters getting the best of both worlds. Both DLs and MSMs are failed racialized masculinities that are placed in a subordinate and marginal location in the taxonomy of “manhood” and in an early development stage in the teleology of modernity.

I would argue that the *Brokeback* lovers are not rendered in the same way as the MSMs and DLs. Rather, unlike their colored counterparts, Jack and Ennis do not exist in historical time but in romantic time. The *Brokeback* lovers do not need to follow a specific chronology or developmental trajectory. Neither are they subject to a hierarchy of personhood and identity. Their insulation or protection is made possible through a series of moves constructed upon difference, the hierarchy of racialized spaces and location of bodies of men of color bodies.

In the movie, Jack, the Jake Gyllenhaal character, goes to a Mexican border town where in one scene he walks amidst the squalor and din of another cultural space. He enters an alley where Mexican men lean in the shadows. Jack approaches a man who is not legibly masculine and this man says questioningly “Señor?” and Jack nods. They then move together and are engulfed by the darkness. This incident will resonate in the pivotal and final scene between the two when Ennis, the Heath Ledger character, enraged that Jack goes to Mexico for such purposes, says “I know what they got in Mexico for boys like you.”

The inevitable coding of Mexico as a space of deviance and as the antipodal location to the Wyoming lair (filmed of course across the northern border – Canada), rests on the very construction of these lovers as classically tragic – virtually alone in their own pristine temporal and cultural space. Their romance is literally and figuratively elevated by the whiteness of the space and memorialized in an immaculate postcard. Mexico stands in contrast to *Brokeback*’s whiteness, serenity, full of light, and visually expansive. Not only is it racialized as brown, it is chaotic, dirty, dim, narrow, and claustrophobic – brimming with history’s detritus.

I would argue that this spatial and temporal colonization works to bring to audiences a neoliberal portrait of a gay love story. This neoliberal portrait is based on a privileged form of market-generated individualism that operates on ideas of universalism and similitude that are established at the expense of economic and racial inequalities. In other words, we are afforded a heroic and redemptive tragedy made possible through the elision of gender, racial, class, and ethnic differences. While people would argue

that Ennis is perhaps the epitome of white working-class or white-trash culture, this marginalized status is offset by the privilege afforded by his whiteness.

Whose War? Which War?

To go further with this argument, it is important to frame the movie in relation to its location in present-day cultural productions. The movie is not a unique feature of the contemporary queer moment. In fact, it stands aligned with other similar cultural products that are “of the queer moment” such as *Queer as Folk* and *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*. In an earlier essay, I argue that mainstream gay cultural productions such as these shows are complicit with the normalizing of the queer community.¹¹ To further elucidate this contention, it is important to note that neoliberal processes are constituted by a particular kind of sexual politics that Lisa Duggan has rightly called homonormativity.¹² Homonormativity is a chameleon-like ideology that purports to push for progressive causes such as rights to gay marriage and other “activisms” but at the same time it creates a depoliticizing effect on queer communities as it rhetorically re-maps and re-codes freedom and liberation in terms of privacy, domesticity and consumption. In other words, homonormativity anesthetizes queer communities into passively accepting alternative forms of inequality in return for domestic privacy and the freedom to consume.

In the previously published essay, I describe how homonormativity creates violent struggles around urban space by queers of color. These forms of violence are characterized by their structural character spawned by neoliberal economic, political and cultural policies and practices. By structural violence, I mean the informal and formal processes by which institutions that promote what social theorist Roderick Ferguson has called “ideologies of discreteness” or practices that seek to demarcate and police racial, ethnic, class, and sexual spaces and boundaries at the same time create physical, emotional and symbolic brutalities and cruelties toward marginalized peoples.¹³

This kind of violence causes the transformation of the built environment including the eradication of spaces imbued with meanings that coalesce around marginalized identities. For example, Samuel Delany eloquently chronicled how new urban policies around Times Square have created new forms of policing that transformed not only the architectural landscape or built environment but also altered the lifeways of numerous groups of people of color that used to hang out on the sidewalks and corners of the area for sex, leisure, and other forms of commerce.¹⁴ Not only are these groups spatially disciplined but they are also sequestered at a safe distance and are typically dispersed when they are seen to be a “nuisance” or are suspected of causing public annoyance or disturbance particularly to patrons and owners of new swank businesses.

