

PHILIPPINE GAY CULTURE

*Binabae to Bakla
Silahis to MSM*

J. Neil C. Garcia



香港大學出版社

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

in association with

The University of the Philippines Press

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Rd
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

© J. Neil C. Garcia 1996, 2008, 2009

First published by The University of the Philippines Press in 1996,
with a second edition in 2008

This edition published by Hong Kong University Press
in association with The University of the Philippines Press in 2009

ISBN 978-962-209-985-2

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

www.hkupress.org
secure on-line ordering

Printed and bound by Liang Yu Printing Factory Co. Ltd., in Hong Kong, China

CONTENTS

A Transgressive Reinscription	ix
Author's Note for the Second Edition	xi
Preface	xv
INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE	
<i>Philippine Gay Culture</i>	39
Chapter One	61
<i>The Sixties</i>	
Chapter Two	82
<i>The Seventies</i>	
Chapter Three	151
<i>Precolonial Gender-Crossing and the Babaylan Chronicles</i>	
Chapter Four	198
<i>The Eighties</i>	
Chapter Five	223
<i>The Nineties</i>	
Chapter Six	246
<i>Prologue</i>	

PART TWO	
<i>The Early Gay Writers: Montano, Nadres, Perez</i>	276
Chapter One	287
<i>Where We Have Been: Severino Montano's "The Lion and the Faun"</i>	
Chapter Two	334
<i>Orlando Nadres and the Politics of Homosexual Identity</i>	
Chapter Three	361
<i>Tony Perez's Cubao 1980: The Tragedy of Homosexuality</i>	
CONCLUSION	387
Philippine Gay Culture: An Update and a Postcolonial Autocritique	420
Notes	457
Bibliography	507
Index	527

INTRODUCTION

THAT PHILIPPINE GAY culture exists is an insight not very difficult to arrive at. In our country, gays may be found virtually everywhere, and what's strange is they have a distinct quality about them which is sometimes unnerving, sometimes welcome if only that it's funny. Gays speak funnily, swish their hips, and wave their broken wrists as though by doing so they are already movie stars. They claim to know one another with the help of their noses, which are especially keen in ferreting out "fishy uteruses" (*malalansang matris*) from up to five miles away. They need this skill because they say one just cannot trust appearances these days: some macho men are actually nelly little girls once the lights go out. They also have their "haunts," or places in which they gather—in loud and flaming clusters inside malls, on campuses, and in the beauty parlors which are their privileged locales because they invariably work there. Randy and misguided boys go to these parlors a lot, for free haircuts, ready cash, and something unspeakable. Gays are very vain. They try to look like women when they know they really aren't, like those impersonators that compete with each other on "Super SiReyna," a gaudy cross-dressing contest on the top-rating noontime variety show, *Eat Bulaga*. It is plain to see that all gays are pathetically fascinated with becoming real women, and with having real men as lovers and lifetime partners. Of course, they'll *never* be women, and they'll *never* find men who'll love them for who they are—which is to say, without some kind of monetary exchange or other.

Honestly, however, what everybody wants to ask is: Why are gays that way, and what on earth do they talk about when they speak in the gratingly shrill and punningly raucous way that they do?

THE SPIRIT OR “intent” of this question, though perhaps honestly curious and inquisitive, is as suspect as the preceding paragraph because it is just as impertinent and viciously condescending: And why shouldn’t gays be that way, and why do other people have to know? This study wants to avoid the self-righteousness and condescension propelling nearly all academic inquiries into the topic of gays and their “culture,” primarily by making sure the dichotomy They/Us does not become operative and thereby detract from its simultaneously academic and testimonial goal. In many ways, and to all intents and purposes, I am the loud and pathetic creature who wants to be a woman, and to have a real man as a lover, and I am undertaking this study because I want to know who I am, and why I am different from all those people I have been taught as a child are good and beautiful and true. Certainly, I make this identification—*I am the loud ...*—despite the fact that I am not really all that loud or pathetic, and neither am I that interested in having straight lovers and subjecting myself to sexual reassignment surgery. The only reason I can perfectly identify with the “garden variety” gay stereotype is that there is an undeniable sameness between us: we both are homosexuals. I am different in this difference, then, but it doesn’t quite matter because I am just as oppressed for it.

What, in the first place, is Philippine gay culture? A simple and straightforward definition is that it is the intriguing systems of signification, of “making sense of the world,” common to the majority of Filipino gays living in our country who cannot be entirely free in carrying out such a significant task. For culture may be and almost always is a response to domination, although to say that it necessarily becomes subversive and “clandestine” would not be very accurate either. Especially not in the case of our local gay culture, which is arguably a response to the dominant heterosexual and macho dispensation, but is not for this reason necessarily driven underground to become completely ulterior or subaltern, for indeed, just a cursory look reveals that it is pretty flagrant and mainstream hereabouts! That transvestites and female impersonators can become stand-up comics and entertainers in our country, and can walk the streets relatively freely without getting killed, and that we all know or have known at least one bakla manicurista, market vendor, or couturier in our clean, quiet, and pleasantly ordinary lives, quite easily prove the point that gays are not exactly a “submerged” group of people in our society. In fact, we may even venture to say that Philippine gay culture is, for

the most part, self-expression rather the societal ascription. This is something I can confidently say, as a matter of both personal and theoretical conviction, then: if oppression and normalization were truly total, then there would be no philosophical position from which we could conclude that oppression exists. It would in fact be impossible for any of us to recognize it. Nonetheless, in the case of Filipino gays, it's undeniable that oppression does exist, and its existence bids us now to study it assiduously, in order to uncover the intricacy of its inner mechanisms, and to unpack these from the inside out, up to the point of critically "voiding" them.

GAY CULTURE

In the first part of this book, I will trace the history of Philippine gay culture in the last four decades. This history will be by turns empirical and conceptual, for as I pursue the meanings of homosexuality that circulate in metropolitan culture through the sixties and up to the nineties, I will invariably be needing to go beyond this spatial/temporal plane, and into the "epistemological field" from which these very same meanings and definitions emanate. As I discuss the dominant pattern of male homosexuality as a psychosexual inversion (a view that takes homosexual males to be psychologically "inverted" females), for example, I will have to come face-to-face with a model of local subjectivity which is the Tagalog-Filipino binarized self: *loob/labas* (literally: "inside/outside"). As I attempt to explain the cultural allowance for male-to-female transvestism and effeminacy, I will be led back to narratives of precolonial and early colonial gender-crossing, as they may be inferred from the *babaylan* chronicles. Needless to say, the history of Philippine gay culture is hardly a purely indigenous narrative, as should be clear when we wade into the heady waters of the 1970s, the time when the Philippines adopted its own versions of what had been raging as a kind of "Sexual Revolution" in the United States and other parts of the West in the previous decade. Hence, we will have to implicate such neocolonial "implantations" in this study as well.

Suffice it to say that the conceptual boundaries between gay and mainstream cultures are hardly impermeable. As should be obvious to the cultural critic or "student," there is always just as much evidence that cultures are distinct as evidence that they are the same, and what probably makes a culture unique in

the final analysis is its differently permeable ability to disappear and reappear as a separate object of scrutiny against a variegated backdrop, depending on the optic through which one sees—which is to say, depending on the questions and assumptions one wishes to “see” it from.

Nonetheless, it is not true that just because my main interest is to elucidate the organizing structures underwriting gay culture (and therefore to employ a “knowledge/power” model in a discussion of its history) then it is no longer possible for me to designate to it certain empirically-arrived-at truths. For instance, the realization that most popular writings on homosexuality are actually homophobic and dismissive of it makes no necessary nullifying claim to the fact that certain fabulous events did happen and certain fabulous things did get done—for example, this or that beauty pageant for gays did take place, with this or that famous person in attendance, etc. I maintain that the empirical project of tracing gay history remains a most feasible one, especially when it is complemented by the kind of critical inquiry that seeks not universally immanent but only specifically situated “truths.”

At this point in our local and national histories, I am altogether convinced that an empirical rendering of gay culture is necessary, especially since most Filipino gays know very little about “their past.” It would indeed be nice if more and more gay researchers were to put their minds to documenting all the beauty contests, plays, parties, and all the other performances that seem to have constituted and defined Philippine gay life for the past three decades. While such a project can be dismissed for being a purely empiricist one, it nevertheless answers to the twin needs for remembrance and posterity. (It is my hope, then, that some way or other the “notes” and “bibliography” sections at the end of this book provide rewardingly in this direction.) In any case, the imperative for representation which I succumb to in this study may be said to moot the admittedly academic, albeit legitimate, concern regarding the reliability of so-called ill- or newly documented facts—“things” an otherwise purely empirical project could scarcely care about. With respect to this issue, my conviction is that most of the effeminate or bakla homosexuals whose articulations have come to constitute the more visibly documented aspects of Philippine gay culture may all be reasonably assumed to be capable of representing themselves.

The questions I will be attempting to answer in the first part of this study are as follows:

1. What are the male homosexual identities that constitute Philippine gay culture?
2. Why is there no gay liberation movement in the Philippines?

Actually, the second question should precede the former, if only because I initially posed them that way. As a gay academic and advocate, I had been one to wonder why no unified, continuous effort to organize might be observed among the gays of my generation. This query led me to inquire into just who the gays were who comprised my generation, and it serendipitously dawned on me that a kind of “conflict” exists among the ranks of urban-dwelling gays in the Philippines, who are really a variegated, noisy, and helplessly provisional “conglomeration” of people, whose inability to liberate themselves from homophobic oppression is not only because they have internalized it, but also because real forces in their lives, almost indistinguishable from who they think they are, make such alliances and “allo-identifications” difficult if not virtually impossible. When I began work on this project, it was clear to me that this has been the situation for quite a while now.

The second part of this book is my attempt to come up with a specific literary strategy to recuperate, read, and radicalize the gay writings of Severino Montano, Orlando Nades, and Tony Perez, whom I consider as three of the Philippines’ first—“early”—gay writers. It’s interesting to realize that these three male homosexual writers all lived through the harshest years of the Marcos dictatorship, which was when they experienced a productive period in their artistic lives. It goes without saying that in interpreting the production of Filipino writers and artists from this time, we must “read” their works against the backdrop of the political and ideological circumstances that could only have informed them. To be sure, these gay writers were not alone in this, for while the Martial Law regime was characterized by the generalized repression of “progressive” discourses, contrary to what might have been expected, it also bore witness to the efflorescence of urban gay culture in what was then a militaristically manacled Philippines.

PROBLEMATIQUE

This study will unabashedly begin from the assumption that it is virtually impossible to adequately represent an abject political position without occupying this position in the first place. In other words, one of the founding premises of this work is the conviction that a history of Filipino gays will not only be politically incorrect, but also profoundly inaccurate and distorted, to the degree that it is told from the point of view of somebody who is not gay.

It should, however, be added that such insistence on “authenticity” and “subject-positionality,” though admittedly smacking of academic correctness, means only to address the ostensibly political absence of gay scholars in the veritable field of research in which they should logically be found. Although it is never completely the case that knowledge—finally—turns inutile every time its provenance lies “outside” its purported object of inquiry, I maintain that my being intimately indissociable from the very topic I am discussing can only increase rather than diminish its “usefulness,” in the end. If anything, the uniquely intriguing synthesis of the personal and the history that both haunts and overtakes it will render this particular version of Philippine gay culture somewhat relevant in—and revealing of—some other things which another less reflexive study may not even be remotely aware of.

For the purposes of this introduction, the word “gay” may be regarded as the signifier for the collective identity of genitally male individuals whose love objects are other “genital males.” It is really more than just a synonym for “male homosexual,” however, as it is simultaneously a given and an imagined category of being and becoming, which signifies a certain teleology of identity that eventuates in its liberation from the shackles of homophobia. As we know, homophobia is the socially endorsed, prejudiced hatred and persecution of gays and lesbians (homosexual women), because of their same-sexual orientation. Homophobia may be institutional or personal: the first is borne out by the hypocritical and untenable belief that sexual behavior should always be yoked onto procreation, which in turn assures the existence of the conjugal family; the second is largely the product of ignorance of and noncontact with “avowed homosexuals.”¹ Obviously, the institutional fear of “purely pleasurable” or “unprocreative” sexuality privileges heterosexual unions at the same time that it reduces the bodies of women to their reproductive capacity; thus homophobia

and misogyny are intimately linked to one another. And the discourse and practice of “gay liberation” are both the end and the means (in other words, the theory) to dismantle homophobia in what, globally speaking, predominates as a masculine-ascendant, heteronormative, and patriarchal culture.

Because this study is pioneering in that it is the first to academically inquire into the history and writings of Philippine gay culture from the avowed perspective of one who is gay, it is necessary to explain several other assumptions out of which it is coming. These include the problem of “depersonalized,” so-called scholarly “objectivity,” as opposed to intersubjective research, issues of containment, and the question of a Philippine gay theory, given the preexistent fact of cultural and historical incongruity: the Philippines is not the West, and therefore, abstractions that are specific to the West may not so easily be employed in our cultures, especially *not* when it comes to experiences as distinct and as culturally malleable as sex and gender relations.

Likewise, the dominant literary modes and the canon need to be interrogated, as obviously the gay writings of Montano, Nadres, and Perez are all positioned in contradistinction to them. A strategy of literary reading that is specifically gay can only be beneficial to any study of Philippine gay culture, and, as with the latter, it needs to be culled from Philippine gay texts themselves.

HISTORY FROM WITHIN AND CONTAINMENT THEORY

When I first conceived of this project, it was of a totally different form from what it has herein finally assumed: a narrativization of gay culture, identities, and politics more personal than I would have preferred. In other words, I had not planned on writing a “history from within,” insofar as any history that is told in the present tense and from the first-person (plural or singular, the difference is moot) point of view may be so called. My somewhat paranoid complaint against this brand of scholarship was that it was “not very scholarly,” precisely. In hindsight, however, and after having begun the actual writing of this study, the distance that I thought would be necessary for a project like this proved to be chillingly tokenist and noncommittal, especially when faced with the reality of oppression to which both I and this particular work of mine aspired to offer something of a curative.

In many different ways, and for many different reasons, the history from which I very much wanted to detach myself was “my self,” precisely. The section in the first part of this work about the gay culture of the eighties, for instance, could only include me, because *I was there*. Boy George, Fanny Serrano, Roda. These were the “models” for being gay that, evidently or not, have helped shape me, determine me. In other words, I have, in timely enough fashion, come to realize how it is not so convincing—not to mention wise and fair to myself—to appeal to objectivity, when my very survival is at stake. “History from within” is therefore necessarily prejudiced against the very idea of objectivity, inasmuch as objectivity has, for the longest time, been deployed to suppress and destroy the individuals who people such a history. In this study, gays get to have their say about what they want, who they are, and what, in their book, defines the world, love, happiness, and whatever “other” reality they have intimate and powerful investments in.

The perspective on gay cultural history which I endorse here views it as being, at heart, a story of resistance. Although the cultural critique to which my methodology is indebted takes dominant and subordinate cultures as mutually exclusive and antagonistic forces always in a state of struggle, my chosen perspective will be from the subordinate’s coign of vantage. This critical decision professes, to be sure, certain strengths as well as certain weaknesses. The strengths include, among other things, the granting of point of view and the investiture of a distinct identity, to gays, as well as the concomitant agency such moves entail. One weakness is that in so focusing on the homosexual minority’s positive projection of itself—its subjectivity and reactive agency—I may be overlooking the chances that, and eliding the actual instances wherein, such gestures and strategies are themselves contained and/or relegitimated by the dominant ideology. In other words, just because gays have been able to textualize themselves, it does not necessarily mean such textualizations are ultimately “good” for them. The theoretical concern over the violent dynamics of subversion and containment has been expressed by various oppositional intellectuals all over the world, and the implications of this so-called “containment theory” are intriguingly relevant to this project, too; hence, they can only deserve some discussion of their own.

Increasingly in the West, “containment” has understandably become an important issue among a number of postmodernist critics, since they deem the

unified Self of humanism to have all but disappeared in contemporary times. Armed with this presupposition, they engage in critiques of modernist texts and declare the instances of transgression, if at all, within them to be contained, because premised on a self-deceived notion of the autonomous subject. At an earlier period in European history, this freely determining subject, or essential Self—originator and agent of change and site of otherness/radical difference itself—had been seen by radical humanists as being characterized by authenticity and integrity. In particular, early Western homosexual writers like André Gide and Marguerite Radclyffe Hall (the lesbian author of *The Well of Loneliness*) wrote about the homosexual as a naturally good individual who had a lot to contribute to humanity, given the compassionate opportunity to do so.² Subjectivity, in this specifically humanist construction, was still predicated on a model of interior selfhood, of identity as psychic depth, and these writers invariably appealed to it when they justified their declarations of their own homosexuality as “a search for authenticity.”

However, more recent cultural critiques, drawing from the massive revisionings by such anti-humanist movements as structuralism and poststructuralism, Marxism, Freudianism, and feminism of the foundational doctrines of Western modernity, have all come to conclude that in the postmodern (in Marxist terminology, “late capitalist”) period, subjectivity has become fragmentary, groundless, multiple, and nomadic. According to postmodern theories of the incoherent subject, discursive formations so interpellate subjects in overlapping and discrete ways, that finally there is no longer any transcendental and foundational Self, only “networks of libidinal attachments.”³ Consequently, any revolutionary project grounded on the *telos* of essential and universal Selfhood will only end up, after a much protracted and harrowing search, with the selfsame power from which it has so wanted to take flight. Discursive formations through which power is exercised are also the very formations constituting subjectivity.

The other version of containment theory applies to the radical project of reversing the terms of a binary opposition. According to containment theory, the end result of such an inversion is simply the theoretical containment within, and the actual reproduction of the structure of, binarity. Thus, the transgressive aesthetic of writers like Jean Genet, although critical of the privileging of the Self in a politically charged project such as gay liberation, to the degree that

they merely invert the hierarchies of logocentric thought, in this light is seen merely to be yet another instance of containment.

But containment presumes that subversion is ever only an effect of the exercise of power. The view that I will take in this project is that this is not necessarily so. Via what Jonathan Dollimore calls “transgressive reinscription,” the very instance of subversion may be traced back to the power which has ironically produced it, but rather than becoming contained, subversion may then be seen to possibly transvaluate and therefore modify the repressiveness of power itself, chiefly by exemplifying how resistance is always capable of producing dissidence—and likely to do so. By demonstrating the inherent contradictions within and the very instability of hegemonic control itself, transgressive reinscription makes it possible to see reversals of the binaries natural/unnatural, heterosexual/homosexual, masculine/feminine, and depth/surface to be in fact revolutionary undertakings.⁴ We must remember that these binaries describe the violent hierarchies which have policed social and epistemological life in the West; hence, they have been the targets of the initial deconstructive projects of feminism, gay and lesbian discourse, and postmodernism itself.

Therefore, any history that articulates the subjectivity of an abject group in society is always potentially dangerous to the dominant culture. The catch is that, as is basically the case with any kind of social struggle, inversion will also most likely engender a violent counterreaction, as inversion does not reveal only those contradictions within the particular binary that has been inverted, but also contradictions within the other elements of the social formation in general which gather around the privileged term of the binary. Any project whose end result is the production of dangerous knowledge is potentially dangerous to everybody, but it is most acutely dangerous to the subordinate culture which has called the fixity of the specific metaphysical binary into question. By the mere act of calling more attention to themselves, subordinate groups/individuals already risk further marginalization, if not demonization, by the dominant dispensation. As we know, demonization is the process whereby all other conflicts that have been festering within the dominant get displaced onto the subordinate, as a form of psychosocial projection. These conflicts, in the case of homosexuals, are not simply about sexuality alone, but also about gender, class, race, and ethnicity.

Which is why, ultimately, this project can do either of two things: circulate meanings of homosexuality which will prove helpful to the homosexuals themselves; or court a conservative backlash that will bear witness to a more sustained and comprehensive persecution of gays and lesbians. Either way, transgressive knowledge is produced, and though essentialist in many respects, the assumptions of Philippine gay culture, as well as the many different assertions made by the male homosexual personalities and authors I have chosen to study here, may just prove an indispensable stage in what could later turn out to be a more constructionist and transgressive project. Nonetheless, the thought of the second scenario—that of a backlash—though daunting enough, has not really dissuaded me, precisely because between remaining silent and expressing myself, it is silence that is always the less livable way to live—and love. The analogy for this can only properly be a personal one, again: “coming out” with a history from within gay culture is always better than dying in the musty depths of the closet of nonexistence. The personal connects inextricably with the public once seen in the light of the annihilating experience of oppression.

In other words: the closet of Philippine gay history is my closet, and this is my own liberation. Likewise, my hope is that our national history’s closet will empty a little with this work, and at the very least allow a booster of air and light into the breathless inanimation and dolor to which closetedness reduces everyone. Should much more persecution follow this declaration of gayness within the many imaginative and “historic” spaces where there used to be none, I am only sorry for not being able to fight fire with a much shriller, eerier, and more discomfiting backfire. After all, the shout of transgression that writes itself back on the page of conformity is one of dissident and troubling identification, both familiar and rebellious: I am like you—we are alike—but not quite!

Moreover, this present work may be understood as partaking of what Dollimore calls the characteristically modern imperative of the *Nosce Te Ipsum* (“Know thyself”), although this time it is less one’s “self” one begins to know by reading one’s own histories and narratives than the different forces which have shaped this self, the many different definitions coming from many different books and many different minds about who one is/“are.” This task is as necessary now as it was to anybody who ever wanted to escape from

oppression, who ever wanted to transform the “world/nature” (now seen to be, in fact, discursive formations) in order to better him/herself. With this work, I also hope to make available to other Filipino gays a model for self-criticism, especially since, for the longest time in our nation’s history, our lives have largely been inaccessible to ourselves.

THE QUESTION OF A PHILIPPINE GAY THEORY

The AIDS pandemic and its initial homosexualization have seen the revitalizing of gay communities in the West, where the already difficult problem of homophobic discrimination has joined forces with, and found legitimation in, the identification, early in the pandemic, of AIDS with male homosexuality. AIDS, the so-called gay plague, has admittedly diminished the ranks of gays literally, but it has not diminished their morale nor dampened the spirit of the Gay Movement in general. On the contrary, the bitter loss of lives and the persecution spurred by this horrific disease have spawned a new radicalism among gays (and even lesbians). Perhaps nowhere has this progressive reaction been more unmistakably felt than in academe, where the prevailing spirit of political correctness has proven nourishing of, and become the new haven for, the recently inaugurated field of knowledge and interdisciplinary research called Gay and Lesbian Studies.

Although there has not been any evidence that AIDS will become homosexualized anytime soon in the Philippines—as it was in the United States and Europe—the need to open an academic clearing for homosexual issues has long been overdue.⁵ More than in any other place in the world, homosexuality in the Philippines would seem to have largely been “humorized”—that is, obsessively rendered into an unsuitable topic for serious discussion—ever since it started becoming a reality in the lives of city-dwelling Filipinos from the second half of this century onward.

Such humorous dismissal of homosexuality has generally been the case in the last three decades, even as it is becoming more and more apparent to everyone that homosexual men and women constitute an important minority in Philippine society. We need only turn on the television or read the tabloids to discover the palpability of the “bakla sensibility” permeating the very texture of our lives. SwardSpeak and the notably gay affectations

which many women are now seen to be deploying, as well as the recent resurgence of gay and lesbian organizing within several Manila campuses and nongovernment organizations (NGOs), only point to the intransigence of homosexuality and the growing awareness among many gays and lesbians of their homosexual identity. Should we not also cite the increasing visibility of gays and lesbians within the hallowed spaces of our lives? A gay father, brother, uncle, cousin, nephew or son; a lesbian friend; a homosexual professor. No wonder the West has seen our society, in particular, to be “tolerant” of the tomboy and the bakla: it indeed appears, to all intents and purposes, that we are everywhere! Such exoticizing notwithstanding, we must nonetheless acknowledge that the immensely underhanded concept of “tolerance” is hardly the case with our culture’s attitude toward homosexuality. In fact, as this study of Philippine gay culture’s last thirty years indicates, the rhetorical pronouncements of “tolerance” have been precisely just that: rhetoric. And it is this rhetoric—as well as its concrete enactments—which has been used to legitimate the countless instances of discrimination against homosexuals, in terms of employment and career specification, political (mis)representation, and symbolic ghettoization.

Gays do apparently exist in our society, but they have been either minoritized in their occupation, or silenced (that is, closeted) about their identities in case they are not. Among the urban poor, it may be noticed that a marked increase in wife beatings has gone hand in hand with gay bashing, as machismo has somehow institutionalized such forms of behavior. It isn’t any less strange for husbands to batter their wives than for fathers and uncles to beat up effeminate boys in an often vain, albeit shamelessly inhumane, attempt to masculinize them. In terms of textual production, homosexuals have also not been given an equal chance to explore, invent, and reproduce their subjectivities in their writings or whatever mode of expression they want, which is why the dominant representation of the homosexual has continually been a ridiculously funny one. A joke. Stereotypes of the loud and funny faggot, as well as of the darkly moody and vengeful tomboy are, for a long time now, the only images heterosexuals have had of homosexuals; and more tragically, the only images homosexuals have had of themselves.

It becomes clear, therefore, that a theory specifically attuned to the local homosexual’s situation is needed, as long as theory may still be looked upon

as a frame of values, a battle plan or map for lives whose abjection may still be helped if not eliminated. It may be useful to summarize the most essential features of such a theory, even as this project cannot really pursue each of these at length. They are as follows:

1. Gay theory in the Philippines will have to address the most basic problem of cultural incongruity: seeing as how there are no native counterparts to the homo/hetero distinction, in what manner may it prove illuminating to utilize the obviously Western terms and concepts gay, homosexual, lesbian, heterosexual? Consequently, how are these different from or similar to the indigenous concepts binabae, binalake, bakla, lakin-on, babay-on, agi, etc.? This part of the theory must therefore necessarily include a postcolonial critique of the genealogy of gender and sexuality in our country, as well as an archeological movement toward precoloniality.
2. Gay theory will have to establish sites for intervention within the dominant macho culture, and map out the points at which issues of sexuality overlap issues of gender oppression. This part of the theory must take cognizance of feminism and of the local and translocal struggles for women's liberation.
3. Gay theory should include a local and materialist critique of the class system, as issues of homosexual prostitution, discrimination, and oppression in general are intimately linked to class-supremacist ideologies.

In order to carry out the first function of a Philippine-specific gay theory, it would be necessary to adopt a certain historiographic stance as regards the question of sexuality. Or more fundamentally, a theory of sexuality needs to be formulated, before a history of gayness/homosexuality can be coherently postulated. There are two current "schools" of thought on the matter, and I will now summarize each of their contentions, after which I will adopt my own position which will become operative in this work.

Sexual orientation, or the potential/inclination of human beings to erotically desire and pursue the desire of members of the same or the opposite sex, may be seen in two distinct ways: (1) as a biological or psychological property to be observed in all human populations, and (2) as an invention/label specific only to those cultures which have deemed it an important distinction. In other

words, the first perspective sees sexuality (here functioning as another term for sexual orientation) to be an essential, transcultural quality (like height, blood type, skin color, etc.) which people either may choose to or cannot help but demonstrate; while the second looks at sexuality as not culture-independent, but simply as a social construction or socially enforced label or role ascribed by certain cultures to what are clearly malleable human desires or behaviors. Consequently homosexuality—which is the erotic orientation toward same-sexual partners—may be seen either as an objectively real category that remains essentially the same across histories and cultures, or as a category of being which is, according to Foucault’s axiomatic study, peculiar to mid-nineteenth-century Europe up to present-day Western civilization.⁶

This arguably bifurcated situation may still be complicated further by implicating other debates: nature vs. nurture and determinism vs. voluntarism. These debates pertain to the controversy behind conflicting theories on the origin of homosexuality. With the first pair, the issue being raised is whether homosexuality is inborn, or socialized. We must realize that an essentialist theory can assert both, because what is required by it is only that homosexuality remain a “transculturally valid” and objective category. An example of an essentialist theory of nature is the genetic theory, which attempts to explain people’s sexual orientations as predetermined, by hypothesizing how certain factors already transcribe one’s sexual orientation in the genes even before birth. An example of an essentialist theory of nurture is the “first pleasurable experience” theory, which basically claims that the psychological inclination toward a certain kind of sexual partner is determined—or rather, “fixed”—by one’s first sexually pleasurable experience. It isn’t very accurate to say, then, that all essentialist theories are necessarily determinist, because as the theory of “first pleasurable experience” proves, it is possible to think of homosexuality as an essential and transcultural property and yet maintain that people can choose to have it or not (inasmuch as they can choose the gender of their first sexual partners). On the other hand, constructionism can only (obviously) advance a “nurture” hypothesis on the origin of sexual orientation, even as it does not necessarily claim that the kind of socialization—as homosexuals, bisexuals, or heterosexuals—a person goes through may be so easily chosen or avoided (as in the case when to belong to a certain sexual orientation is pretty much like being born into a certain socioeconomic class).⁷

Although seemingly contradictory, essentialist and constructionist accounts of sexuality can actually be simultaneously assumed: to say that societies historically invent their own sexual meanings need not foreclose the question of whether certain properties of sexual orientation underlie such meanings. In other words, the essentialist/constructionist debate on the issue of sexuality need not be conflated with the profoundly confounding and epistemological impasse between realism and nominalism. Nonetheless, to the degree that the phylogenetic inquiry on sexuality (“how human beings become sexual”) often becomes confused with questions of sexual ontogeny (“how a particular individual thinks he or she turns out homo- or heterosexual”), the stakes in the debate between essentialism and constructionism remain clearly very high. It remains most alarmingly so to the precise degree that an asymmetrical investment of energies seems to oversee the whole issue: both camps have simply failed to realize that any theory of the origin of homosexuality remains dubious (and unscientific) if it can-/will not deign to explain the genesis of heterosexuality. Scientific inquiry requires that one develop a theory for all sexual orientations, or else one is merely paying lip service to heteronormativity, whose debatable assumption is precisely that heterosexuality is the natural form of desire, and therefore it needs no further explication.

For this project, the more important theoretical issue has less to do with adjudicating between or among competing models of sexual phylo- or ontogenesis, than with articulating a historiography that would not be completely essentialist by positing the existence of a universal gayness/homosexuality across Philippine histories and cultures, and yet that would not erase the reality of homosexuals—and consequently, of homosexual oppression—by deeming homosexuality a pure “construction,” which is to say, unreal (this extremism being one notable tendency in constructionism). In other words, for the former project I will adopt a moderate constructionist position which allows for the positing of the homosexual act as an objective category that may be studied across histories and cultures, but for which the homosexual person remains a specifically psychiatric and therefore a colonial implantation into the Philippines, from at least the middle of this century onward. For the latter, I shall make use of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s markers on the issue of homosexuality, which plainly situates all theoretical positions

on this issue along two intersecting, finally political axes: the act/identity axis, and the gender axis.⁸

Sodomy is an example of a discourse of sexual acts, more specifically “unnatural” sexual acts, which became ascendant in Europe and its colonies—including the Philippines—before the consolidation of the discourse of homosexuality in the West as a form of psychopathology in the mid-nineteenth century. Sodomy did not presume that the sodomite was a certain kind of person who was distinct from all other people, for it could refer to all sorts of sexual activities, and most often these were heterosexual ones. The only requirement for a sexual act to become sodomitic was that it be not missionary (the position), or procreative and/or conjugal, even. Hence, to read references to sodomy in the Philippine archives would not necessarily be to read the homosexual act—and most certainly *not* the homosexual person—within our early colonial history. It would be necessary, first of all, to determine just what kind of sodomy was being alluded to, before one could employ the moderate constructionist perspective with regard to historical references to the homosexual act.

By referring to the homosexual act instead of the homosexual person, I am accomplishing two things: the assumption, mainly for heuristic purposes, of the cross-cultural presence of distinctions of genitally marked bodies; and the preclusion of the myth-making project of looking for gay “affectional ancestors” (or famous homosexual personages) in our history as an oft-colonized people. Hence, even if it can be empirically shown that this certain eighteenth-century *indio* personage manifested extensively homosexual behavior in his lifetime, it is not correct to call him gay or homosexual because this self-identification was not possible at the time. Simply put, the abstractions of homo/hetero and gay/straight were precisely, during such presexological periods in our history, not available. As one of the more famous early social constructionist researchers of human sexuality, Robert Padgug, writes:

“Homosexual” and “heterosexual” behavior may be universal: homosexual identity and consciousness are modern realities. These identities are not inherent in the individual ... To commit a homosexual act is one thing; to be a homosexual is something entirely different.⁹

Padgug further specifies that the concept of sexuality as a “private truth” that defines us best and yet is seemingly not as important as the more public part of our lives—where social action and change take place—is bourgeois and oppressive, for it necessitates the definition of sexuality as a fixed essence or determinism. This view also effectively splits the individual from his society, and restricts all notions of struggle to the public, collective, and nonsexual realm. (As we know, about this last point the feminists have argued otherwise, insisting that oppression is precisely both public and private, and that the personal is nothing if not coincident with the political.) Likewise, Foucault has shown us that, historically, this Western, bourgeois interpretation of sexuality as a universal category of experience later devolved into psychosexual biologism, which then became the basis for much of the current normative attitude that distinguishes between those whose psychosexuality is healthy, and those whose sexual selfhood is deviant. Suffice it to say that previous to the nineteenth century, and outside of industrialized Europe, this kind of medicalized distinction of persons/personalities simply did not obtain.

In sum, the constructionist approach to which I moderately subscribe is, as a whole, a perspective which assumes that

- 1) the way we go about studying the world is determined by available concepts, categories and methods; 2) the concept and categories we use vary considerably in their meaning and connotations over time and across cultures; 3) the persistence and popularity of a certain concept, category or method depends more on its political usefulness for social influence and control, than on its validity; 4) descriptions and explanations of the world are themselves forms of action and have consequences.¹⁰

And so, sexuality as an abstraction/category of erotic experience which may seem perfectly clear to us needs to be historicized as an abstraction/category specific to twentieth-century, Judeo-Christian, capitalist, post-industrialist civilization. Sexuality must not be naively seen as just an uncomplicated product of some human, transhistorical essence, but, more important, as a variable cultural and historical reality whose forms, contents, and contexts can potentially differ from society to society, according to the sexual categories—and consequently, roles—within which individuals act and define themselves. It is only proper for the historiographer of “sexuality,”

then, to try to uncover and explain the categories appropriate to each society, before undertaking any discussion of such extremely sensitive, and hence consequential, “truths.”

Moreover, constructionist historiography cannot be too hasty in equating non-Western concepts of gender and sexuality with Western ones (in other words, the specifically Western homo/hetero dualism). Cultures are self-sufficient signifying systems which do not evolve along any single pattern of development. Hence, it would not be accurate to impose one culture’s definitions on another. For this reason, I will be making clear that the traditional Philippine concept of gender-crossing—a transitivity between genders, paradigmatically seen in the phenomenon of the binabae—is simply not the same as homosexuality, even as the two concepts seem to be the same in the sense that the gender-crosser’s sexual acts are invariably same-sexual (i.e., homo-genital).

Nonetheless, within the last three decades, and in the urbanized, “metropolitan” spaces of Philippine life, homosexuality may be shown to have already been implanted as a discourse, by way of the institutions of biomedicine, church, academe, and media. And if homosexuality is to be seen as a question of identity—because there are people who are homosexual, and they are distinct from people who are heterosexual—then the perspective is a minoritizing one, for it limits itself to a politics of militant difference. Consequently, gay liberation must be seen as a simplistic issue of civil liberties, and hence, of sociopolitical reform. If, on the other hand, homosexuality is really not a matter of people, but of what and how people do (and feel), then the issue becomes much wider, or universalizing, for it involves potentially anybody who has ever engaged or can engage in homosexual sex (meaning, presumably, all of us). The consequence of this view is that gay liberation as a political notion is false, for it is possibly sexual revolution, or the liberation of all sexual potentialities that have been “locked up” inside all of humanity, which will ultimately liberate the homosexual, whose suffering will consequently disappear together with the disappearance of sexual distinctions among all of us: polymorphously bi-, multi- or even asexual beings.

The axis of gender delineates the opposite views toward homosexuality as either a liminality of genders or gender exclusivity. Homosexuality can be seen either as a transition of gender from one to the other (as for instance,

from male to female, translating into effeminacy and/or inversion) or as gender separatism (men remaining men despite or precisely because of their homosexual orientation). This axis will admittedly prove most important in this study, for Philippine gay culture is almost completely peopled by “feminine” (gender-transitive) homosexual men who are made to suffer from minoritization by default, and by the workings of masculinist ideology. On the other hand, non-effeminate (gender-intransitive) and so-called macho homosexuals do exist in local gay culture too, although they are not marked as gays or bakla precisely because they are masculine.

Sedgwick’s model of interweaving perspectives underscores the fact that homosexuality is hardly a clearly defined, unproblematic field of knowledge in our own time. She does, however, slant her model just a bit, for to her the more important theoretical concern should be to empower gays by making available to them all the critical tools with which they can undertake their common liberations. She, for example, does not call the essentialist perspective on the homosexual identity simply essentialist, for politically it translates into minoritization. Hence, the essentialist view betokens a variety of minority politics which is very important in light of the discourse of multiculturalism and civil liberties currently ascendant in the West, particularly the United States. To talk about gays as a kind of distinct ethnic group is admittedly to ghettoize the issue of homosexuality, but it is also a strategic move. The other view may be seen to derive from Kinsey’s sociological conception of sexuality that sees homosexuality and heterosexuality as a bipolar continuum that stretches from exclusive homosexuality to exclusive heterosexuality.¹¹ Kinsey’s report states that a great number of American men and women are neither of the two, but may be situated along several gradations in between at any one time in their lives. So, the terms homosexual and heterosexual are more properly adjectives to describe acts rather than people, who shift from one sexual activity to the other in real life without very much trouble. Sedgwick doesn’t call this view simply constructionist; she calls it “universalizing,” as this is what in effect it accomplishes: homosexuality becomes an issue beyond the minority calling itself gay or lesbian, for it is an issue which concerns the mainstream, so-called heterosexual majority, too.

For this project, both pairs of definitional perspectives are granted their validity (and epistemic status), if only because they already operatively exist in

the field of inquiry that is contemporary Philippine gay culture. Furthermore, the local metropolitan gay culture around which this study revolves is not a static, superseded regime of knowing, as conflicting forces generated by these views are themselves wrestling within it to continually configure and reconfigure it. To strictly adhere to any one axis, or any one specific model of the homosexual question, would be to radically simplify the situation, and therefore to vitally miss out on an important realization that we may obtain from the study of any culture, and of culture, in general: life, like sexuality itself, is really quite complex, and the subterfuges of domination only require that one complicate her critical task at each and every turn.

The second function of gay theory in the Philippines directly relates to feminist thought, as it occurs indigenously or otherwise in the country. The dominant macho culture in which gays and women live and rankle has indeed efficaciously naturalized gender oppression in its categories of feminine/masculine, effeminate/macho, virgin/whore, real/unreal, etc. These very same binaries need to be refunctioned by gays and women as a matter of necessity, if both groups should ever attain a kind of equality to, and a state of being that is comparable with, the universally privileged class of the masculine, heterosexual man.

The overlapping of gay and feminist issues in the Philippines is apparent in the way male homosexuality as a form of deviance is largely feminized therein. Other than this, the construction of the gay identity is clearly gender-transitive: inverted men (that is, inward women), *binabae*, *bakla*. The possible links between these two sets of liberation—from gender oppression and from homophobia—therefore have to be negotiated more along the lines of the former, inasmuch as the brute fact is that all the entry points to a radical homosexual discourse in our case are still, pragmatically speaking, via gender. The women's movement has already gained some (albeit still shaky) ground in the Philippines, and to my mind, the gay and lesbian communities can only situate themselves alongside it. The reason for this is simply the fact that liberationist causes that involve issues of sexuality and gender naturally come together when patriarchy is the common power which such struggles must be waged against.

But finally, there can be no assurance that allo-identifications among the many divergent feminist groups and the gays will come without some degree of rancor and animosity. As in the West, where feminism has already

become internalized into the gay and lesbian struggles themselves—and is no longer simply clearly distinct from them—local gay causes must not rely on explicitly feminist support to begin to undertake their own fulfillments. Gay and lesbian theory, although clearly indebted to the feminist critique of patriarchal consciousness and culture, cannot totally rely on the tools of feminism to launch a specifically anti-heteronormative critique or inquiry into homophobic culture: an antihomophobic discourse. The most useful insight feminism has given us is that gender oppression—or more accurately, gender differences themselves—are cultural constructs and are ideologically and institutionally set in place in all patriarchal societies. Nonetheless, feminism cannot wholeheartedly grapple with the issue of sexual orientation inasmuch as this does not exclusively involve gender's distinctions of femininity and masculinity, but more particularly, the problems and *problematiques* of sexual object choice, which can and do cut across genders. How is it that male individuals are deprived of their macho-ordained privilege as males once they desire other males sexually? Or more tellingly, how is it that lesbians are not exactly welcome in nearly every women's movement all over the world?