To underscore the insidious ways in which homonormativity is inscribed in hegemonic discourses and participates in these ideologies of discreteness, I suggest that established authorities and institutions such as police and city government are not the only perpetrators of this form of neoliberal violence, but they also include a motley crew of mostly white gay scholars from both sides of the political spectrum. I argue that the insidious forces of homonormativity encompass political affiliations of all

sorts. In her critique of gay pundits like Andrew Sullivan, Duggan argues not for dividing homonormative ideas in terms of conservative and progressive camps but rather in framing these seeming political extremes as part of a continuum of ideas and their proponents that are all complicit with the stabilizing and normalizing of specific forms of capitalist inequality.¹⁵

To illustrate Duggan's point, let us take a recent example. In *Queer Wars: The New Gay Right and Its Critics*, literary scholar Paul Robinson focuses on conservative gay pundits such as Sullivan, Michelangelo Signorile, and others to take issue with these gay men's attempts to derail or prevent a more progressive gay future.¹⁶ In other words, Robinson is declaring, there is a war – a queer war and the enemy is the rogue group of conservative gays. While Robinson contributes very astute observations, he makes a disturbing final move when he shifts from discussing these gay commentators to a discussion of the cable show, *Queer as Folk*. In the final section, he holds up this show of upper-middle-class white gays and lesbians living in Pittsburgh (again, the actual filming location is Toronto – across the border) as an antidote to the gay conservative poison. In other words, he holds the friendships and romantic love that circulate between the members of this group as a possible redemptive script to the retrograde positions of the thinkers he has just analyzed. Robinson then is taking this privileged group obsessed with and having unbridled access to the amenities and products of gay market to be the exemplar of queer life.

Robinson is by no means alone. There are many others (of all political persuasions) heeding the now emerging call for “color-blindness” within the gay community and in the larger community. This call is based on the increasing privatization of gay struggles. For example, shows like *Will and Grace* and *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* enable the parsing of identity wherein freedom to be gay is mobilized through the specific operations of niche and racialized marketing.¹⁷ The emergence of the term “metrosexual” as part of this cultural assemblage illustrates this point. The metrosexual is not at all about sexuality but about “informed” shopping. Following this logic, to be gay and to be free in the contemporary moment means to wear Prada.

The market is so constructed to be the filter of freedom that dominant discourses in the gay community disregard how this kind of freedom is predicated on the abjection of other groups of people who are not free to consume and do not have access to these symbolic and material forms of capital. Therefore, if one were to construe the free market as a kind of competitive arena or war zone, then, the unnamed enemy in neoliberal warfare is not as varied as the proclivities and activities of diverse groups of activists and politicians might suggest. Rather, closer inspection of what is seemingly a chaotic assemblage of political culprits fuses into the figure of the female and feminized, the foreigner, the colored, and the poor. In other words, queers of color and women are at the crux of veiled homonormative rhetorical machinations of mostly white gay commentators and scholars.

Brokeback Mountain then is a palatable product made possible through the eradication or muffling of colored and female bodies and voices. Its market appeal is based on how it seems at first glance to create “revolutionary” changes by remaining true to the scripts of family, romance, and nation. Again, similitude is achieved at the expense of inequality. It does not disrupt anything so much so it blends right into the national landscape. For example, noted journalist and political pundit Frank Rich, in an op-ed

Martin F. Manalansan IV

piece for the *New York Times*, waxed poetic about the mainstream triumph of the film. He describes his viewing experience in this way:

In the packed theater where I caught “Brokeback Mountain,” the trailers included a National Guard recruitment spiel, and the audience was demographically all over the map. The culture is seeking out this movie not just because it is a powerful, four-hankie account of a doomed love affair and is beautifully acted by everyone starting with the riveting Heath Ledger. The X factor is that the film delivers a story previously untold by A-list Hollywood.¹⁸

However, I do not want to make it seem that gay men, lesbians, and other queers are no more than a market niche. I would like to go against the idea of throwing love and intimacy out the window and to see the interactions of queers as not mere reactive consumptive behavior. I follow Bell and Binnie and many other queer theorists who argue for an expansive notion of love into an ethics of collective care-taking. I would push for a move away from the ideas of individual competition and responsibility into a more democratic notion of feeling – and of love.

Love is the Answer?

People today seem unable to understand love as a political concept, but a concept of love is just what we need to grasp the constituent power of the multitude. The modern concept of love is almost exclusively limited to the bourgeois couple and the claustrophobic confines of the nuclear family. Love has become a strictly private affair. We need a more generous and more unrestrained conception of love. We need to recuperate the public and political conception of love common to premodern traditions . . . Love means precisely that our expansive encounters and continuous collaborations bring us joy . . . There is nothing necessarily metaphysical about the Christian and Judaic notion of God; both God’s love of humanity and humanity’s love of God are expressed and incarnated in the common material political project of the multitude. We need to recover today this material and political sense of love, love as strong as death. This does not mean you cannot love your spouse, your mother, and your child. It only means that your love does not end there, that love serves as the basis for our political projects in common and the construction of a new society. Without this love, we are nothing.¹⁹

Modern love with all its imperfections and illusions has continually been accused of trapping people into “domestic gulags” and relationship black holes – always in a discrepant position to the institutions which have been historically linked to it such as family, home, nation, and reproduction. These discrepancies and complications have not diminished its allure. If love is the question, then is it also the answer? Some scholars seem to think so. In this case, it is love that bypasses the restrictive confines of the public/private binaries into becoming the nexus for citizenship training. Hardt and Negri provide what seems to be a surprising ending to their book. Appearing to be a quasi “sermon on the mount” meets Empire,²⁰ and despite their problematic allusion to a Judeo-Christian love, these two unlikely love purveyors do provide some useful mean in mapping out a blueprint for a democratic future. That would be a future that is not colonized by private and privatized desires and entanglements,

but those that really refuse the romance with the family and nation that restricts them only in neoliberal terms. Thus, this love is about connections for a collectivity – affects that rein in common interests and alliances. Love as a political project becomes the fuel for forging multisectoral relationships within and among classes, ethnicities/ races, genders, and sexualities.