I had to ask myself these questions—or at least, questions that were similar to them—after an initial confusion of categories gave way to the realization, owing largely to Sedgwick, that sexuality is already analytically separable from gender; that more than being male or female, people are necessarily ascribed to be either homosexual or heterosexual in contemporary times. My initial attempts to theorize gayness in the Philippines took the form of feminist critique: gay is a gender identity, just like man and woman, and therefore, all the theoretical tools that are applied by the feminist woman may, I thought, be applied by the gay critic as well. In this early phase in my theorizing, gynocritics became a *gaycritics*; femininity became *effemininity*. In other words, during this rather parodic and imitative period in my work, I had looked through the concept of the bakla and not at it: he is woman-hearted all right; therefore, he may or should be treated as a woman. I had totally become interpellated by the discourse of inversion—perhaps because, at the time, I had not even recognized it as a discourse—and in the process I had elided the significance of the bakla's physical and material reality as “still and all a man.” (Or was this nonrecognition simply a product of male-to-female wishfulness?) Now, however, I realize that there are many different perspectives on the question

of homosexuality, and essentialist gender transitivity (or inversion) is just one of them. When I began to conceptualize and to work within a discourse of bodies—which is to say, of genitally marked bodies—then the perspectives toward homosexuality as orientation and as “acts” began to seem more rewarding and tenable for me. And it is via the same route that gay discourse elsewhere, I presume, finally found itself.

From the feminist concept of alterable gender, the homosexual inquiry has moved on to the domain of sexuality where it must increasingly be made to belong. For both the feminist sake as well as the gay: with two sets of critiques being brought to bear on the same oppressive structure, heterosexual patriarchy’s homophobic and misogynist categories can become critically exhausted all the more thoroughly and all the faster.

Such a realization can only be propitious for Philippine gays, in any case, as I am not too sure if there are any local feminist discourses which are frankly and genuinely open to questions of sexuality. Already, it is clear that the predominant strain of Philippine-style feminism is becoming more and more conservative in its sexual ideology, and it is likely that there are many Filipino feminists who are averse to effeminacy or *kabaklaan*, just as there are many Filipino mothers who have never come to understand their gay sons and have been averse to gayness all along. To this particular malaise the elixir should be the realization that sometimes it is the feminist perspective, rather than the feminists themselves, that is more important.

The current “blind spot” of the feminist discourse in the Philippines is precisely its failure to undertake a locally based critique and/or theory of sexuality. In a forum on homosexual issues held at the University of the Philippines in 1993, radical feminist and lesbian thinker Aida Santos pointed out that the marked increase in the number of violent crimes against women stems from our macho culture’s denying of women their sexuality.¹² In more specific terms, local women are not supposed to enjoy their sexuality (or its physical *situs*, the body), as it belongs not to them but to their husbands and/or male partners. Wife beating and brutal rapes all emanate from the same heterosexually sanctioned belief and practice which assume that women’s bodies are property to be possessed and vanquished, if not kept under close masculine surveillance—under the “gracious munificence” of the indicatively male heterosexual Gaze.

Elizabeth Uy Eviota, in a historical materialist analysis of the Philippine colonial and neocolonial gender systems and their relationship to the sexual division of labor, comes up with the same conclusion:

The ideology of male sexual needs serves no purpose other than the perpetuation of a sexual hierarchy which serves the interest of men well. This ideology sees to it that men have much more opportunity to be sexual and more social support for their sexuality; women remain at a particular disadvantage in terms of their right to have sex, much less enjoy it.¹³

Eviota's work, as a whole, studies the various historical transformations which have conspired to dominate women in the Philippines—economically, politically, and sexually. Her framework, however, does not account for sexuality in the way it is largely understood in our contemporary times: as a matter of the gender of one's sexual object choice; in other words, as either homo or hetero. Hence, she fails to take note of that other layer of oppression obtaining not on the gender, but rather on the sexual, front. To be sure the men she speaks of in this passage are first and foremost the machos and heterosexuals, not the bakla and homosexuals who can enjoy neither the privilege of their masculinity nor the birthright of heterosexuality (being both economically marginalized and symbolically subordinate: as “deviants,” “sinners,” “unreal men” and/or “false women”). This short history of Philippine gay culture will somehow supplant, if not modify, Eviota's finding that local “women who are interested in sex are promiscuous whereas men who are sexually active are perfectly normal,” for in this project it will be strongly suggested that there are some Philippine women who have begun to reclaim their sexualities with gay abandon, and they are the fag-hags. Feminists need to see that if the initial legitimating discourse for gay issues is one grounded on gender inquiry (that is to say, on feminism), then the feminist project of consciousness-raising as concerns the bodily/libidinal and reproductive rights of women may best (or should I say, solely) be done through sexuality. And with this topic, gays and their fag-hag friends are already rather familiar.

The notion of the lewd and loose woman being the inverse of the Christian “Virgin” archetype may now be supplanted with the paragon of the babaeng-bakla—a freakish and fishwifely creature whose awareness of and rights over her own sexuality are rather pungent and inalienable. And

as the peculiarly gay expression or swardspeak to which she is indebted and of which she is a fervent believer is filled and practically bristles with terms for self-ironic sexuality and kinkiness, then her ability to use it simply makes available a space for her to invent herself in. And therein also to re(dis)cover her sexuality.

In other words, it is feminism that has to begin to look beyond what is apparently there, and to slice across the layers of lies the new snake in the garden of patriarchy is hissing out: the snake of essentialism, which insists that all things male are oppressive, including gay males. The lure of falling into an essentialist concept of “woman” and, consequently, of the concept “man” is made stronger by the allegedly diachronic existence of male and female bodies almost universally; and feminism, in focusing exclusively on gender, has initially been bogged down in a biologistic model of universal gender oppression.

However, such essentialism is a trap that is harder to fall into in gay discourse, just because the gay individual is always already an “invention”: there are no biologically determinable gays who are as immanent and as easily identifiable as women and men, and to a great extent “gay” is largely a faddish label more similar to “yuppy” than anything else. Plainly and simply put, there are, in fact, no gays or homosexuals unless they “come out” one way or the other about their (homo)sexuality. Biographical analysis as the desired form of gay literary criticism—to which this book wholeheartedly subscribes—is precisely based on the assumption that self-disclosure in a text is simultaneously an individualist affirmation and an act of community-identification. In other words, for gay biographical critique, what is more important is not the author’s declaration of his individuality, but on the contrary, the “representative aspects” which are based on his homosexuality, and which can cut across barriers, as they are all premised upon a communal experience of homophobia-specific oppression.¹⁴ This particular form of oppression is both the result and the source of the transgressive power which the act of admitting one’s homosexuality mobilizes.

And so, it becomes plain that *Coming Out*, even before gender or sexual theorizing, forms the indomitable crux of this whole project. This is due to the fact that *Coming Out* is just about the only means gays and lesbians have of dispelling those privately powerful fears society harbors toward

homosexuality, even as this very same act lays them open to the ravages of institutional homophobia.

The third function of a locally based gay theory seems the hardest to presently address, as it is common knowledge that class-conscious critiques are mostly unconscious of and dead to other axes of oppression (and almost everything else). In fact, it is most interesting to note that unlike the historical developments in gay organizing in countries like Argentina, Mexico, Cuba, and other places in the Third World, the beginnings of the “gay movement” in the Philippines did not evince any socialist or Marxist texture.¹⁵ Quite the opposite, in fact: the first gay liberationist calls were sounded by gay middle-class artists and intellectuals in Metro Manila, who apparently had no ideological linkages with any of the “people’s movements” that—it has recently been revealed—were all extremely antigay anyway.

In a seminar on “Homophobia in the Philippine Popular Movement” held at the University of the Philippines early in 1993, male and female homosexuals who used to belong to the many “collectives” comprising the “Philippine Left” bewailed the homophobia to which they were subjected for so many years.¹⁶ The socialist dismissal of homosexuality as a form of “bourgeois decadence” was unabashedly present among and exhibited by the leaders of a number of progressive groups in the Philippines during the seventies, and this is true even up to now. This was another reason, perhaps, for the “permission” ostensibly granted by the Marcosian dispensation to local gay discourse: because despite the fact that gay progressivism in other Third World nations was intimately linked to revolutionary-socialist thought, the local counterpart socialist movements practically and disgustingly disowned it. So, the agonistic space which was granted Filipino gays for a good part of the Martial Law period may have become the logical trade-off for the generalized suppression of socialist discourse at the time.

In this project, this function is the least evident of the three necessary functions of a Philippine gay theory, and I am hereby confessing that I will not really pursue this point here. This, however, is only because my framework is not single-mindedly Marxist-inflected, even though the assumptions and conclusions I will be having/making as regards ideology, class, and power do effectively gesture toward an inevitably materialist critique of gay culture as well.

GAY LITERARY CRITICISM AND THE PHILIPPINE CANON

In the West, the newest and most insightful critical debates have come to dilate upon sex and sexuality, and the dynamically multidisciplinary field of Gay and Lesbian Studies has been responsible for the many recent critiques of what has otherwise been long presumed dead and buried: the lie whose name is humanism. On the contrary, as gay and lesbian scholars have demonstrated, the oppressive criteria of humanism are still very much alive and well within many so-called oppositional practices. First World feminism, for instance, has suffered extremely from the attack of lesbians, who used to be called “radical feminists,” but have now emerged from the project that singularly aimed to criticize gender oppression, and linked arms with gays whose homosexual orientation they have seen to be a more urgent and real basis for movement. Together, gays and lesbians in the West have reminded feminists that at the heart of liberal humanism is heterosexism, an ideology (and discourse) of identity which needs to constantly demonize and displace its own contradictions onto its logical inverse, homosexuality. Dollimore has convincingly shown in his book, *Sexual Dissidence*, that although socially marginal, homosexuality is symbolically central to Western civilization, precisely because homosexuality is never simply about sexuality alone, but also about race, class, and gender—contradictions the unified Self of humanism has sought to suppress. The convergence of misogyny and homophobia, for instance, illustrates how patriarchy itself is premised on the denial of difference, be it in sexual or gender terms. Dollimore’s may hence be seen as exemplifying one vein of gay literary scholarship: a cultural materialist venture of re-reading history in a specifically homosexual way.

The project that reinstates upsetting and transgressive difference within patriarchy is a central one for much of gay and lesbian cultural critique, and this may best be seen in the work of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, a soft-spoken yet headstrong gay-identified woman whose fellow-feeling for gays and commitment to the gay cause have merited her the admiration of many other scholars doing work in gay and lesbian studies. Her first book, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*,¹⁷ for instance, explores the male homosociality to be found in the Gothic and Victorian novels of the mid-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such as Laurence Sterne’s *Sentimental*

Journey, William Makepeace Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*, and Charles Dickens's *Our Mutual Friend*. She points out that there is male bonding to be observed in so much of the "heterosexual" literature of the period: a peculiar type of masculine bonding that needed to be suppressed in the narrative and thenceforth found its expression in the figure of the bitterly rivaling suitors, whose common desire for a woman is simply a detour of their proscribed desire for each other. (This theory takes off from Rene Girard's graphic schema of the erotic triangle, in which the seemingly antagonistic bond that negatively unifies the male rivals actually overpowers and supersedes the bond between either of them and the same beloved woman.) It is precisely because the psychiatric discourse of homosexuality had come to be invented at around the same time these novels were being written that the erstwhile sanctioned male bondings had to be reified in such a manner. Sedgwick achieves, through this particular project, the radical revaluation of masculine heterosexuality, by magnifying the inconsistencies and contradictions inherent within it—and thus, within the patriarchy that it upholds and is upheld by—with such scholarly vengeance and panache.

Another gay approach to literary reading has been the psychoanalytic, taking its cue from the invidious Freudian connection between latent homosexuality and certain kinds of male literary production. Thus, re-readings of D.H. Lawrence, Norman Mailer, and Ernest Hemingway have become rather exciting textual enterprises for many gay literary historians and critics. Other psychoanalytic deployments for the gay cause are premised upon radical revisions of Freud, which pursue his thesis of bisexuality and androgyny to extend to the culture at large. Marjorie Garber's study of "Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety" is a re-reading of the Lacanian Symbolic and its links to transvestism. According to Garber, cross-dressing is what makes culture possible.¹⁸

Perhaps the subspecies of gay literary production of which I am most enamored is the autobiography. Specifically, I am interested in the study and recuperation of avowedly homosexual texts. An archival task, in other words. This project remains crucial, I am convinced, to Philippine gay culture because it just may spell the difference between a gay movement and the continued silencing and persecution of homosexuals in our country, where the current state of affairs is still one of quietly seething crisis. Coming Out

is a process admittedly painful and difficult for many Filipino gays, whose specifically homosexual writings remain just as closeted as their authors. The tragic thing is that Coming Out is still an indispensable element in any homosexual movement, and yet in the Philippines we have pretty much not seen any other kind of male homosexuals other than the markedly bakla ones.

The approach I shall be advocating in this study is “gay biographical critique,” and by this I mean a critical approach to textuality which sees the text’s representation of gender and sexuality to be indicative of the author’s own position concerning the oppression of gays and women. Obviously, the easiest way to guarantee the fruitfulness of this approach is to look for avowedly gay writings from known homosexuals, and see just how their political vision of liberation is shaped and/or limited by prevailing dominant ideologies. This is easier said than done, however, for there are as yet quite a small number of works that are identifiably gay. In his book, Perez declares himself to be “gay liberationist,” although of course the critical perspective I seek, and which will be more desirable in the final analysis, will have to develop finer tools and methods for appreciating gay texts. In other words, gay criticism cannot do without at least a modicum of aesthetic theorizing. Thankfully enough, in the local scene, there is of course *Ladlad*, the multigenre anthology of post-Marcosian gay writings which I coedited with another gay writer.¹⁹ All the authors in this groundbreaking collection are unapologetically gay, and almost all of them are thirty years old and younger. Just now I’d like to say that it is patently not true that just because one is young one has nothing to lose. Only now I realize that it is precisely because they are young that they have their entire futures, their whole lives, to lose. Nonetheless, it’s quite possible that a generational dynamic is at work here, as generations are merely nodes for other elements and determinants of subjectivity which have admittedly changed over the last three decades or so.

Severino Montano’s unpublished novel, “The Lion and the Faun,” is an opus written in the roman à clef tradition. Its relative obscurity only emblemizes the homophobia that has conspired with New Criticism—the dominant aesthetic mode of his time and ours—in order to silence Montano and make unavailable his radical work. Montano’s case is a particularly problematic one, for he is a canonical writer whose “dossier” as a writer has

not included “that interesting little detail” of his homosexuality. Should it therefore be assumed that his being gay is not important? For this study I have had to read the novel, and so I, for one, know that this specific sin of omission rankled. However, I must also acknowledge the radical implications of such a fact. In effect, Montano’s novel reevaluates our concept of the canon, as well as enlightens us about the kind of sexual milieu in which he lived.

Admittedly, there are many homosexual writers to be studied, other than Montano, Perez, and Nadres. One such writer is Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero.²⁰ Certainly, it is true that Guerrero did not “come out” as a homosexual, or even as a homosexual writer, but neither did Montano. After everything, however, it becomes clear that such “worries” become irrelevant when cast against the backdrop of their homosexual works—in Guerrero’s case, his obviously personal homosexual play, *The Clash of Cymbals*. After all, the other topic which gay literary criticism can talk about is the representation of homosexuality in literary and/or cultural texts, and under this description Guerrero’s play can most certainly be put. Here, too, may be placed Jose Garcia Villa’s trilogy of autobiographical stories, “Wings and Blue Flame”; N.V.M. Gonzalez’s *The Bamboo Dancers*; Edith L. Tiempo’s stories “Dimensions of Fear” and “Chambers of the Sea”; the early novels by Mig Alvarez Enriquez; Jessica Hagedorn’s *Dog-eaters*; Ninotchka Rosca’s *State of War*; Gilda Cordero-Fernando’s short story, “High Fashion”; Eric Gamalinda’s *Fire Poem/Rain Poem* and *Planet Waves*; plays by Lito Casaje, Rene Villanueva, Bienvenido Noriega, Anton Juan, among others. These works do not necessarily talk about homosexuality in a politically self-conscious way; they do, however, all offer representations of homosexuality that countenance a certain perspective toward the homosexual identity (thus, they all purvey a kind of politics). Certainly, however, we need to remember that nonliterary representations may prove equally important in studying gay culture and the constructions of gender and sexuality as they affect the life of both gays and nongays alike.

Likewise, a counterpart project to Sedgwick’s just might prove instructive here. Already, I have been looking at a possibly homosocial angle in Jose Rizal’s novels, where there are always males bonding with each other: for example, Ibarra with Elias; Simoun with Basilio. Or perhaps Balagtas’s *Florante at Laura* may likewise prove to be a fruitful locale for homosocial sight-seeing: I’m not too sure if anyone has noticed it yet, but I find it a ticklishly kinky idea

that Florante's protracted narration on the hardy lap of the darkly ravishing Persian Aladin may be more than meets the metrical eye.

In order to come up with a Philippine homosexual canon, therefore, it should first of all be clear to us that what will ultimately prove most useful is the abandonment and "unburdening" of the many literary biases the past has given us as Literature's votive subjects. The ascendancy of New Criticism and/or Formalism in the production and dissemination of Philippine literature—and of literature in general—made it possible for there to be canonical writings, but not necessarily canonical writers, within the privileged list of literary texts which the canon is. Formalist perorations against biographical interpretation and the so-called intentional fallacy have made it possible for homosexual writers—the likes of Montano, Perez, and Guerrero—to become canonical, even as their identities as homosexuals are not exactly "canon-worthy." (Actually, these writers' subscribing to such heavily formalist tenets must have been simply a means of coping.) Perhaps, the solution is to come up with an alternative canon: one that will contain not so much texts as people. Such a project doubtless will prove useful, as the gathering and recuperation of those texts which did not measure up to the literary shibboleths of the New Critical—really, uncritical—past may now be undertaken to grant these very same texts their deserved political and interpretive space. Such a project can doubtless only benefit gays in the long run.

In a paper I delivered at the 1992 University of the Philippines National Writers Workshop (where I was myself a fellow), I reevaluated the place writing workshops should play in the lives of gay writers, whose works continue to be marginalized not because of their lack of formal merit—or at least not for that alone—but also for other, more politically charged reasons. What I ended up saying then turned out to be most meaningful to those gay fellows whose otherwise honest and remarkable gay plays had become the beating post of so much of the homophobic—disguised as merely technical and/or formalist—attack coming from certain tetchy members of the workshop panel:

As regards the project of periodizing gay texts, the gay critic's task will be primarily to establish a certain tradition of gay authorship: a task also known as archival work. This can only be done through extensive "search-and-rescue" operations that will seek to recover those gay texts which have been institutionally forgotten, ostensibly because they have failed in the outmoded

and sadly bankrupt scientific norms of well-writtenness and craft, which have made them unworthy of the canon. Of course, it is less their “artistic shortcomings” than their very radical politics which has disqualified them from such ... Vital to the gay critic’s thinking must be a shift in emphasis: while he does not deny that a certain degree of craft is required at a minimum—for intelligibility—he will gladly overlook this aspect for the sake of the political readings such “badly written” texts can afford him. He also knows that as an alternative mode of knowledge, gay texts may well be operating under a different aesthetics of which he may not yet be fully conscious. It is his other duty to make this artistic process conscious.... The early feminists did not ask whether Emily Dickinson’s “unfinished” poems were truly poems. They studied her anyway, because she was a woman ahead of her time, because she wrote consciously as a woman, because they chose to ...

I suppose, in the end, things become exactly that: because we want to; because we have taken matters into our own hands, we have redefined ourselves, since nobody else is going to do it for us. Gay plays will never be fully accorded the greatness they deserve, unless the gay interpretive community for whose sake they are made has been achieved.²¹

The separatist impulse readily evident in this early reflection of mine—“early” because at this time I had not yet untangled some of the more stubborn knots in the gay theoretical enterprise—is problematized by the present insight into the canon that this study of Montano, Nadres, and Perez has afforded me. To the extent that the many works of these authors are widely distributed and anthologized in textbooks and continue to be taught in many schools in the country, we can conclude that there are gays already to be found in the Philippine canon. (I remember Montano’s romantic play *Sabina*, for example, as a standard theater piece presented for the “dramafest” in my high school each year.) But to the extent that writers like Montano have not been recognized as gay writers, archival work is still necessary. This project will aim to uncover “unheard-of” texts by established writers, such as Montano, which are explicitly homosexual in subject or politics. But then again, it may be possible to keep to what already exists, only perhaps to come up with a fresher, more incisive way of interpreting it.

Hence, the critical task of re-reading the canon with such a goal in mind—which is to textually reinstate the gayness of several writers whose works are already to be found in it—remains clearly separatist insofar as the

identity of such authors remains reducibly and identifiably homosexual. The task of “making patriarchy paranoid,” in any case, is also another possible form of textual bombardment which may be deployed on the monolithic censor which is the canon, as there have yet been no such local interrogations made along this line. This involves radically re-reading the canon—which is to say, working within it as it is presently constituted by “apparently heterosexual, macho texts”—but at the same time calling attention to textual insights and observations about male homosocial bondings in the form of friendships, jealousies, bureaucratic solidarities, etc. This kind of textual strategy has already been employed in the West by gay critics, to the delectation of the aware minority and the shock of the naive majority. Homosociality, although different from homosexuality, limits the naturalized pervasiveness of heterosexuality by pointing out its inherent dependence on male bonding, which, call it what one pleases, remains a rather queer thing when seen against macho culture’s effusively and exclusively heterosexual claims. In masculinist society, males are allowed to identify with, but never to desire, each other. Jealous males, as they are textualized in several literary texts in the West, invariably end up erotically objectifying and desiring their rivals, being that this tormented kind of bonding is the product of the confusion between identification and desire. The premise behind homosocial reading is that patriarchy’s structures are formed around the archetypal male-to-male bond, only that females are still and always necessary to keep the bond from “turning queer” (that is to say, becoming homosexual). And so, misogyny and the denial of male homosexuality are, from this perspective alone, really of the same homophobic piece.

Other similar integrative strategies may be employed, and they must all be inferred from the texture of the very texts which have suggested them. For instance, the knowledge that our local cultures traditionally evince “gender-crossers” who possess transgenderal characteristics may be taken to imply that vicarious identifications with femaleness, as they occur in the texts of certain local male authors, are already a declaration of this “difference” (for lack of a better term, and for obviously political purposes, I would now like to call this difference a kind of “female-wishful sexuality”). An example of this would be Nick Joaquin’s wanton fictional and poetic celebrations of femininity and his mythic embellishments on some kind of incipient or

antediluvian matriarchy (to be seen in such stories as “The Summer Solstice” and “May Day Eve,” and in his novels, *The Woman Who Had Two Navels* and *Cave and Shadows*). It’s indeed rather telling that, read more closely, the quality of such textual celebrations approaches the identificatory rather than the possessive: to become—not to have—a Woman.

These, as well as other “cryptohomosexual” textual strategies, may obviously all provide entry points into other forms of gay reading. Regardless of the actual methodology, the ultimate goal of all such “integrative” approaches—as opposed to the earlier mentioned separatist “biographical/archival” approach—is the disavowal of homosexuality’s absolute difference, and the establishment of liminal zones between gays and straights, homosexuals and heterosexuals, women and men, evil and good, Satan and God.

GAY CULTURE: HISTORY AND WRITINGS

This study is divided into two parts: gay history and culture, and gay writings. Either part may be taken by itself and not necessarily “linked” to the other. In fact, I would prefer them to be read not sequentially but as mirror images of each other, whereby two different text-milieus are able to come up with relatively “same” pieces of reading. The first part implicitly talks about how culture has produced gays and vice versa, and the second more or less demonstrates—through modest readings of Montano’s, Nadres’s, and Perez’s identifiably homosexual works—how gay literary texts have produced gay culture, and how gay culture spurred the writing of such texts. My framework in both enterprises emerges from the “contact zones” between and among feminist and materialist cultural critiques, cultural and social anthropology, gay and lesbian theory, historiography, deconstruction, biography and social semiotics.²² In the process of mediation I assume I must have fashioned my own particular versions of such “traveling theories.” The organizing principle within each component has been thematic, but in this case, I have let the material suggest the themes that have become the subheadings in each section. I literally sat down and wrote the central arguments of this study in one go. This does not necessarily commend the less deliberate and more compulsive method of research, but it does demonstrate, I suppose, the rare and happy coincidence between intuition and intelligence.

The questions I wish to answer in the section on Philippine gay culture relate to popular and academic formulations of homosexuality which I feel would shed light on the urgent issue of the gay movement (or the patent lack thereof). Thus, here, formal definitions of the terms *bakla*, *gay*, and *homosexual* are juxtaposed against the “lived” definitions and self-expressions of gays in the urban or metropolitan cultures of the last three decades. For the former I have relied on dictionaries and academic positivist sources, and for the latter I have inquired into popular gay writings that were particularly aplenty in the seventies. Both, however, are finally “supplemented” with my own personal narratives that occasionally intrude into the history.

Although historical, this section does not strictly hew to what may appear as clearly diachronized divisions of the last three decades: from 1960 up to the nineties. Actually, the division of part 1 into chapters is a mere formality since, in truth, I so wrote this study’s first part so that it may read like one complete chapter in itself, with only “subheadings” to mark off thematic sectionings. I did it this way because I wished to underline the assertion that in terms of conceptual history, these three decades could be taken as one. Meanings regarding homosexuality and homosexual identities circulate with and cross-refer to each other throughout the time frames in question, and the supersession of any one model of male homosexuality, *gayness*, *kabaklaan*, etc. does not really happen here.

Part 1 commences with an outline of relevant models of (male) homosexuality, with a section on terminology that will become selectively operative in the work. After this, definitions which may be traced back to the decade of the sixties, but do not remain completely its monopoly, are discussed. Here, I will employ the heuristic “*bakla/homosexual dynamic*” to indicate the areas of equivalency and disparity between what are fundamentally different, culturally specific terms: mainly, that *bakla* denotes gender compartment and identity (effeminacy, femininity, cross-dressing, etc.), and *homosexual* is obviously limited to the concept of sexual object choice (or sexuality). This dynamic may be shown to structure much of what follows in the history of gay culture, as a critical unawareness of it has inadvertently minoritized homosexuality to the identity of the *bakla*, and therefore institutionalized both inversion and the hierarchy of heterosexualized (that is to say, inverted) same-sexual desire. Other

than the difference that is implied by this dynamic, bakla's other, presexual connotations are also considered in terms of their potential impact on the issues of gayness and (male) homosexuality by the time the next decades swish along.

From the sixties, the study moves on to a discussion of gay culture in the seventies (its actual "efflorescence"). In this section, specifically gay—hence, political—issues are discussed the way they are understood by the purveyors and discussants of what by this time is clearly evolving as the official Philippine urban "homosexual" script (namely, "Third Sex"), and analyzed in terms of their actual, historically positioned significance in the ongoing struggle by Filipino homosexuals to achieve liberation. The eighties and the nineties are also considered in terms of the cultural themes by which they may be seen to be most easily remembered. This analysis includes the discussion of topics which are not strictly about gays or homosexuality, but which nonetheless shed light on certain concepts in gay culture that either presuppose them or are their logical extrapolations. (An example would be a discussion of loob as a local cultural trope that connotes internal sexual subjectivity.)

An important section that departs from the apparently diachronic ordering of gay culture's themes is the one about gender-crossing in pre- and early colonial Philippines. For this section, I will rely on ethnographies, confession manuals, and dictionaries written by Spanish chroniclers and priests, and also on the more recent feminist scholarship that focuses on the Philippine and regional precolonial gender systems, in order to postulate the historiographic cogency of an institutionalized and prestigious status that was uniformly accorded the "transgenderal," genitally male babaylan, who were the earliest Philippine gender-crossers—"precursors" even, in a more or less culturally verifiable way, to the twentieth century's bayot and bakla.

Finally, I summarize the results of the study by way of a model that accounts for the different expressions of the homosexual identity in the gay culture of the last three decades. For part 2, I select and look into the identifiably homosexual writings of Montano, Nadres, and Perez (an unpublished novel, a "cult classic" of a stage play, and a multigenre book, respectively) and analyze them individually, in an attempt to rearticulate their positions on the question of homosexual oppression and liberation,

and to finally relate these to their authors' concrete "autobiographical selves." Hence, in these analyses, my implicit goal is to "out" them (that is, lay them bare, raise them high for all to see), and therefore to offer up their alternative and/or oppositional views on homosexuality to the largely orphaned, patrimonially impoverished Filipino gays of the present.

COMING OUT

I can imagine this study eventually becoming significant to Philippine academe once the gays who are unmistakably—as strongly suggested by this very work—in it begin to come out collectively in order to assert themselves as openly gay individuals. Otherwise, this project and its author will simply be just another case in point that lends further credence to the open secret of how gays thrive in the academe because therein gayness is simply the extra price for creativity.²³ The problem with all open secrets, however, is that they are really closed.

Nonetheless, it should please my friends to know that the primary and most immediate significance of my work is that it has helped me to appreciate myself better, and therefore to be less brooding about my bitter lot, and to be more secure about my talents. They no longer have to comfort me too much anymore. If at all, by providing them with what I believe is the best that I can give, by way of this modest study and at this moment in my intellectual life, I am doing them a good turn for a change.

Certainly, this project may well induct a fresher, less demonizing, and more humane atmosphere in which to study gay culture. I'd like to believe that much can be learned from this story of resistance and pride. Gays and nongays (or those who think they are gays and nongays) have a lot to find here. Lessons on how to be better people, for instance. On beauty. On justice. Plain survival. Certainly, for the reticent gay reader and/or sympathizer, the sheer verbosity of this work may well provide the impetus and the words with which to articulate what she has always had on the tip of her tongue which, once untied, will gorgeously say to all: In our world, gays comprise an important minority sector.²⁴ And their oppression and victories oughtn't go unrhapsodized any more.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Gregory Herek, "Homophobia," *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 552-55.
2. Jonathan Dollimore, "Becoming Authentic," in *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (London: Oxford University Press, 1991), 39-63.
3. Terry Eagleton, "Capitalism, Modernism and Postmodernism," *Against the Grain* (London: Verso, 1986), 131-47.
4. Dollimore, "Early Modern: Cross-Dressing in Early Modern England," in *Sexual Dissidence*, 284-85.
5. Actually, all the current government figures on AIDS are at best tentative and misleading. According to one particular Department of Health report, by September of 1993, the total number of reported HIV infections has risen to 416, 75 of which were homosexually transmitted. See Christine Avendaño, "AIDS-Related Deaths Now 69; 8 More Pinoys Infected," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, September 18, 1993, 1, 14.

Nonetheless, it must not be ignored that the chances of Philippine gays becoming stigmatized with AIDS are always there. In the same article, the wording—and in a potentially explosive issue such as disease-control and the labeling of so-called risk groups, the official wording of statistical data is always rather crucial—the breakdown of the total number of HIV infections goes this way: "most of the 416 HIV cases in the country or 290, however, were acquired through sexual contacts. This involved 215 heterosexuals and 75 homosexuals." The use of the words homosexual and heterosexual is rather telling: the report prefers to look at AIDS as an issue of identity rather than behavior, the more proper wording for which should have been "homosexually/heterosexually transmitted," and not "homosexuals" or "heterosexuals." (Or perhaps the best would be to simply state that so many cases were "sexually transmitted.") A more recent article also makes a

similar linkage between AIDS and gay identity: “31 percent of infected persons (of more than 31,000 in the Western Pacific region) are homosexuals” (“AIDS Cases Rising in Western Pacific,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 24, 1993, 10).

The Filipino gay communities in the United States have another story to tell, however. They have the “highest incidence of AIDS among Asian-Pacific immigrants in San Francisco.” See Arlene Chipongian, “AIDS Strikes Filipinos Hard on West Coast,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, January 1993, 1.

6. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978).

Actually, the social constructionist position was first articulated not by Foucault but by sociologist Mary McIntosh, in her paper “The Homosexual Role.” Here, she concludes that “homosexual” is not really a psychiatric and medical description that is completely scientific, but rather a social category (label) which is coercively imposed on certain people for purposes of social control. Nonetheless, it was Foucault who historicized the subject and came out with the actual date and context of the manufacturing of the homosexual person. See Mary McIntosh, “The Homosexual Role,” in *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy*, ed. Edward Stein (New York: Routledge, 1992), 25-42.

7. For this whole section on the theoretical distinctions between essentialism and social constructionism, I am much indebted to Edward Stein’s illuminating discussion on the matter. See Stein, *Forms of Desire*, 325-53.
8. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: Regents of the University of California Press, 1990), 49.
9. Robert Padgug, “Sexual Matters: On Conceptualizing Sexuality in History,” in Stein, *Forms of Desire*, 43-67.
10. Leonore Tiefer, “Social Constructionism and the Study of Human Sexuality,” in Stein, *Forms of Desire*, 297-98.
11. “Kinsey’s Report” is actually a two-part study: the first is about sexual behavior among American males, and the second about sexual behavior among American females. For the former, see Alfred C. Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy, and C. E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948).
12. We were together in a forum on homosexual issues held on August 18, 1993, sponsored by a student gay organization of the University of the Philippines, UP Babaylan. The other gay and lesbian speakers and reactors all agreed that the plea for “acceptance” which is implicit in the forum’s title, “Acceptance or Struggle: Positioning the Homosexual in the Social Order,” is no longer to be desired. Homosexuals are not defectors to be accepted back into proper society—the same way that heterosexuals do not have the God-deemed right to accept anyone. In any case, this might well be the first time Filipino gays and lesbians dialogued

with each other, and we were all rather amused by the fact that some of our many concerns, though apparently divergent, converged in rather telling and beautiful ways.

13. Elizabeth Uy Eviota, *The Political Economy of Gender: Women and the Sexual Division of Labour in the Philippines* (London: Zed Books Ltd., 1992), 170.
14. I refashion this critical method out of the redefined position of the autobiography within the feminist movement. Feminist critic Rita Felski writes: "It is the representative aspects of the female author's experience rather than her unique individuality which are important, allowing for the inclusion of fictive but representative episodes distilled from the lives of other women." See Rita Felski, "On Confession," in *Beyond Feminist Aesthetics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), 95.

In the case of Philippine gay autobiography, the "other women" can only be the homosexual minority that already exists and that suffers from homophobic subordination: the outwardly bakla, precisely.

15. Stephan Likosky, "New Understandings," in *Coming Out: An Anthology of International Gay and Lesbian Writings*, ed. Stephan Likosky (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 119.
16. I refer here to the Lean Alejandro Lecture Series held on March 26, 1993, at the University of the Philippines Diliman. All the speakers for the symposium subtitled "I'm Gay. Will You Still Be My Friend and Comrade?" were members of the different leftist collectives in the Philippines. Some of the speakers were Rody Vera of PETA (Philippine Educational Theater Association); Ding Quejada of Education Forum; visual artist Alex Umali; lesbian freelance writer Nini Matilac; former League of Filipino Students member and current PRO-Gay Philippines president Allan Tolosa; and KALAYAAN feminist Aida Santos. Soxy Topacio, the current artistic director of PETA, reveals the same experience of oppression in the hands of Philippine progressive movement leaders in an interview with *Graphic*, sometime in February of 1993.
17. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
18. Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992).
19. The title of the anthology, edited by poet Danton Remoto and me, is *Ladlad: An Anthology of Philippine Gay Writing*. Published by Anvil Publishing in May 1994, the book took a little over a year to finally put out, but the interim had been instructive. Also, the wait proved salutary, because other gays were emboldened to have their works published in the anthology after they had won in some local contest or other. Read from cover to cover, the anthology wonderfully reveals the

diversity of Filipino gay men, especially where individual philosophies, interests, and obsessions are concerned.

20. Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero passed away on April 28, 1995. He was 84.
21. I read this paper as part of a discussion panel on gender at the University of the Philippines National Writers' Workshop in April 1992. The rest of the paper talks about the arrogance of some creative writers in the academe who haughtily presume that what they teach during workshops such as that one is innocent of ideology. In that paper, I felt I had to remind everyone that precisely the formalist apolitical attitude is ideological, and in view of the workshop's many "incidents," rather homophobically suspect.
22. I am not loath to say that the general rubric for the approach that I have taken in this study is "Cultural Materialism." As Dollimore and Alan Sinfield put it, contemporary cultural criticism, in order to be viable, requires that one employ a combined strategy of historical context, theoretical method, political commitment, and textual analysis.

See Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, "Cultural Materialism," *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Manchester University Press, 1985), vii.

23. That teaching is a feminine occupation in the Philippines is a fact acknowledged by the education secretary himself. According to Ricardo Gloria, of the country's 500,000 public school teachers, only 30,000 (or 6 percent) are males. To correct the imbalance—and to provide schoolboys masculine role models—Gloria's hare-brained scheme is to pay "macho" teachers a higher rate as an incentive. He adds that macho teachers are hardier—they can be sent to far-flung places with no danger of getting raped—as well as more diligent in their attendance (since they do not go on maternity leaves).

Of course, the man is quite simply mistaken about four things: (1) effeminacy in children cannot be attributed to a lack of role models alone; (2) in any case, effeminacy is not a bad thing; (3) macho teachers are in no danger of getting raped but as the recent cases of sexual harassment filed against "masculine" teachers show, they are in many ways predisposed to committing rape against their female students; (4) teaching is feminine and feminizing and there is nothing anyone can do about it short of changing our culture's gender system. See "Macho Teachers Wanted," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, March 31, 1995, 12.

24. I use "minority" here not so much to preempt the homosexual question upon which this study dilates—for indeed, all the major arguments of this book strongly gesture toward the epistemological instability of the homo/hetero binary—as to appeal to the word's rhetorical force. Likewise, the term minority describes less an actual social fact (a real "minority") than a phantasmatic structure in which

a majority obsessively imagines a minority in order to constitute itself. Thus, “minority” possesses a transgressive power mostly unbeknownst to itself.

PART ONE PHILIPPINE GAY CULTURE

1. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: Regents of the University of California Press, 1990), 49.
2. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 19-21.
 “Homosexual panic” is a pseudo-psychiatric concept that is currently being used as a legal defense in order to exculpate the perpetrators of gay bashing from their “hate crime.” This notion admits to the possibility that men who are *latently homosexual* (universalizing view) cannot be blamed for becoming violent and “panicky” in the presence of *gays* (minoritizing view) because they have merely been overcome by irrational fear. Hence, it exemplifies how the conflictual views on homosexuality, or its “definitional crisis” (as Sedgwick puts it), can and actually does work against gays.
3. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978). Cited in Sedgwick, 45.
4. A.C. Kinsey, W.B. Pomeroy, and C.E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948). Cited in Warren Blumenfeld and Diane Raymond, *Looking at Gay and Lesbian Life* (Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1988), 79.
5. David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 16.

The passage pertaining to this goes:

The emergence of homosexuality out of inversion, the development of sexual orientation independent of relative degrees of masculinity and femininity, takes place during the latter part of the nineteenth century and comes to its own only in the twentieth. Its highest expression is the “straight-acting and -appearing gay male,” a man distinct from other men in absolutely no other respect besides that of his “sexuality.” (Quoted in Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 8-9.)

I, like Sedgwick, agree with both the impulse and the insight of this passage, if only as a formulation of the discourse of gender-intransitive homosexuality. I, like Sedgwick, take issue with the unproblematic incumbency of postinversion. Obviously, my grounding in Philippine gay culture’s “realities” tells me that

hereabout at least inversion is still the dominant pattern, and will likely stay that way for some time more.

6. Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford University Press, 1992), 7-11.
7. Emerito Gonzales, "Homosexuality: An Ethical Appraisal," *The Thomasian Philosopher*, 1991, 28-40. University of Santo Tomas.
8. Jonathan Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).
9. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "A Poem Is Being Written," in *Tendencies* (London: Routledge, 1994), 204.
10. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 184-86.

Sedgwick elucidates further on her idea of homosexuality by citing the works of Claude Levi-Strauss and Heidi Hartmann, and by linking her own project with the New Historicist readings of the Renaissance scholar, Alan Bray.

See Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 115; Heidi Hartmann, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," in *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, ed. Lydia Sargent (Boston: South End Press, 1981), 14; and Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1982), 25.

11. Gert Hekma, "Homosociality," in *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 560-61.
12. Alan Bray and Michael Rey, "Friendship (Male)," in Dynes, *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, 444.
13. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 41.
14. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 40.
15. This gay bar first opened in 1970. See Eric Catipon, "Cruising," *Sunday Times Life Magazine*, February 21, 1993, 3-6.

CHAPTER ONE: THE SIXTIES

1. Lee Sechrest and Luis Flores, "Homosexuality in the Philippines and the United States: The Handwriting on the Wall," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Massachusetts, October 1969: 9.
2. University of the Philippines Professor Martin F. Manalansan IV claims bakla comes from the first syllables of the Tagalog-Filipino words for woman and man, babae and lalaki, respectively. Although the intervening consonant sound "k" is not accounted for in his hypothesis, the cross-gender import of the term bakla is

admittedly interesting and suggestive. See Martin F. Manalansan IV, “Tolerance or Struggle: Male Homosexuality in the Philippines Today,” MS, 1990.

3. Sechrest and Flores, 9.
4. Jane S. Banzhaf, “Toward the Exploration of the Bakla Personality,” Master’s thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, 1969, 1.

Bakla, for Banzhaf, is semantically similar to binabae, which for her means “the process of making into a woman, and being like a woman” (7). She, however, is at variance with Sechrest and Flores because she posits male homosexuality to be a more advanced form of effeminacy with which “the masculine elements of society cannot reconcile.” For Sechrest and Flores, with whom I will have to agree, femininity and homosexuality are two very different behaviors that in the bakla only happen to meet. They likewise observe that the bakla is immediately understood to be effeminate/feminine, with the existence of his homosexuality vaguely implicit in his person.

5. Rogelia Pe-Pua, “Ang Sikolohiyang Pilipino at ang Programang Pampopulasyon,” *Diliman Review* 39, no. 4 (1991): 13-18. University of the Philippines.