However, my appeal for love does not amount to recuperating the film as a whole. We do not need a “romance like any other” but new forms of love motivated by collective wishes and aspirations and unscripted by heteronormative institutions. My appeal does hinge on a hopeful note. To paraphrase Bell and Binnie, this task is based on new scripts, flights of fancy, looking into “as yet unforeseen kinds of relationships” that rework what we mean by love, family, and friendship and rethink what we mean by citizenship or more appropriately, what we mean by “as yet unforeseen kinds of citizenship.”²¹

I wish to end this reading of *Brokeback Mountain* not with the iconic image that has been touted as the film’s romantic emblem – that of a shirt folded into another resting on a hanger. This object d’amour merely re-inscribes the colonizing ethos inherent in the story. I would end with an alternative reading of the scene with Jack and the nameless Mexican man walking into the darkened alley. I see them languidly traipsing not toward an abyss of a romantic elsewhere but into the heat, dirt, grime, and blaring lights of history.²²

Acknowledgments

I thank my colleagues Junaid Rana, José Capino, Ricky Rodriguez, Ellen Moodie, Siobhan Somerville, Dara Goldman, and Rick Bonus for enriching conversations. This chapter is written in memory of my father whose love encompasses the spaces of my diasporic life.

Notes

- 1 Kenneth Turan, “Brokeback Mountain,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 9, 2005; www.calendarlive.com.
- 2 Anthony Lane, “The Current Cinema: New Frontiers – Brokeback Mountain and The Chronicles of Narnia,” *The New Yorker*, December 12, 2005; www.newyorker.com.
- 3 Lauren Berlant, “Intimacy: A Special Issue,” *Critical Inquiry* 24:2 (1998): 281–8; Laura Kipnis, *Against Love: A Polemic* (New York: Pantheon, 2003); Stephen Seidman, *Romantic Longings: Love in America 1830–1980* (New York: Routledge, 1990). See also the works of ethnographers such as Laura Ahearn, *Invitations to Love: Literacy, Love Letters, and Social Change in Nepal* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003); Nicole Constable, *Romance on a Global Stage: Pen Pals, Virtual Ethnography, and “Mail Order” Marriages* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003); Linda Ann Rebbun, *The Heart is Unknown Country: Love in the Changing Economy of Northeast Brazil* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); Margaret Trawick, *Notes on Love in a Tamil Family* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990); and Ara Wilson, *The Intimate Economies of Bangkok: Tomboys, Tycoons and Avon Ladies in the Global City* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004) for culturally and historically specific studies of love and its non-western articulations. See also the works of cultural and literary scholars such

Martin F. Manalansan IV

- as David Shumway, *Modern Love: Romance, Intimacy and the Marriage Crisis* (New York: New York University Press, 2003): 1–28 and Arlie Hochschild, *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003).
- 4 David Bell and Jon Binnie, *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2000).
 - 5 Martin, Manalansan, “Race, Violence and Neoliberal Spatial Politics in the Global City,” *Social Text* 84–5 (2005): 141–56.
 - 6 David Eng, Judith Halberstam, and José Esteban Muñoz, “Introduction: What is Queer about Queer Studies Now?” *Social Text* 84–5 (2005): 1–18.
 - 7 Lisa Duggan, *Twilight of Equality: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics and the Attack on Democracy* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2003).
 - 8 Various commentaries on the matter have been made by critics and bloggers. See www.JimmyAkin.org for an example of the controversy between herder and cowboy in the movie.
 - 9 Annie Proulx, “Brokeback Mountain,” in *Close Range: Wyoming Stories* (New York: Scribner’s, 2000).
 - 10 Anthony Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992): 57.
 - 11 Manalansan, “Race, Violence and Neoliberal Spatial Politics in the Global City.”
 - 12 Duggan, *Twilight of Equality*.
 - 13 Roderick Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).
 - 14 Samuel Delany, *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* (New York: New York University Press 1999).
 - 15 Duggan, *Twilight of Equality*.
 - 16 Paul Robinson, *Queer Wars: The New Gay Right and Its Critics* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
 - 17 Dwight McBride, *Why I Hate Abercrombie and Fitch: Essays on Race and Sexuality in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2005).
 - 18 Frank Rich, “Two Gay Cowboys Hit a Home Run,” *The New York Times*, December 18, 2005, 13.
 - 19 Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: Penguin, 2005): 351–2.
 - 20 Thanks to Junaid Rana for this felicitous phrase.
 - 21 Bell and Binnie, *The Sexual Citizen*, 140.
 - 22 Thanks to Ricky Rodriguez for this insightful interpretation.