If the nature of the “stumbling block” that prevents the development of a more effective family planning program is linguistic, then may I suggest to the Department of Health that swardspeak be used as the vehicle for the dissemination of public health and contraceptive material to the communities? As we shall see in the succeeding pages, swardspeak does not only involve a lexical difference, but more important, a difference in “attitude” toward the very subject of sex as well. I’m sure there are enough swardspeak terms to handle the basics about sex; if not, swardspeak can always, in each and every case, invent them.

6. In the “little speech” I delivered for that occasion, I imagined how a cartographic analogy of the Philippine gender system may actually be revealing of two distinct axes of identity: sexuality and gender. “Superimposing the two conceptual maps might show how in terms of sexuality all bakla are homosexual, while in terms of gender, homosexuals are only partly bakla ... And so, we need to examine how complementary or hostile are these two terms, although ‘gay’ (a term which I prefer to call myself and whatever it is my ‘self’ does—this book, titled *Closet Quivers*, included—may well be regarded as the points of overlap of the areas covered by the homosexual and the bakla in this very clumsy, albeit hopefully useful, map of sexual identities” (from J. Neil C. Garcia, “Closet Quivers: Politics and Poetics,” *Diliman Review* 40, no. 2 [1992]: 5-10).

The Cine Café opened in March 1992. By the time I launched my book there, it had become a cozy and fitting venue for gay film showings, poetry readings, and exhibits. Recently, Nicolas Pichay’s Coming Out play, *Karga Mano*, was staged at the Cine Café by Dulaang Talyer, a gay theater collective headed by actor-director

Paul Morales. For a review of Pichay's play, see J. Neil C. Garcia, "Karga Mano: A Gayer Kind of Love," *Manila Chronicle*, January 18, 1993, 14.

7. Carmen Santiago, "Ang Kahulugan ng Pagkalalake sa mga Pilipino," in *Ulat ng Ikalawang Pambansang Kumperensya sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino*, ed. Lilia Antonio et al. (Manila: Lathalian ng Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino), 101-19.
8. Frederick Whitam and Robin Mathy, *Male Homosexuality in Four Societies: Brazil, Guatemala, the Philippines, and the United States* (New York: Praeger Scientific, 1986).
9. Joseph Itiel, *Philippine Diary: A Gay Guide to the Philippines* (San Francisco: International Wavelength Inc., 1989), 10.
10. Banzhaf, 1.
11. In any case, it doesn't seem the practice of early American medicine in the Philippines was very much interested in the field of psychiatry. On the contrary, the Bureau of Science in Manila undertook a number of laboratory projects aimed at classifying the different tropical parasites residing in native bodies in order to protect the health of the racially superior albeit microbially vulnerable American settlers here.

See Warwick Anderson, "'Where Every Prospect Pleases and Only Man Is Vile': Laboratory Medicine as Colonial Discourse," in *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*, ed. Vicente L. Rafael (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1995), 83-103.

12. Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 182. Quoted in Harriet Whitehead, "The Bow and the Burdenstrap: A New Look at Institutionalized Homosexuality in North America," in *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*, ed. Sherry B. Ortner and Harriet Whitehead (Cambridge University Press, 1981), 110.
13. It is to explicate the complexities of this "reality" that Sikolohiyang Pilipino, under the charismatic leadership of Virgilio Enriquez, has sought to indigenize the study of the psychology of Filipinos from within their own culture: this implies that the energies of social science research should now be directed less to the uncritical adoption of Western categories than to the culling of indigenous concepts and research methods that will respect the cultural givenness of Filipinos. While at first blush merely relativist, Sikolohiyang Pilipino actually remains very much interested in the scientific project of searching for "universals." It must however be qualified that only a cross-indigenous model of psychologies will suffice in carrying this out, which therefore presupposes that even Western industrialist psychology is an ethnoscience specific to its social milieu. In this respect, the cultural validation of psychological models and theories across different cultures

is to be considered a most necessary undertaking. Enriquez calls this orientation “universalist”: Sikolohiyang Pilipino does not assume the irreducible uniqueness of all cultures, but insists that any attempts at understanding them must be made *from within* each of these cultures. Only after such a project has been completed can the idea of the possible “generalizability” of certain psychological properties begin to be entertained.

See Virgilio G. Enriquez, *Pagbabangong-Dangal: Indigenous Psychology and Cultural Empowerment* (Quezon City: Akademya ng Cultura at Sikolohiyang Pilipino, 1994), 47-48.

14. Actually, this study does not wish to adjudicate among the many competing models of Filipino personality and selfhood. In the first place, the “ensign” under which I will operate in this project is more sociological than psychological: this book cannot really be said to belong to sikolohiya, indigenous or otherwise. As has already been qualified before, it is merely the performative—rather than the interpretive—aspects of the concept of selfhood between the West and our cultures that are to be considered in this work. Likewise, the project of ascertaining (almost prescribing) a Filipino psychology does not and cannot take into account the differences among the many cultural communities and groups making up the geopolitical reality that is the Philippines; this makes such a project a nationalistically mystifying and therefore a potentially fascistic one.

Nonetheless, *loob* would seem to be one of the more fertile local concepts around which revolve a number of tropes that have hitherto been used to explain what I would call Tagalog-Filipino “psychospirituality”: that blurred site of significations that are both secular and religious and that relate to the inner life of an individual or collectivity belonging to Tagalog-Filipino society. Enriquez has sought to render this “psyche/spirit” less blurry by clarifying the object of Sikolohiyang Pilipino as *kamalayan*, *ulirat*, *isip*, *diwa*, *kalooban*, and *kaluluwa* (the last being the equivalent of the “psyche” itself). (See Enriquez, 3.) An alternative model that is supposedly “less secular” than Enriquez’s schema has been forwarded by University of the Philippines anthropologist Prospero Covar: *kaluluwa*, *budhi*, *katauhang panlabas*, and *katauhang panloob* (Enriquez, 54-55).

15. Mark Johnson, “Cross-Gender Men and Homosexuality in the Southern Philippines: Ethnicity, Political Violence and the Protocols of Engendered Sexualities amongst the Muslim Tausug and Sama,” paper presented at the European Conference on Philippine Studies in London, April 13-15, 1994.
16. One such passage in *Orosman at Zafira* goes like this:

Zelim: Abdalap na taksil, ang isip mo бага
Kaya di sumagot ay dahil sa bakla?

In this most recent edition, a footnote reference explains the word “bakla” to mean manghang may takot (“fearful awe”). From Balagtas, *Orosman at Zafira*, ed. B.S. Medina Jr. (Manila: De la Salle University Press, 1990), 254.

17. Jose Villa Panganiban, *Diksyunaryo-Tesaurus Pilipino-Ingles* (Quezon City: 1972), 91.

An “obverse” of this compendium came out almost two decades later, and it is interesting how the English word homosexual is translated—rather, transliterated—therein as “omosekswal.” Such liberally orthographic translation may have been a result of the newer trend emerging out of the national language debates, which allows for direct phonetic equivalences between foreign words and Filipino. On the other hand, however, such an exclusively orthographic way of translating words may also effect a more conservative movement which aims to mark off what is inherently “foreign” from what is “indigenous.” See Jose Villa Panganiban, *English-Filipino Thesaurus-Dictionary* (Marikina: 1988), 372.

18. See Juan de Noceda and Pedro de Sanlucar, *Vocabulario de la Lengua Tagala* (Reimpreso en Manila: Imprenta de Ramirez y Giraudier, 1860), 49; Pedro Serrano Laktaw, *Diccionario Tagalog-Hispano* (Manila: Imprenta v. Lit. de Santos y Bernal, 1914), 131.
19. Michael Tan, “Sickness and Sin: The Medical and Religious Stigmatization of Homosexuality in the Philippines,” MS (1992).
20. Donn V. Hart, “Homosexuality and Transvestism in the Philippines: The Cebuano Filipino Bayot and Lakin-on,” *Behavior Science Notes* 3 (1968): 211-48.
21. James Weinrich, “Reality or Social Construction,” *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy*, ed. Edward Stein (New York: Routledge, 1991), 175-208.

Weinrich identifies three patterns of homosexuality that supposedly exist all over the world: the age-biased pattern (exemplified by the Greek and New Guinea models), the inversion pattern (exemplified by the Amerindian *berdache*, the Indian *hijra*, and may I now add, the Philippine bakla/bayot), and the role-playing pattern (to be seen in some Latin American and Middle Eastern cultures).

Of course, the most insightful work on Melanesia and New Guinea was undertaken by Gilbert H. Herdt. See for instance his *Ritualized Homosexuality in Melanesia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

22. Stephen O. Murray, *Latin American Male Homosexualities* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995).
23. Whitehead, 97.

On the centrality of homo/sexuality in the matter of defining gender in contemporary Western civilization, Whitehead argues: “Homosexual activity has

been so strongly definitive of an enduring, gender-anomalous condition that it has long been impossible to engage in it casually.”

24. Lina Espina, “Homosexuals Are a Major Police Problem,” *This Week Magazine*, July 31, 1960, 34.

She explains the etymology of the word *biniboy* thus: “Homosexuals are called bakla in Tagalog. But since terms, like people, take on the mestizo quality, this has developed into *biniboy*, which is said to be a combination of the words binibini which means maiden in Tagalog, and boy which is, well, boy. Other terms are sioke and sister.”

Though unformulated, this passage manages to foreshadow the future efflorescence of the highly generative language of swardspak.

25. Ma. Simeona Ponteñila, “An Ethnographic Study of the Overt Bayots in Dumaguete City” (master’s thesis, Silliman University, March 1975). In a master’s thesis in psychology, a researcher concludes that transvestites in Antipolo are “significantly unfavored” by his respondents. See Praxedes S. de la Rosa, “The Attitude of the Professionals of Antipolo, Rizal toward Effeminate and Transvestites,” *Philippine Education Quarterly*, March 1979, 23.

CHAPTER TWO: THE SEVENTIES

1. Jonathan Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). See especially his section on “The Paradoxical Perverse,” 103-30.
2. Angie Santiago, “Gay Manila: A Panel on Homosexuality,” *Manila Paper*, May 1975.* References with the asterisk may also be found in Diana Julao, “Gay Philippines: Pagkatao, Suliranin at Wika ng Sward,” unpublished compilation, Institute of Mass Communication, University of the Philippines (1980).
3. Aida Sevilla Mendoza, “A Peek into Private Lives of People Who Swing and Love Both Ways,” *Philippine Panorama*, June 17, 1979, 6.
4. Bibsy Carballo, “Second Thoughts on the Third Sex,” *Mirror Magazine*, April 5, 1969.
5. Ian Hacking, “Making Up People,” in *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy*, ed. Edward Stein (New York: Routledge, 1992), 69-88.
6. Nick Joaquin, *Gloria Diaz and Other Delineations* (Manila: National Book Store, 1977), 203.
7. Josie Darang, “How About a Third Force?” *People*, July 8, 1979, 16.

8. Rosalia de Leon, "Filipino Attitudes Towards Homosexuality" (term paper submitted to Professor Joseph Regalado for Psychology 11, Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, August 1979).*
9. Jane S. Banzhaf, "Toward the Exploration of the Bakla Personality" (master's thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, 1969), 1.
10. Banzhaf, 3.
11. Gerry N. Zaragoza, "Save Fofonggay!" *Campus Journal*, March 13, 1975.
12. Ma. Simeona Ponteñila, "An Ethnographic Study of the Overt Bayots in Dumaguete City" (master's thesis, Silliman University, March 1975).
13. Santiago, "Gay Manila."
14. M. L. Maniquiz, "Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming Salamat," in *Cultural Center of the Philippines Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, vol. 7, ed. Nicanor G. Tiongson (Manila: CCP, 1994), 196.
15. Fely Luz Marcos, "A Case Study on the Language of the Homosexuals Based on the Play *Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming Salamat*" (undergraduate thesis, Institute of Mass Communication, University of the Philippines, March 1976).*
16. Santiago, "Gay Manila."
17. Ponteñila, 87.
18. R.H. Desuasido, "A Second Time for Boys in the Band," *Parade*, October 28, 1979.
19. Nestor B. Fernandez, "Madam I'm Adam," *Philippine Panorama*, July 20, 1980, 18.
The "Jade Vine" pageants later gave rise to the biggest gay beauty contest so far, "Tala ng Kalighatian." See A. C. Florendo, "A Gay Reality," *Expressweek*, July 22, 1976.
20. Mario Taguiwalo, "The Pursuit of Happiness at Coco Banana," *Who?*, August 2, 1980, 18.
21. Taguiwalo, 18.
22. Juan Birion, "Intellectual, Social, and Emotional Adjustments and Sexual Behavior of Homosexual College Students," *Manuel L. Quezon University Graduate Journal*, first semester, 1981-1982, 38-46.
23. Warren Johansson, "Transsexualism," *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 1310.
24. Elena Patron, "Ako si Emma ... Babae," *Liwayway* (September 23, 1974–April 21, 1975).
25. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 49.
26. Lee Sechrest and Luis Flores, "Homosexuality in the Philippines and the United States: The Handwriting on the Wall," *Journal of Social Psychology*, October 1969, 9. Massachusetts.

27. Princesita Buma-at et al., *The Misunderstood: An Attempted Study on Homosexuality* (Manila: United Publishing House Co., 1974).
28. Ponteñila, 41.
29. Laura Samson et al., "Ang Pagkilala at Pagbabansag ng mga Alanganin," *Diwa 5, Journal of Psychology*, nos. 1-2 (1976). University of the Philippines.*
30. According to recent sociological studies, in the United States, heterosexual males who cross-dress may actually outnumber homosexual transvestites. See Lawrence Senelick, "Transvestism," in Dynes, *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, 1313.
31. Carballo, 6.
32. Jimmy Rimonte, "Are We Breeding a Generation of Badaf Forever?" *Parade*, November 2, 1980, 9.

An incomplete chronological listing of published articles that offer a variety of homosexual "etiologies" includes the following:

1. C. Alvarez, "Sexual Mixups," *Mirror Magazine*, January 17, 1968, 6.
2. Carballo.
3. *Pace Newsmagazine*, "Why Homosexuals Are That Way" and "The Freudian Theory," January 21, 1972, 44-45.
4. Ponteñila, 114. She suggests that, judging from the case studies she conducted for the bayots (sic) of Dumaguete City, there is a very strong mother-causation in the genesis of male homosexuality.
5. Ma. Corazon Amansec, "Ang Transekswalismo," *Tao at Lipunan* (Journal of the Social Sciences, University of the Philippines, Diliman), 1974?*
6. Jose Meily, "Homosexuality," *Philippine Panorama*, July 6, 1975, July 13, 1975.

Other Meily (Jose and Anita) columns that tackle homosexuality and its roots came out in the following dates: "God didn't create the gay," August 4, 1985; "Homosexual Love," November 16, 1986; "Coping with a Gay Child," August 9, 1987; "Frustrating Relationships," October 1, 1989.

7. Birion, 116.
8. Greg Laconsay, "Gay Power Did It," *Who?*, August 18, 1982.
9. M. Guerrero, "Homosexuality: A Hormonal Problem?" *Women's Journal*, November 1984, 20.
10. "Questions You've Always Wanted to Ask about Homosexuality But Were Afraid to Ask," *Campus Magazine*, August 1987, 15.
11. Belinda Nera Gallamos, "Sociocultural and Psychological Variables Related to Adolescent Homosexuality among Male University of Santo Tomas High School Students" (master's thesis in Psychology, University of Santo Tomas, (March 1988).
12. Noel de Pano, "Yes, Homosexuals Can Be Cured," *Mr & Ms*, June 28, 1988.

13. Tomas Q. Andres, "Homosexuality: A Third Normal Sex?" *Philippine Values Digest* 4 (1989): 64-74.
14. George Nava True, "Facts and Fallacies about Homosexuality," from the biweekly column, Health Frontiers, *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, January 7, 1993, 9.

I have deliberately left the columns of Margarita Go-Singco Holmes out from this listing because they do not, first and foremost, treat homosexuality as a pathological state. It is notable, however, that save for Ponteñila, Birion, and Gallamos, all the authors of these papers and/or magazine articles merely summarize the state of the art in theories of homosexuality.

Amansec's paper, on the other hand, ventures to explain that the Oedipal drama, whose nonresolution leads to homosexuality, hardly plays itself out in the Philippine home: the father is absent, but it's because of some slowly encroaching matriarchy to be observed in the Filipino family:

Nagkakaroon ng bakla ngayon dahil sa dumarami ang mga lalaking bumibitiw sa kanilang posisyon bilang mga pinuno ng kani-kanilang pamilya ... sa pangkaraniwang pamilya ngayon, ang babae ang humahawak ng isang posisyon na hindi katulad ng kanilang kalarangan sa Asya ... Ang Pilipinong ina ang humahawak ng pera ng pamilya ... gumagawa ng halos lahat ng malalaking desisyon ukol sa paggastos ... Kaya tuloy ang karaniwang lalaki ay lumalaki sa ilalim ng impluwensiya ng babae ... hindi siya lumalaki na may kinikilalang matatag na ama ng tahanan. Mabigat ang kanyang loob sa babae (7).

[There is an increase in the number of gays because there is also an increase in the number of men who do not live up to their role as the head of the family ... the woman in the contemporary Filipino home holds a position not enjoyed by her counterparts in the rest of Asia ... The Filipino mother keeps the family finances ... makes all the important decisions regarding spending ... All this is responsible for the fact that the typical Filipino male grows up extremely under the influence of the female. He ends up without a strong male role model in the home. He holds a grudge against women.]

Banzhaf echoes the same theory of "feminized masculinity." I think all these congruent interpretations that lay the blame for the existence of male homosexuality on women may be traced to the misogyny which Freudian theory itself reproduces. Sexual deviance is also demonized, together with women, because women are the markers of difference, the "unknown," in a patriarchal system.

33. Denise Chou Alas, “Four on the Third Sex,” *Celebrity*, May 31, 1980, 18-23.

34. Darang, 16.

35. Sedgwick, 87.

This is the classic Christine Jorgensen one-liner: A woman trapped inside a man’s body.

36. That “manly women” are better indulged by a society than “womanly men” probably reflects that society’s belief that “it is degrading for a man to be reduced to the status of a woman, while it is a step up for a woman to be credited with the qualities of a man.” See Wayne R. Dynes, “Effeminacy (Semantics),” in Dynes, *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, 349.

37. Santiago, “Gay Manila:”*

38. Ponteñila, 45.

Ponteñila’s work, sadly, only mentions briefly the lakin-on of Dumaguete City. Nonetheless, for researchers who may be interested in carrying out “lesbian studies,” the following materials are available in the libraries of UP Diliman:

Edna Aceveda et al., “Paraan ng Panliligaw ng mga Babaeng Homosekswal,” panel na inihanda para sa klase ni Propesor Mita Jimenez, Departamento ng Sikolohiya, Unibersidad ng Pilipinas, Diliman.*

Josefina Cacnio, “A Study of the Female Homosexual in the University of the Philippines” (undergraduate thesis, Institute of Mass Communication, University of the Philippines Diliman, 1973).

The De La Salle University Library also keeps a couple of undergraduate theses on female homosexuals in the campus:

Sheila Cardiel and others, “Ang Pakikipag-ugnayan ng mga Binalake, o Ganda Babae: Pusong-lalake.”

Christy Catanghal and others, “Like Poles Attract: Female homosexuality in De La Salle University.”

39. Victor Gamboa and Henry Feenstra, “Deviant Stereotypes: Call Girls, Male Homosexuals, and Lesbians,” *Philippine Sociological Review* 17, nos. 3-4 (July-October 1969): 136-48.

40. “Prostitution Report,” prepared by the Special Squad of the Manila Police Department, *Philippines Free Press*, April 14, 1962, 3.

41. Wayne R. Dynes, “Third Sex,” in Dynes, *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, 1306.

42. *Manila Paper*, “Three Boys in the Band,” May 1975.*

43. *Manila Paper*.

44. *Manila Paper*.

45. Ponteñila, 118.

She adds that most of the terms of bayotspeak (my coinage, not hers) are disguised; some less disguised, particularly the sex terms; others are universally used and understood by both homosexuals and heterosexuals.

46. Ponteñila, 128.

Ponteñila includes eight such songs in her Appendix “as ethnographic material.” Most of the songs deal with themes of alienation, love, and happiness, but always flavored with that unique mockery and funniness associated with the bayot. The existence of such songs (which were performed and/or composed mostly by Visayan artists-singers the likes of Yoyoy Villame, R. Guadalupe, P. Sunga, and Bebeng Samson) awakened me to the realization that “gay culture” in the Philippines has indeed been around for a long time now, and that archival work is quite vital in assuring that these precious legacies and texts do not fall by the wayside of institutional forgetting. They should also belie the “inaugural” and “space-clearing” claims by anybody that he is the first of anything in this country. These songs also bear witness to the inaccuracy, if incompleteness, of the project: perhaps gay culture, albeit of a qualitatively different form, has been alive and well much longer in the southern islands than even in Manila itself?

47. Rimonte, 9.

48. Marie Antonette Raquiza, “Bakla: Do They Have a Chance?” *Diliman Review* 31 (5): 35-77.

49. Philip Waite, “Notes on Swardspeak.” Mr. Waite’s folio of loose papers on the subject of swardspeak may be found among the files on “kabaklaan” of the Philippine Psychology Research and Training House, UP Village, Diliman, Quezon City.

50. Laura Samson, “Ang Swardspeak sa Showbiz,” *Sagisag*, March 1979.*

It is deplorable that libraries do not keep copies of popular showbiz magazines. I am just too sure that the gay entertainment culture manifests a texture of gayness so different from what I have outlined here; renarrativizing it will possibly upset many of the findings of this tentative undertaking.

51. Jose Javier Reyes, “Swardspeak: A Preliminary Study,” *Pintig-Isip* 1, no. 20 (October, 1977): 60-85. Behavioral Sciences Department, De La Salle University.

A list of undergraduate theses coming from the College of Mass Communication of the University of the Philippines on the topic of swardspeak includes the following: Raquel Bautista, “Gays’ Perception on Gay Language: A Case Study of the Gay Language as Used in Lucban, Quezon”; Allen Field, “A Study of Male Homosexual Couturiers of the Greater Manila Area: Personal Characteristics, Attitudes, Sexual Behavior and Mass Media Habits”; and Salome Flores, “A Descriptive Case Study on the Gay language as Used in Metro Manila: Evolution and Its Use.”

On the more recent variants of swardspeak, see Isah V. Red, “Manash, Baklese It Is, Type Nyo?” *Manila Chronicle*, August 9, 1987, 18; and Danilo Maramba, “Gayspeak,” *Sunday Times Life Magazine*, February 21, 1993, 7.

52. Joanne Ramilo et al., “Gay Bar: Isang Pagsusuri at Pagbibigay-Puna” (paper in psychology, submitted to Prof. Virgilio Enriquez, Philippine Psychology Research and Training House).

The researchers interviewed some of the patrons of the “Amulet” gay bar in Ermita, and their respondents gave them the names of six gay organizations and a brief description of each:

1. Boston Guys – composed of straight-acting gays; membership is by invitation only.
 2. Cosmopolitan Circle of the Philippines – all members of this group sport a moustache, as proof of the fact that they are all former straights; most of them are married, even.
 3. Kami-kami Atbp. – the gays who make up this group all have celebrity nicknames, after the current showbiz stars; e.g., Charito Solis, Hilda Koronel, etc.
 4. Mothers, Sisters, and Daughters – only impersonators may join this organization; members are called “mujeristas” or “feministas.” (I must say I find the latter monicker outrageous.)
 5. Sining Kayumanggi Royal Family – the name of this group comes from the bar its members regularly meet in; this group is largely geriatric. (I met the original members of SKRF at their silver anniversary in the stately house of one of its founding members, in San Mateo, Rizal, late 1992.)
 6. A-Z International – supposedly the biggest gay group, with members from all over the archipelago; there is a screening committee that decides on whether or not an aspirant is “talented” enough to become a member. (I suspect the group has since splintered and/or disintegrated. The current organization KATLO seems to have inherited some of the A-Z International’s criteria for selecting members.)
53. Ponteñila, 47.
54. This account appeared in the Sunday magazine of a daily broadsheet only in 1993. It takes the form of a feature article in which an anonymous speaker provides a chronological listing of the many different gay “cruising” spots from the 1970s onward. Some of the places in which local gays had regular sex in the seventies are the following: movie houses in Quezon City and Manila (Delta, Circle, New Frontier, Coronet, Grand, Ever, Ideal, and Galaxy); gay bars in Quezon City, Manila, and Pasay (690, Karetela, Taberna Taboso, Karachi, Adam and Eve, Can-Can, Bar Gay-zer, Gas-Light, Inside Bar, Pendulum, The Saint, and Kalesa); and public parks (Mehan Gardens, Luneta or Rizal Park, and the golf course in front of the Manila City Hall, provocatively called “Chocolate Hills”). See Eric Catipon, “Cruising,” *Sunday Times Life Magazine*, February 21, 1993, 3-6.

55. Nick Joaquin, *Manila: Sin City? and Other Chronicles*, May 1970 (Manila: Cacho Hermanos, 1980), 270.
56. Ricardo Dimayuga, "Libreng Kaligayahan: Landas ng mga Bakla sa Lungsod ng Maynila" (paper submitted in Psychology 118 to Prof. Bartolome, October 1, 1979; found under "kabaklaan," Philippine Psychology Research and Training House).
57. Lamberto Nery, "The Covert Subculture of Male Homosexual Prostitutes in Metro Manila" (paper prepared for Psychology 150 under Professor Benedicto Villanueva, Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, first sem., 1977-1978).*

An intriguing description of gay bar life in the eighties may be found in Cris Marimla, "The Gay Life," *National Midweek*, April 16, 1986, 32-33.

58. Martin Manalansan IV, "Speaking of AIDS: Language and the Filipino 'Gay' Experience in America," in *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*, ed. Vicente L. Rafael (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1995), 193-200.

Manalansan distinguishes the Philippine pattern of male homosexuality from the Latin American *activo/pasivo*, which is (strictly) characterized by a distinction of anal receptive/penetrative roles.

59. Frederick Whitam, "Philippines," in Dynes, *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, 981. On the bakla's claims, see *Manila Paper*; Birion, 132; and Ponteñila, 115.
60. The notion of "pseudohomosexuality" is itself rather pseudo. According to historian Kenneth Lewes, a certain psychoanalyst named Ovesey and his colleagues advanced the idea of the pseudohomosexual in order to "come to the aid of men troubled by feelings of inferiority and powerlessness, (but) to whom the charge of latent homosexuality would be 'catastrophic.'" Hence, the notion of pseudohomosexuality is simply another heterosexual invention meant to minoritize the question of homoeroticism by focusing the psychiatric model of sexuality on a certain part of the population (in this case, the psychosexual inverts) alone.

See Kenneth Lewes, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Male Homosexuality* (New York: Simon and Schuster Inc., 1988), 238.

61. Ponteñila, 55-56.
62. Sofronio G. Calderon, *Diccionario Ingles-Español-Tagalog* (Manila: Libreria de J. Martinez, 1915).
63. Prospero R. Covar, "Kaalangang Bayang Dalumat ng Pagkataong Pilipino," *Diliman Review* 41, no. 1 (1993): 10-15.
64. Vicente L. Rafael, *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule* (Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1988), 125.

65. Alejo's is the latest and inarguably most expansive scholarship on the Tagalog-Filipino concept of shared inner self, or loob. See Albert Alejo, SJ, *Tao Po! Tuloy!* (Office of Research and Publications, Ateneo de Manila University, 1990).

Alejo's work aims to prove that loob is not a flat, static structure, but rather, that it has "roundness" (lalim) and is dynamic. His framework is largely Christian structuralist-Humanist, and as with other texts of this sort I choose to look at his work not as descriptive (not in the least), but as prescriptive.

66. Rafael, 124-26.
 67. Alejo, 104.
 68. Joseph Itiel, *Philippine Diary: A Gay Guide to the Philippines* (San Francisco: International Wavelength Inc., 1989), 12.
 69. Reynaldo C. Iletto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979), 143.
 70. Rune Layumas collaborated on this film project with German avant-garde filmmaker Jürgen Bruning. It is the second part of the trilogy, *Maybe I Can Give You Sex*, which is really Layumas's work. The film came out of Bruning's curiosity concerning the reality of "straight-gay" relationships in the Philippines, a sexual arrangement quite kinky and unheard of in the West. For more on the film, see this study's Conclusion.
 71. A similar point is raised by Manalansan, in his essay on the strategies of Filipino-American gays in the wake of AIDS.

"The Roman Catholic Church, with its coterie of female saints, martyrs and most especially the Virgin Mary, has provided the models par excellence of suffering" (Manalansan, 216).

While I can perfectly understand the argument that suffering has come to be identified with femininity in the current time, I nonetheless disagree with Manalansan's implicit assumption that all suffering has always been feminized within the history of Roman Catholic Philippines. As Reynaldo Iletto points out in *Pasyon and Revolution*, the "stylized forms of behavior" of Christ and the faithful in the *sinakulo* (passion plays) in the nineteenth century were not necessarily understood by the Tagalog peasants to be indications of subservience. On the contrary, the story of the *sinakulo* demonstrated Longinus's "defiance toward the authorities out of commitment to an ideal"; hence, Iletto's work rests on the thesis that the popular movements borrowed their ideology from the passion texts of their time. See Iletto, 17.

72. Emerito Gonzales, "Homosexuality: An Ethical Appraisal," *The Thomasian Philosopher*, 1991, 29. University of Santo Tomas.
 73. Dollimore, 131-47.

74. This may be linked to the notion of the homosexual as a joke: neither here nor there, he is deemed funny because he cannot be placed anywhere. Alanganin has been translated as “deviant,” and deviant means a quality of having strayed from a path; wayward. In light of Augustinian theodicy, deviance is also evil itself.

I suggest, therefore, that rather than look at the conventionalized funniness of the bakla, it is better to inquire into the insights that his being evil/deviant, or “alanganin” brings.

75. Warren Blumenfeld and Diane Raymond, *Looking at Gay and Lesbian Life* (Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1988), 214.

76. John Silva, “Filipino Resistance to the Anti-Homosexual Campaign during the Spanish Regime.”*

77. Manalansan’s observation that the “masculine bakla is the *cassowary* (anomalous category) in the Philippine taxonomy of sexual behavior” doesn’t take into account the slippage of categories implicit in the bakla/homosexual dynamic: precisely, the bakla cannot be masculine, according to the native distinctions of gender; but to the degree that sexuality is not reducible to the categories of gender, that there can indeed be homosexual males who are masculine and not bakla, as this study has been trying to say all along. See Manalansan, 198.

78. Maria Aurora Garcia, “Ang Paglaganap ng Kabaklaan sa Pilipinas.”*

79. Leo Sergio, “Manila and the Male Homosexual,” *Graphic*, August 31, 1966.

80. Pontefila, 58.

81. So popular did these gay representations become that clones of them appeared in a number of movies in the 1970s and early eighties. Some of these are *Tubog sa Ginto*, *Maynila: Sa mga Kuko ng Liwanag*, *Ang Tatay Kong Nanay*, *Lumakad Kang Hubad sa Mundong Ibabaw*, *Showbiz Scandal*, *City After Dark*, *Si Malakas, si Maganda, at si Mahinhin*, and *Mahinhin vs. Mahinhin*. See Lamberto Antonio, “Ang Tauhang Alanganin,” *Observer*, June 2, 1981, 44.

82. Julian E. Dacanay, “Pain and Reality in a Spoof Show: Close Encounters with the Third Sex,” *Who?*, January 12, 1980, 8.

83. *Manila Paper*.

84. *Manila Paper*.

85. Arlene Babst, “Feminism and Gay Liberation,” *Who?*, August 23, 1980.

86. G. Gonzales, “The Funny Company,” *Who?*, July 21, 1979, 46.

87. Santiago.

The person who makes this remark is Dr. Lourdes V. Lapuz, a psychiatrist who may be found giving interviews in many magazines at this time.

88. Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 70.

89. *Manila Paper*.

90. Banzhaf, 10.

More than a decade later, Barrera, another researcher on male homosexuality in Metropolitan Manila, encounters the same social role specification for the bakla. From a survey of male homosexual college students, she concludes that they prefer and most probably will end up in artistic careers. Certainly, then, her work is not cognizant of the bakla/homosexual dynamic, for if it were, then definitely there would be more variety in the profile of her respondents who would, to be sure, prefer a spectrum of “preoccupations for their careers,” the same spectrum one would expect of heterosexual males. See Carmelina Barrera, “The Homosexual College Students of Manila: Their Demographic Profile, Personality, Career Preference, Problems and Opinions Regarding Issues on Homosexuality” (master’s thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila, 1983).

91. Desuasido.

92. Sedgwick, 4-9.

93. Marcos.

94. Pontañila, 82.

95. *Manila Paper*.

96. Procopio Madlangbayan, “Will Your Son Be Gay?” *Expressweek*, June 14, 1979, 14.

97. Rosario Aquino, “The Sociological Aspect of Homosexuality,” *Santo Tomas Journal of Education*, October-December 1965, 20-25.

Actually, her rather outré classification divides homosexuals into three:

1. Respectable – these are men who lead quiet, decent lives, and apart from their sexuality they live normally.
2. Prostitute – this type is not only abnormal but uses his abnormality to his profit.
3. Hoodlum – this is the bullying blackmailer who frequently works with the prostitute type to entice the respectable homosexual to his clutches. (These are almost verbatim descriptions.)

What is interesting about this schema is that it is so scheming: one almost feels a plot thickening for these three characters who are a world unto themselves. This classification, grounded in some kind of illogic I am unable to figure out (silliness notwithstanding), reflects an early “criminalizing” as well as a minoritizing tendency when regarding homosexuality. Suffice it to say that these three “classes” of homosexuals feed on one another, and the heterosexual/homosexual dialectic (in which hetero depends on homo to exist as a category) all but conveniently vanishes.

98. “He has reconciled ‘herself’ with himself and his man,” *Philippine Panorama*, November 11, 1979, 34.

99. Margaruite Evans, “The Case of Bobby Torres” (master’s thesis in Education, major in Guidance and Counseling, La Salle College, April 1972).

His story takes the form of a short autobiography he wrote himself, and transcripts from several sessions with the researcher and a certain psychiatrist. Suicidal when Evans met him, Bobby nonetheless manages to maintain a relationship with a girlfriend who understands all his problems and whom he marries after a false pregnancy. At the end of the case study Bobby is looking forward to fatherhood and a busy career, and he forgets all about his homosexuality of which he has been cured.

He does impress me to be a genuinely distraught homosexual, although I could sense a certain pressure being brought to bear on him by the guidance and counseling situation. Authentic or not? I dare not answer, because, as with all of these archival materials, the more important line of inquiry is not authenticity or its opposite (apocryphality). Rather the more interesting question relates to the material and cultural effects these texts have produced. In the end, the voice of a true anguish manages to whisper across the obvious restrictions an MA thesis bent on mobilizing the myth of heterosexual panacea straddles along the way.

Bobby wrote poems—for self psycho-help perhaps? The sheaf of verses that I found alongside his autobiography also reveals a certain yearning for belongingness, something a gay community, had it existed then, would have given him ungrudgingly. But certainly, minus all the trappings of a hateful humanism that is bent on making everybody the same as everybody else.

One of the sadder and therefore necessarily gloomier poems is called “The End.”

The End

a descending heart is crying
for love that will never be
the body, so dry, is dying
like an age-old tree

the leaves begin to fall
the twigs begin to dry
the trunk begins to rot
the roots begin to die

where is the fertile soil?
blown by the wind, eroded
where is the refreshing rain?
gone, consumed by arid air

there will never be a smile again
 it is forever gone from the face of earth
 sweet music never will be played
 it never will be hummed, it's dead

Where is Bobby Torres now? The part of him that died in this poem lives now in our remembering.

100. Darang, 16.

101. Marcos.

102. Mendoza, 62.

103. *Manila Paper*.

104. Marcelino R. Realeza, "Every Inch a Woman," *Expressweek*, September 27, 1979, 31.

CHAPTER THREE: PRECOLONIAL GENDER-CROSSING AND THE BABAYLAN CHRONICLES

1. Josie Darang, "How About a Third Force?" *People*, July 8, 1979, 16.

A similar remark is made by a British anthropologist who did a recent ethnography on the bakla in the Bicol region: "The bakla try to look for money outside the barangay, possibly as a domestic servant, but more usually by setting themselves up in one of the very numerous small beauty shops which can be found in every tiny Filipino town, servicing the huge demand for dressing up, even among the poor." See Fenella Cannell, "The Power of Appearances: Beauty, Mimicry and Transformation in Bicol," in *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*, ed. Vicente L. Rafael (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1995), 242.

2. I understand the concept of "gender-crossing" has been under attack, specifically from the camp of social scientists who claim that it suffers from an uncritical Western dualism: the idea of "crossing genders" would seem to assume that there are clear frontiers to be crossed between male and female, when precisely—these social scientists are quick to point out—traditional non-Western societies are commonly known to profess unitarian rather than dualistic gender ideologies.

My use of the concept of gender-crossing, however, is informed by the following assumptions: (1) genital difference, by virtue of our human embodiment as persons, is a cultural artifact: that is to say, the human biological body is always already symbolically constructed as a system of signs; (2) out of all the possible signs which can be read from the human body, it is possible to signify the human body in terms of genital difference in order to begin to understand

gender difference; (3) anatomic/genital “sex” (gender) may therefore be seen—heuristically—as a cultural constant; and finally (4) certain other physiological and hence occupational distinctions between genital “males” and “females” further bolster this “difference.”

And so, even as the precolonial Philippine gender system may have indeed been a “unitarian” (or to borrow from Errington’s nomenclature, “centrist”) one, distinctions between male and female bodies—in our case, between the lalaking katawan and the babaeng katawan—were not necessarily erased, only perhaps “undeveloped” because of it. Hence, also, crossing from one gender to the other was not only possible, but in the light of the findings of the present study, most probably necessary for certain individuals whose pre-givenness (in terms of bodily “nature” and/or temperaments) was, albeit initially male, tended to the female in certain important, socially crucial ways. (As when, for instance, the “transformation” from one gender to the other resonated integrally with the given culture’s cosmology.)

3. For an “areal” overview of the various cross-cultural studies done on “homosexuality” within the discipline of anthropology, see D.L. Davis and R.G. Whitten, “The Cross-cultural Study of Human Sexuality,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 16 (1987): 69- 98.
4. For instance, this study will not really delve into the ethnographies written during the American occupation of the Philippines that mention the existence of effeminate cross-dressing in certain tribal societies in the archipelago.

An example of one such ethnography would be Fay-Cooper Cole’s work on the Tinguian. On the matter of cross-dressed males in the villages where he conducted his fieldwork, Cole writes: “On three occasions, the writer has found men dressing like women, doing women’s work, and spending their time with members of that sex ... In Plate 34 is shown a man in woman’s dress, who has become an expert potter.” See Fay-Cooper Cole, *The Tinguian: Social, Religious, and Economic Life of a Philippine Tribe* (Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Series, vol. 14 no. 2, 1922), 360.

5. One of the conclusions of this study on Philippine gay culture is that the current local model of “homosexuality” is characterized by gender transitivity on the part of the bakla alone. By this I mean that the local model for both male homosexual identity and relationship gravitates around the bakla, whom the culture recognizes to be an anomalously embodied—hence, unreal or imperfect—woman; the bakla’s partner, by contrast, remains a “real man,” metaphysically untainted by homosexual demonization. Consequently, because of this, it should not be very difficult to explain why there has been a very long tradition of transvestism in

the Philippines: effeminacy is a necessary foil to machismo, that only renders it necessary—and fascinatedly so—in the end.

6. Sister Mary John Mananzan, OSB, “The Filipino Woman: Before and After the Spanish Conquest of the Philippines,” in *Essays on Women*, ed. Sister Mary John Mananzan, OSB (Manila: Institute for Women’s Studies, 1991), 6-35.
7. Cristina Blanc-Szanton, “Collision of Cultures: Historical Reformulations of Gender in the Lowland Visayas, Philippines,” in *Power and Difference: Gender in Island Southeast Asia*, ed. Jane Monnig Atkinson and Shelly Errington (Stanford University Press, 1990), 345-84.
8. Reynaldo C. Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910* (Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979).
9. Alicia P. Magos, *The Enduring Maaram Tradition: An Ethnography of a Kinaraya-a Village* (Manila: New Day, 1993).
10. F. Landa Jocano, “Conversion and the Patterning of Christian Experience,” in *Acculturation in the Philippines: Essays on Changing Societies*, ed. Peter G. Gowing and William Henry Scott (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1971), 43-72.
11. Zeus Salazar, “Ang Babaylan sa Kasaysayan ng Pilipinas,” in *Women’s Role in Philippine History*, papers and proceedings of the conference held on March 8-9, 1989 (University of the Philippines, Center for Women’s Studies), 35-41.
12. Shelly Errington, “Recasting Sex, Gender and Power: A Theoretical Regional Overview,” in Atkinson and Errington, 1-58.
13. Alfred W. McCoy, “Baylan: Animist Religion and Philippine Peasant Ideology,” *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 10 (1982): 141-94.
14. See Francisco Ignacio Alcina, *Historia de las Islas e Indios de Bisayas* (1668), Part 1 Book 3., trans. Paul S. Lietz (Chicago: University of Chicago, Philippine Studies Program, 1960), quoted in Evelyn Tan Cullamar, *Babaylanism in Negros: 1896-1907* (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1986), 18; Marcelo de Ribadeneira, *Historia de las Islas del Archipelago Filipino* (Madrid: Imprenta Saenz, 1947), 52, cited in Mananzan, 17; Domingo Perez (1680), “Relation of the Zambals” in *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*, ed. Emma Blair and James Robertson (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark, 1903-1909), vol. 7, 300; Juan de Plasencia, “Customs of the Tagalogs,” Blair and Robertson, vol. 7, 194; and Juan Francisco de San Antonio, “Cronicas,” Blair and Robertson, Chapter 53, paragraph nos. 452, 459 (Manila, 1738-44).

For an English translation of San Antonio’s (partial) “Cronicas,” see Blair and Robertson, vol. 40, 343-45.

15. Marjorie Garber, “Breaking the Code,” in *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 25.
16. Alcina’s *Historia* was being published by the Loyola House of the Ateneo de Manila University within the third or fourth quarter of 1994. The translation

of this passage and this section's subsequent references to Alcina's account had all been culled from that forthcoming book's typescript. See Francisco Ignacio Alcina, "Historia de las Islas e Indios de Bisayas," part one, book three, chapter 13, 195-209.

17. Harriet Whitehead, "The Bow and the Burdenstrap: A New Look at Institutionalized Homosexuality in North America," in *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*, eds. Sherry B. Ortner and Harriet Whitehead (Cambridge University Press, 1981), 80-115.
18. Antonio de Morga, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, ed. Jose Rizal (Paris: Garnier, 1890). See Blair and Robertson, vol. 16, 130.
19. Miguel de Benavides (1605), Archbishop of Manila, Blair and Robertson, vol. 13, 278.
20. Gaspar de San Agustin (1717), *Confesionario Copioso en Lengua Española y Tagala, Para Direccion de los Confesores, y Instruction de los Penitentes* (Sampaloc: Convento de Nuestra Senora de Loreto, 1787), 148-49.
21. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: Regents of the University of California Press, 1990), 202-3.

For these particular quotes on the "unmentionable sin/crime" (sodomy), Sedgwick cites: John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 349; and Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1982), 62.

22. Tomas Pinpin, *Librong Pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang Uicang Castila* (1610), *La Primera Imprenta en Filipinos*, ed. Manuel Artigas y Cuerva (Manila, 1911), 218-22.
23. This is an unpublished translation by William Henry Scott.
24. Francisco Blancas de San Jose, *Librong Pinagpapalamnan yto nang Aasalin ng Tauong Christiano sa Pagcoconfesar at Pagcomulgat; nang capoua napacagaling at capoua paquinabangan niya ang aua nang P. Dios* (Santo Tomas, 1792), 160.
25. Francisco Combes, "Historia de las Islas de Mindanao" (Madrid, 1667) ed. W.E. Retana (Madrid, 1897). An English translation may be found in Blair and Robertson, vol. 40, 150.

The "pathologizing" of homosexuality, if the account is accurate, was not, after all, exclusively a product of our Christianization, as University of the Philippines anthropology professor Michael Tan would assume. See Michael Tan, "Sickness and Sin: Medical and Religious Stigmatization of Homosexuality in the Philippines," MS (1992).

26. "Ordinances for the Sangleys" (Manila, January 26, 1599), in Blair and Robertson, vol. 11, 56-57.

27. The foremost young researcher doing work on the Mindanaoan bayot is a poet from Iligan City, Ralph Semino Galan. He is currently carrying out an archival project that aims at retrieving and documenting the noncanonical literary productions of the Mindanaoan bayot, in order to demonstrate the luminous fact that despite or precisely because of the strictures of Philippine southern macho culture, effeminate homosexual men therein are able to express and constitute themselves in their writings.
28. William Henry Scott, *Looking for the Prehispanic Filipino* (Manila: New Day, 1993).
29. Combes, chapter 16. See Blair and Robertson, vol. 40, 158-64.
30. While seemingly tongue-in-cheek and catty, this “malicious” reading that seeks to locate desire in the ethnographic rendering by Combes of the exotically feminine *bido*, actually explores the implication of Antonio de Morga’s observation in his *Sucesos* that the Spanish were themselves committing with the natives—actually, they were communicating to them—the “abominable sin against nature.” Morga writes: “As long as the natives lived in their paganism, it was not known that they had fallen into the abominable sin against nature. But after the Spaniards had entered their country, through communication with them ... it has been communicated to them somewhat, *both to men and to women* (underscoring mine). In the matter it has been necessary to take action” (see Blair and Robertson, vol. 16, 130).

Consider Morga’s statement that the Spaniards were not much loath to the idea of sodomizing both local women and men, and then juxtapose such a thought with the mixedness of gender characteristics in the *bido*, *bayoguin*, et al., and this specific reading of Combes’s text takes on an entirely new and refreshing quality! Certainly, though, the ellipsis dots in this quotation conveniently excise the typical indictment—even or especially in Morga’s text—of the Sangleyes, “who are much (more) given to this vice.”

31. Combes, Blair and Robertson, vol. 40, 160.
32. Jonathan Goldberg, “Discovering America,” in *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford University Press, 1992), 179-92.
33. Chris Berry, *A Bit on the Side: East-West Topographies of Desire* (Sydney: Empress, 1994), 75-76. On this matter Berry quotes the work of Joao Trevisan on the colonization of Brazil. See Joao Trevisan, *Perverts in Paradise* (London: Gay Men’s Press, 1986), 19-24.
34. Goldberg, 216.
35. William Henry Scott, *Cracks in the Parchment Curtain* (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1985), 98.
36. “The Manners, Customs and Beliefs of the Philippine Inhabitants of Long Ago; Being the Chapters of a ‘Late Sixteenth-Century Manila Manuscript,’” trans. Carlos

Quirino and Mauro Garcia, *Philippine Journal of Science* 87, no. 4 (December 1958): 374-75.

The English translation here is by the editors, and may be found on page 430 of the same journal.

37. Sedgwick, 184.

38. McCoy, 167.

McCoy uses the term “homosexual” by which to describe Elope. As I have already distinguished the difference between the concepts of identity based on demeanor and sexual object choice in the preceding discussions, I presume he must have mistranslated the obviously transgender term bayot into the only popularly used Western concept that came closest to it: homosexual, precisely. Furthermore, Hart’s description of Buhawi, from which McCoy derives the comment, doesn’t use the word homosexual at all: “Buhawi was tall, had a long nose and fair complexion ... Buhawi’s classification, by one informant, was as bayut-bayut (a somewhat feminine-acting male).” In any case, McCoy himself interviewed a descendant of another gender-crossing babaylan, Gregorio Lampiño, who also led peasant uprisings in Panay, and whom he also describes as a homosexual. See McCoy, 168.

See Donn V. Hart, “Buhawi of the Visayas: The Revitalization Process and Legend-Making in the Philippines,” in *Studies in Philippine Anthropology*, ed. Mario D. Zamora (Manila: Alemar-Phoenix Publishers, 1967), 336-96.

39. The transparent visibility and “freeness” of sex among the precolonial natives of the Philippines make their sexuality not sexuality at all. According to lesbian feminist Judith Butler, (Western) sexuality must always be partly undisclosed and hidden in order to qualify as sexuality at all.

See Judith Butler, “Imitation and Gender Insubordination,” in *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories/Gay Theories* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 15.

40. Rex Wockner, “Homosexuality in the Arab and Moslem World,” in *Coming Out: An Anthology of International Gay and Lesbian Writings*, ed. Stephan Likosky (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 102-16.

Wockner declares that the Middle East may well be the most homosexualized region in the world; and yet, despite this fact, it is also where one finds the world’s harshest penalties for homosexuality.

41. Sebastian de Totanes, *Arte de la Lengua Tagala y Manual Tagalog* (Sancto Tomas, 1745), part two: 143-46.

42. Vicente L. Rafael, *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule* (Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1988), 122.

43. Louie Cruz, “Pretty Woman?” in the weekly column “Off the Shoulder,” *Sunday Chronicle*, May 2, 1993, 35-36.

44. Jerome Bailen, "Medical Anthropology: The Pal'awan Babaylan's Views on Disease Causation," in *Anthropology: Range and Relevance*, ed. Mario D. Zamora and Zeus A. Salazar (Quezon City: Kayumanggi Press, 1969), 477-88.
45. Juan de Noceda y Pedro de Sanlucar, *Vocabulario de la Lengua Tagala* (Reimpreso en Manila: Imprenta de Ramirez y Giraudier, 1860), 45.
 See Pedro de San Buenaventura, *Vocabulario de Lengua Tagala* (Con licencia infresso en la noble Villa del Pila, por Thomas Pinpin y Domingo Laog, 1613), 28; Guillermo Bennaser, *Diccionario Tiruray-Español* (Manila, 1892), 24; Jacinto Juanmarti, *Diccionario Moro-Maguindao-Español* (Manila: Tipografía Amigos del Pais, 1892), 339; Diego Bergaño, *Vocabulario de la Lengua Pampanga* (Manila: Ramirez y Giraudier, 1860), 33; and Lorenzo Fernandez Cosgaya, *Diccionario Pangasinan-Español* (Manila, 1865), 70.
46. Diego Aduarte, OP, "History of the Province of the Holy Rosary and the Order of Preachers in the Philippines, Japon and China," Blair and Robertson, vols. 30, 31.
47. Juan Felix de la Encarnacion, *Diccionario Bisaya-Español* (Manila: Imprenta de los Amigos del Pais, 1851); respective pages are 49, 37, and 30.
48. See the most recent ethnography on the bantut of the Tausug and Sama of southern Philippines: Mark Johnson, "Cross-Gender Men and Homosexuality in the Southern Philippines: Ethnicity, Political Violence and the Protocols of Engendered Sexualities Amongst the Muslim Tausug and Sama," paper presented at the European Conference on Philippine Studies, London, April 13-15, 1994.
49. That an effeminate bayot could lead an armed rebellion is something that cannot be accounted for within Zeus Salazar's evolutionary schema of the babaylan-function within an essentially unchanged and unchanging Philippine history. His biologicistic, heterosexist, and egregiously sloppy transhistorical categories of Philippine genders are seven: tunay na babae, tunay na lalaki, binabae, tomboy, hermaphrodite, lalaking AC/DC (bisexual), and babaeng AC/DC. See Salazar, 35.

Salazar's conclusion that the babaylan, who led the numerous peasant uprisings against Spain, were "real men" begs the question of what exactly such a concept signified during that time. (In any case, we must remember that the category of "realness"—predicated as it is on anatomic immutability—would seem to be more operative in our anatomy-obsessed century than during the Spanish colonial period.) Precisely, as Perez's account of the Zambal bayoc and Buhawi's case would appear to exemplify, effeminacy may not have necessarily entailed an inability to fight, hunt, or perform certain acts we would nowadays thoughtlessly equate with masculinity. It appears that, the "native" division of male and female "experiences" aside, armed rebellion and gender-crossing, though apparently independent and unrelated phenomena, may not have been mutually exclusive, after all.

50. Martin F. Manalansan IV, "Tolerance or Struggle: Male Homosexuality in the Philippines Today," MS, 1990.
51. Pedro Chirino, "Relation of the Filipinas Islands and What Has There Been Accomplished (1601-1604)," Blair and Robertson, vol. 12, 260.
52. Elizabeth Uy Eviota, "Gender Subordination: Historical and Contemporary Configurations," in *The Political Economy Gender: Women and the Sexual Division of Labour in the Philippines* (London: Zed Books Ltd., 1992), 167-75.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE EIGHTIES

1. Teresita Leuterio Santiago, "The Self-Concept, Adjustments, and Interpersonal Values of College Male Homosexuals" (master's thesis, University of Santo Tomas, September 1987).
2. Abe Florendo, "Out of the Closet, Into the Real World," *Times Journal*, March 11, 1984, 9.

Florendo lists the following gay plays that were staged in or around 1984. The stories of these plays basically deal with the painful process of Coming Out which, predictably, reproduces the covert/overt distinction first seen in a local production with Nadres's *Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming Salamat*; these are Frank Rivera's *Casa Verde*, Bobby Las-O's *Goodbye Loverboy*, Clet Unrubia's *Sukatin man ang Langit*, Quito Co-Unjieng's *Skeletons in the Closet*, Karlo Abellar's one-act *Señora Segundina*, Soxy Topacio's *Neneng*, and other plays of which Florendo does not mention the authors: *Ismael (Mga Damdaming Maiinit sa Gabing Malamig)*, *Dingas sa Langit*, and *Belinda's Replica: This Is Your Life*.

The venue for these plays is mostly pubs and cafes, such as the Leather Lounge, Ryan's Pub, and other similar nightspots.

In another article, Boy Abunda's gay play, *Engkuwentro*, is staged at Ryan's pub in September 1983. (From Nick Nicolas, "The Sad World of a Gay," *Times Journal*, September 17, 1983, 13.)

Rene O. Villanueva's award-winning *Kumbersasyon* also gets produced around this time, and the play is a sensitive study of gay self-disclosure which it sees as necessary in the excoriation of homosexuality's countless hungry ghosts. Adaptations of foreign gay works like *Bent*, *La Cage Aux Folles*, and *Kiss of the Spiderwoman* are also part of this exploration of gayness within local theater. For a review of *Bent*, see Nick Nicolas, "A melodramatic play on homosexuality," *Arts Monthly* 2, no. 12 (1982): 14.

3. Susan B. Argel, "New Paper Dolls: Impersonation as Total Entertainment," *Parade*, August 31, 1980, 14-15.

4. Jonathan Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 226-30.
5. Severino Montano, "The Lion and the Faun," MS, c. 1980.

My reading of this novel, which I delivered as a paper in the University of the Philippines Department of English and Comparative Literature's Faculty Lecture Series in 1992, reveals that Montano gravitates around two fundamental themes: Misogyny, and Greek/Neoplatonic Sexuality, with the first being the logical consequence of the second. It is also evident that Montano believes in a "feminine inner self"—again, a *babaeng kalooban*—which needs to be liberated by homosexuals. The itinerary such a liberation takes is remarkable for the sacrifice, faith, love, and happiness and religious faith that characterize it.

The novel, presumably written over the period 1960-1980, is unabashedly autobiographical. In terms of "subject-position," this is the first truly gay novel in the country (which I am cognizant of, anyway). The point of view is Montano himself, not some child prostitute; and, reading it, one begins to appreciate the courage it took for Montano to endure the unbelievable torture of unbosoming so many secret "truths" about the homosexual self. While we may argue that the novel is "contained"—because it never really left the dominant ideologies as regards homosexuality, and indeed, while alive, Montano called himself a humanist—we nonetheless may not so easily dismiss the radicalizing effect of acknowledging the presence of gay bodies and persons in otherwise purely heterosexual territories, like Philippine Literature. Montano, we must remember, is part of the Philippine literary canon. The existence of this scandalously candid and "confessional" novel, in effect, troubles and reevaluates our concept of this canon.

6. Dollimore, 230.
7. Marjorie Garber, "Breaking the Code," in *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 10.
8. Arlene Stein, "All Dressed Up But No Place to Go? Style Wars and the New Lesbianism," *Outlook* 1, 4 (Winter 1989): 38.
9. Other non-Roda movies with homosexual plots that are shown at this time include *Apoy sa Iyong Kandungan*; *Mga Paru-parong Buking*; *Si Malakas, Si Maganda, at Si Mahinhin*; *Star*; *City After Dark*; and *Ang Kabiyak*. Actors who portray gay roles for some of these movies are Sandy Garcia, Eddie Garcia, Dindo Fernando, George Estregan, Ronaldo Valdez, and Bernardo Bernardo.

Alternative cinema also sees the rise of gay filmmaker Nick Deocampo, whose shocking and poignant documentary *Oliver* is a remarkable attempt to understand the gay bar culture and the politics of impersonation.

10. "Manananggal Terrorizes Tondo Folks," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, May 9, 1992, 10.

11. Editorial, "From Man to Maternity," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, May 31, 1992, 4.
12. Editorial, "Truth and Media," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 17, 1992, 4.
13. Cynthia de Leon, "Male Nurse Faked Pregnancy," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 11, 1992, 1.
14. Cynthia de Leon, "Carlo Is Expecting a Boy," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, May 28, 1992, 1.
15. Cynthia de Leon, "'Pregnant' Male Nurse Loses Face, Job, Lover," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, August 17, 1992, 1.
16. Gay screenplays constitute yet another area that sadly I have not been able to exhaustively cover in this study.

As an undergraduate thesis in Mass Communication puts it, the popularization of swardspeak as a lingua franca in Philippine television seems to accompany—if not confirm—the ever-increasing presence of gay images and "lifestyles" in popular media, particularly during the 1980s; nonetheless, I think it may be too soon to celebrate the complete liberation of gays by virtue of this fact alone. See Juan Leonardo Gonzales, "Homosexual Language in Philippine Television: A Historical Case Study" (undergraduate thesis, College of Mass Communication, University of the Philippines, 1988).

17. Cris Marimla, "The Gay Life," *National Midweek*, April 16, 1986, 32-33.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE NINETIES

1. J. C. Nigado, "The Life and Loves of Lady Valerie," *Sunday Times Life Magazine*, February 11, 1990, 5.
2. Cynthia Allanigue and Josef Francia, "Homosexuals Say They're Everywhere," *Malaya*, January 21, 1989, 14.
3. An essay written by this organization's founding president explains the political vision of the group as one of "social acceptance." See Venir Turla Cuyco, "Apathy or Revolution: An Apologia for UP Babaylan," *Sinag: Journal of the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy* 5, no. 1 (1993): 12-13. University of the Philippines.
4. Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford University Press, 1992), 9.
5. That the homosexual act—as sodomitic or as itself—is not covered by the Philippine penal code does not perfectly mean, as we have seen in the preceding analyses of Philippine gay culture, that homosexual persecution does not obtain in this country. See Bartolome S. Carale, "Criminal Adultery and Fornication in the Philippines: A Re-examination," *Philippine Law Journal*, no. 45 (July 1970): 34-52.

6. Senator Leticia Ramos-Shahani, Senate Bill 427, typescript (July 21, 1992).
7. Laura Claridge and Elizabeth Langland, eds., "Introduction," *Out of Bounds: Male Writers and Gender(ed) Criticism* (Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), 3-21.

A relevant passage about a more constructionist feminist critique of patriarchy is this (7): "Both terms (feminine and masculine) ... are implicated in patriarchy ... the movement suggests the first step in a Derridean deconstruction in which the hierarchies are reversed preliminary to dismantling the hierarchical structure."

8. The University of the Philippines' theaters-in-residence have likewise been regularly staging gay plays. For the first half of the 1990s, David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly* and Anton Juan's *Death in the Form of a Rose* were presented at UP, and both were notably outstanding productions. (For a critical essay on the latter see J. Neil C. Garcia, "Death in the Form of a Rose: A Gay Perspective," *Diliman Review* 39, no. 2 [1991]: 24-30).

One of the more recent gay productions on campus was a trilogy staged by the Playwrights Theatre and directed by Alex Cortez. All three plays in *Tatlo* forward a universalizing opinion on homosexuality, and as a whole they reevaluate macho culture itself by turning its sexual structure inside-out: sexual dissidence inheres within the boundaries of hetero and homo, and all three plays consider it to be actually necessary for the existence of macho myth and domination. See J. Neil C. Garcia, "A Theater of Sexual Dissidence," *Manila Chronicle*, September 29, 1992, 16.

9. Other than Silva's, another example of irresponsible gay historiography that essentializes and mystifies precolonial "gayness" (precisely!) in regard to the babaylanic chronicles is Jomar Fleras, "A History of Gays in the Philippines," *Manila Chronicle*, October 23, 1991, 16.
10. The Western (especially American) connection in the local AIDS-awareness efforts by NGOs whose leaders and staff are gays is apparent to anybody keeping tabs on the Philippine HIV/AIDS prevention scene. Some of these organizations are ReachOut Foundation, The Library Foundation, HAIN, and the Remedios AIDS Foundation. As early as 1990, an article that appeared in *Katipunan* seemed to foreshadow the local movement that would originate from the Filipino gay populations in the United States to combat the spread of AIDS from a specifically homosexual front. See Benjamin Pimentel Jr., "AIDS Among US Filipinos: Silence Equals Death," reprinted from *Katipunan* 4, no. 3 (November 1990) in *Health Alert* 6, no. 112 (December 1990): 500-502.
11. Alya Honasan, "Homosexuals: To Hire or Not to Hire," *Manila Chronicle*, June 4-5, 1991, 11.

12. Allan Tibbey, "Is There Safe Sex?" *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, January 6, 1993, 11.
13. Mariquit Almario, "Tatad Seeks Ban on Gay, Showbusiness Senators," *Manila Times*, May 12, 1993, 1.
14. Michael Tan, "Foreword," in Margarita Go-Singco Holmes, *A Different Love: Being Gay in the Philippines* (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1993), x.
15. Go-Singco Holmes, 171.
16. Tan, "Foreword," ix.

CHAPTER SIX: PROLOGUE

1. Frederick Whitam and Robin Mathy, *Male Homosexuality in Four Societies: Brazil, Guatemala, the Philippines, and the United States* (New York: Praeger Scientific, 1986).
2. For the ramifications of the essentialist/constructionist debate, see Edward Stein, *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy* (New York: Routledge, 1992). Steven Epstein's essay, "Gay Politics, Ethnic Identity: The Limits of Social Constructionism" (239-93), provides a cornerstone discussion of the ethnicization (both self-imposed and imposed) of gays in America, and how *essentially* this affects everybody in the Gay Movement.
3. Arnold Davidson, "Sex and the Emergence of Sexuality," in Stein, *Forms of Desire*, 89-132.
4. Carol-Anne Tyler, "Boys Will Be Girls: The Politics of Gay Drag," in *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories/Gay Theories*, ed. Diana Fuss (New York: Routledge, 1991), 32-70.
5. Jamie Gough, "Theories of Sexual Identity and the Masculinization of the Gay Man," *Coming on Strong: Gay Politics and Culture* (London: Unwin and Hyman Ltd., 1989), 119-36.
6. Raymond Burgos, "Alunan: Gay Cops OK. But ...," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, March 1994, 1.

Certainly, though, this frivolous attitude—typical by this time and in this particular context—toward the topic of gays in the military belies its actual seriousness, as General Espina of the Philippine Army himself revealed in a candid interview a decade before. See Josie Darang, "How About a Third Force?" *People*, July 8, 1979, 22.

A more recent article uses anonymous sources in the Armed Forces of the Philippines in order to confirm the presence of homosexuals therein. See Lorna Barile, "Are There Gays in the Military? Yes There Are," *Philippine Graphic*, October 12, 1992, 56.

7. Marjorie Garber, "Breaking the Code," in *Vested Interests: Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 137.
8. *Ibid.*, 159.
9. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "How to Bring Your Kids Up Gay," in *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, ed. Michael Warner (University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 69-81.
10. Tony Perez, "Ang Diwata," in *Cubao Pagkagat ng Dilim: Mga Kuwentong Kababalaghan* (Manila: Cacho Hermanos, 1993), 69-79.
11. See the third chapter of this book's second part for an explication on this point.
12. "Five Prettiest Gays Chosen in PICC Pageant," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, January 24, 1994, 9.
13. Kris Kirk and Ed Heath, "The Rad Drag Queens," in *Coming Out: An Anthology of International Gay and Lesbian Writings*, ed. Stephan Likosky (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 279-86.
14. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 146-47. Cited in Tyler, 53.
15. See Fenella Cannell, "Catholicism, Spirit Mediums and the Ideal of Beauty in a Bicolano Community, Philippines" (unpublished dissertation in anthropology, London University, 1992).

See also Mark Johnson, "Cross-Gender Men and Homosexuality in the Southern Philippines: Ethnicity, Political Violence, and the Protocols of Engendered Sexualities Amongst the Muslim and Sama," paper presented at the European conference on Philippine Studies in London, April 13-15, 1994.

16. I am particularly reminded of what New York visual artist Nan Goldin observed about the "Philippine transsexuals" she had photographed for her book on global gender-benders, *The Other Side*: of all the "queens" she had seen and met all over the world, the Filipino bakla struck her as seeming to enjoy the highest level of social tolerance. Goldin writes: "In Manila ... one friend took me home to meet her family where she and her boyfriend live with her parents and brother and nieces and nephews. Another teenage queen supports her parents and five siblings in the provinces with the money she makes from her shows. These queens haven't been alienated from their families in the way most of the queens I know in the Western world have been." See Nan Goldin, *The Other Side* (New York: Scalo Publishers, 1992), 7.

Unlike other foreigners who have said the same thing, Goldin actually has a photograph to illustrate what she means: Anna, a male-to-female impersonator working in a gay bar in Manila, is shown putting on makeup on her way to work, while nephews, nieces, and her mother are sitting in the living room, watching

television. Anna obviously hasn't left her home in Pateros, and this arrangement impressed Goldin immensely (96).

This tableau strikes the Western gaze as emblematic of familial and social tolerance. I, on the other hand, see something different in it altogether: it isn't so much because of tolerance as the fact that Anna is the breadwinner of this household that she can pretty much have her way. Again, what needs to be said is that Philippine gays need to compensate for being "different" before they are even granted the most grudging amounts of this "tolerance." Also, in the photograph, the mother's face turns scornfully away from what her "daughter" is doing in front of the mirror, thereby telling us a lot about what she actually feels about the matter.

This "sociological" reading in regard to the putative familiar "acceptance" of gays in the local culture is actually similar to what Ponteñila discovered in her ethnography almost two decades ago: the bayot/bakla becomes "acceptable" to his family only when he possesses some utilitarian value for his parents and/or siblings. (For instance, when—like one of Ponteñila's subjects—he is industrious and does the laundry for all the members of the household.) See Ma. Simeona Ponteñila, "An Ethnographic Study of the Bayots in Dumaguete City" (master's thesis, Silliman University, March 1975), 43.

17. Fenella Cannell, "The Power of Appearances: Beauty, Mimicry, and Transformation in Bicol," in *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*, ed. Vicente L. Rafael (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1995), 223-58.
18. Cannell, "The Power of Appearances," 245.

PART TWO THE EARLY GAY WRITERS

1. Some of these writers are Nicolas Pichay, whose gay poetry collection, *Ang Lunes na Mahirap Bunuin*, recently won in a literary contest and has just been published; Tony Perez, whose newest book set in nightmare district Cubao promises to be equally exciting and controversial; and Nick Deocampo, whose essay on Philippine homosexual cinema, entitled "Homosexuality as Dissent/Cinema as Subversion: Articulating Gay Consciousness in the Philippines," appears in *Queer Looks*, a book on homosexual cinema recently published in New York by Routledge.
2. Wilfrido Ma. Guerrero, "A Clash of Cymbals," *Diliman Review* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1968).

3. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: Regents of the University of California Press, 1991), 49.

Actually, Sedgwick cites two other novels, Herman Melville's *Billy Budd*, and *Death in Venice* by Thomas Mann, as foundational gay texts in the West.

4. Montano wrote thirty plays in all, four of which became the repertoire of his own Arena Theater (founded in 1953 in the Philippine Normal College). See M. L. Maniquiz, "Severino Montano," in *Cultural Center of the Philippines Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, ed. Nicanor G. Tiongson (Manila: CCP, 1994), vol. 7, 355-56.

CHAPTER ONE: WHERE WE HAVE BEEN ...

1. The anthology spoken of here went through a lot of re-visionings, and a composite of all such stillbirth versions came out in May 1994. See J. Neil C. Garcia and Danton Remoto, eds., *Ladlad: An Anthology of Philippine Gay Writing* (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1994).
2. Nancy K. Miller, "Arachnologies," in *The Poetics of Gender*, ed. Nancy K. Miller (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 270-99.

In order to establish a theory of female authorship, feminists have had to "resurrect the author." Most early feminist theorizing, after dismantling the original power of authorship, inadvertently ended up "underreading": the critic/reader may be brilliant in her mapping out of the networks of meanings in the text, but the woman who wrote it has been left behind in the process of interpretation.

In this "(auto)biographical approach," the gendered author for whose sake the reading begins to undertake itself in the first place remains clearly in the foreground.

3. I got my facts about Montano's life from the back covers of his two-volume *Selected Plays* (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1981).
4. This is taken from Severino Montano, *The Arena Theater of the Philippines: A Progress Report*.
5. Severino Montano, ed., *The Prize-winning Plays of the Arena Theater of the Philippines* (Manila: Phoenix Press, 1958).
6. Jacques Lacan, "The Direction of the Treatment and Principle of Its Power," in *Ecrits* (New York: Norton, 1977).

Through transference, the analysand is unburdened of all the "ego-forms" he has constructed for himself. The regression of the patient from one signifier of demand to another is made possible only by their frustration, which is the only method of the analyst to make the subject reach the signifier of his own desire.

Hence, we can see how the novel's own version of "talking cure" is not even credible or correct: the diagnosis can only be made—the cure can only be ascertained—after the ego has been laid bare of its trappings, a process which is described as potentially "interminable."

7. J. Neil C. Garcia, "Gender Theory and Gay Writing," paper read at the PAKSA Conference, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, February 1992.

This "teleology of martyrdom" is the major preoccupation of Philippine gay productions of the Coming Out period, by way of a predominant theme. This may have something to do with the observation that, here, the ideal of a "real man" to whom many gays are subjected, has made it very difficult to think of an "equal partnership" taking root in gay relationships.

It is a fact that the economic complexities attendant upon the local gay scenario only add to the disparity between the complexions of gayness here and elsewhere in the West. Here, the homosexual is expected to "reward" his lover with something invariably monetary, as a sine qua non to the existence of the relationship itself.

Mainly, it is because the gay thinks it his duty: the illusion of a "real man" prevents gay relationships from ever turning mutual because the "real man" has to be compensated for loving not a "real woman," who is his due, who proves his realness, but another man, one who is not even "real" to begin with.

The philosophical underpinnings are truly a matter of ethics: here, it is possible to remain a "real man" even when party to a homosexual relationship, so long as the "real man's" sexual love object is still a "real woman." Indeed, most men who have gay lovers also have female girlfriends, and in almost all such cases, the gays themselves consent to the arrangement. The issue is an ethical one not only because it can be said to lie at the heart of the macho culture itself, but because in the Philippine sexual context, inner subjective "desire" (*kalooban*) is most important, and actually offsets the resultant act which is regarded as purely incidental anyway.

8. Kenneth Lewes, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Male Homosexuality* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), 230-41.
9. John Fletcher, "Freud and His Uses: Psychoanalysis and Gay Theory," in *Coming on Strong: Gay Politics and Culture* (London: Unwin and Hyman Ltd., 1989), 91-118.
10. Michel Foucault, "The Repressive Hypothesis," in *Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), 301-9.
11. Jimmy Alcantara, "jonathan n.," in *The Flame* (Manila: University of Santo Tomas, 1989), 4.

CHAPTER TWO: ORLANDO NADRES ...

1. According to the *Cultural Center of the Philippines Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, Nadres's *Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming Salamat* has been presented all over the country over the past twenty years, often to full houses of appreciative mixed audiences. See M.L. Maniquiz, "Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming Salamat," in *Cultural Center of the Philippines Encyclopedia of Philippine Art*, ed. Nicanor G. Tiongson (Manila: CCP, 1994), vol. 7, 196.
2. See Fely Luz Marcos, "A Case Study on the Language of the Homosexuals Based on the Play *Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming Salamat* (undergraduate thesis, Institute of Mass Communication, University of the Philippines, March 1976). Found in Diana Julao, "Gay Philippines: Ang Pagkatao, Suliranin, at Wika ng Sward" (unpublished compilation, University of the Philippines, 1980); and M.L. Maniquiz.
3. A slight but important variation seems to have been made on the play from the first time it was staged by PETA in 1974 to the time it was supposed to be staged by IPAG in 1992.

The variation has to do with the absence in the play's first version of the tangent narrative of Efren's impending marriage to his (female) classmate in Manila. Nadres must have added this narrative detail—which he nonetheless didn't consider important enough to be dramatized in a scene of its own—in order to heighten the pathos of Fidel's character, who is about to lose his secretly beloved one to somebody else.

4. Cebu's leading gay playwright today is Albert Claude Evangelio, who produced and directed in 1990 a modern-day gay Cebuano sarsuwela entitled *Pepe en Phil*. In Negros Oriental, on the other hand, Rajit Palanca put up *Intermisyon*, around 1989; likewise, around 1993, two Negrense writers were collaborating on a gay play. They are established entrepreneur and playwright Bobby Flores Villasis, and Negrense lawyer Ernesto Superal Yee.
5. Dean Alfar's *Short Time* was the third play in a trilogy entitled *Tatlo*, staged by the UP Playwrights' Theater late 1992 and directed by Alex Cortez. All three plays deal with homosexuality using varying degrees of conscious treatment, but it is Alfar's play that thematizes the Coming Out process in an unmistakable way. The interesting thing in this production is the "Western-ness" of the characterization of the two homosexual men. They are not effeminate anymore, but are rather straight-looking and -acting. What's more, they fall in love "equally" with each other, and not with a "real man." In fact, there is no such character here at all.

This play, therefore, may well be the signal of a new period in Philippine Gay Theater, in which Filipino homosexuals begin to talk about issues that relate

directly to sexuality, and no longer strictly to gender and gender roles. The most recent gay theatrical production furthering the same politics of homosexual love was Nicolas Pichay's *Karga Mano*. For a review of Pichay's interesting play, see J. Neil C. Garcia: "Karga Mano: A Gayer Kind of Love," *Manila Chronicle*, January 18, 1994, 16.

6. This biographical tidbit comes from R. Galang, "Orlando Nadres," in Tiongson, 358.
7. Michel Foucault, "The Repressive Hypothesis," in *Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), 301-9.

CHAPTER THREE: TONY PEREZ'S CUBAO 1980 ...

1. Jonathan Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (London: Oxford University Press, 1991), 39- 45.
2. Inversion theory is now considered just one among several other narratives and/or tropes of homosexuality that are circulating in contemporary Western civilization. Nonetheless, the cogent unpacking of this theory was first articulated by Michel Foucault: "Homosexuality first appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphroditism of the soul ... The sodomite had been a temporary aberration. The homosexual was now a species." See Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 43.
3. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1990).
4. This is the universalizing view which Sedgwick advocates in her book, *Epistemology of the Closet*. Using this perspective, homosexuality becomes less and less easy to isolate from mainstream social orders that obsessively denounce it and yet actually reproduce it in order to maintain themselves. See Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: Regents of the University of California Press, 1991), 2.
5. These are some of the facts that I have come across while writing a history of the Philippine gay culture of the past three decades. See part 1 of this study, specifically the section on the (happy) seventies.
6. Michel Foucault, "On the Genealogy of Ethics," in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, ed. Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982), 223.

7. An account of the American version of gay liberation may be found in John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the US, 1940-1970* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1983).
8. J. Eakin, *Fictions in Autobiography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), 6.

Eakin says, regarding the blurring of the fiction/fact aspects in autobiographical writing: "Autobiography in our time is increasingly understood as both an act of memory and an act of imagination." I suppose this means, in the case of gay autobiography, an allowance for experimentation and embellishment, outside of representing the gay subject-position in the text.

CONCLUSION

1. John Leddy Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses (1565-1700)* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1959), 186-87.
2. A sample account of the Spanish friar's distrust of the *Sangleyes* may be found in the testimony of Fray Juan Ibañez, Regent of the College of the University of Santo Tomas, before the ecclesiastical Commission headed by the Archbishop of Manila, in 1685: "He (the Reverend Father Fray Ibañez) started preaching to all and except for the *Sangleyes* and the Chinese, others asked for his forgiveness ... he does not trust these Chinese people since he has heard that those who have repented before have gone back to their old ways, though they do it with much secrecy and fright." This translation of the Spanish colonial church's efforts to curb the recurrence of "demonic idolatry" among the newly converted *indios* and Chinese, may be found under the file, In San Gabriel Extra Muros de Manila, Bolinao Manuscript, in the library of the Institute for Women's Studies, Malate, Manila.
3. Vicente L. Rafael, "Writing Outside: On the Question of Location," in *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*, ed. Vicente L. Rafael (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1995), xxiii.
4. Fenella Cannell, "The Power of Appearances: Beauty, Mimicry and Transformation in Bicol," in Rafael, *Discrepant Histories*, 241.
5. Marcelo de Ribadeneira, *History of the Islands of the Philippine Archipelago and the Kingdoms of Great China, Tartary, Cochinchina, Malaca, Siam, Cambodge and Japan* (Barcelona, 1601), ed. Legisma (Madrid, 1947), 50. This quotation is an unpublished translation by William Henry Scott.
6. Jonathan Goldberg, "Discovering America," in *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford University Press, 1992), 179-222.

7. Benedict Anderson, "Cacique Democracy in the Philippines: Origins and Dreams," in Rafael, *Discrepant Histories*, 5.
8. Goldberg cites Alan Bray's New Historicist work on the Renaissance concepts of male-male friendship in explaining the "other side" of the discourse of sodomy. See Goldberg, *Sodometries*, 14-18.
9. Proceedings from the Second National Conference on Student Mental Health, *Problems of Counselling in Philippine Colleges and Universities* (Quezon City: Philippine Mental Health Association, 1961).
10. Jürgen Bruning's film about the Philippine and Thai gay (sub)cultures is really a trilogy entitled *Maybe I Can Give You Sex?* I had the chance to view it early August of 1993, and after the preview the audience got the opportunity to talk about the film with Bruning. Apparently, he had shown the film before an American audience, and they had criticized him for cashing in on and exoticizing the "Third World." I had to tell him that there really shouldn't be any problem about the film's ideological point of view, since it was clearly articulated (and confessed) in the film. But still, the production of knowledge of whatever kind about countries such as Thailand and the Philippines, when its consumption is meant for the West, is and can only be fraught with political implications. An interesting point of discussion—not so much between Bruning and the local gays but among the local gays themselves—was about the preponderance of so-called filmic and literary "alternative gay representations" that all use as either background or actual focus the homosexual (prostituted) subculture. In other words, even the sections in Bruning's film that talk about the Philippine gays are still gay bar-specific. Not only does this obsession with the flesh industry give a lopsided idea of what gay culture mainly is about and what it can still be, this choice of imagistic focus is keenly susceptible of imperialistic exploitation. I ended up saying that there are so many other aspects in being gay in the Philippines other than that aspect about prostituted sex, and everybody could only assent. Of course, this obsession is also telling of how precisely homosexual love in the local context has been framed and contained within the notably feudal, native patron/ward structure.
11. Historian Wayne R. Dynes, arguing against the diversitarian tendency among social constructionists to insist on the fundamental uniqueness of *all* cultures, invokes the ethnological concept of *Kulturkreis* or "supraregional cultural entities ... (that are composed of) a large complex of societies in which certain cultural constants can be found." Dynes further remarks that despite the 5,000 distinct human cultures which have been identified in the field, "six categories suffice to classify those in which the sexual configuration is known." To prove this point, Dynes demonstrates that it is basically the same *berdache* pattern which may be seen in the ethnographic records of North America, Western Siberia, and Madagascar. See

- Wayne R. Dynes, "Wrestling with the Social Boa Constructor," in *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy*, ed. Edward Stein (New York: Routledge, 1992), 209-38.
12. Peter A. Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand: An Interpretation of Contemporary Thai Sources* (New York: Global Academic Publishers, 1989), 228.
 13. For instance, this book has looked into two recent ethnographies on the Philippines authored by London-based anthropologists and discovered their Orientalizing projects. See Fenella Cannell, "Catholicism, Spirit Mediums and the Ideal of Beauty in a Bicolano Community, Philippines" (dissertation in anthropology, London University, 1992); and also Mark Johnson, "Cross-Gender Men and Homosexuality in the Southern Philippines: Ethnicity, Political Violence and the Protocols of Engendered Sexualities amongst the Muslim Tausug and Sama," paper presented at the European Conference on Philippine Studies in London, April 13-15, 1994.
 14. Frederick Whitam, "Philippines," in *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 980.
 15. Rev. Eddie Karnes, *Tears in the Morning* (Philippine Publishing Company, 1979).
 16. Joseph M. Carrier, "Gay Liberation and Coming Out in Mexico," in *Coming Out: An Anthology of International Gay and Lesbian Writings*, ed. Stephen Likosky (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 482-98.
 17. Stephen O. Murray and Manuel C. Arboleda, "Stigma Transformation and Relexification: 'Gay' in Latin America," in Likosky, 412-18.
 18. Dennis Altman, "Liberation: Toward the Polymorphous Whole," in Likosky, 123-52.
 19. This may no longer be true in certain parts of the West. Queerness has emerged as a signal for the return of the revolutionary perspective on sexual (no longer just gay) liberation. Queer signifies the polyvalencies of desire which do not fall within the normative homo/hetero dualism, and it arose in the 1990s because of the stigmatizing effect of using "gay" as a self-identificational sign for young queers and because of the increasing visibility of bisexuals within the Gay and Lesbian Movement. It signalizes new identifications across race and gender primarily on the grounds of nonnormative and dissonant sexuality and gender. See Simon Watney, "Queer Epistemology: Activism, 'Outing,' and the Politics of Sexual Identities," *Critical Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 13-27. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
 20. Barry D. Adam, *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987), 6.
 21. Margarita Co-Singco Holmes, *A Different Love: Being Gay in the Philippines* (Manila: Anvil Publishing, 1993).

22. Doctors from the Medical City hospital in Manila have been quietly performing sex change surgeries since the early eighties. One of the first preoperative transsexuals to undergo sex change in this hospital was Vinna—formerly Gavino—Santiago-Robinson who bravely faced the media in the early nineties (after the collapse of her six-year marriage to a British man), supposedly in order to enlighten the general public on the complex nature of the transsexual surgery. See Joanna U. Nicolas, “Sex Change,” *Moneysaver: The Discount Card Magazine* 3, no. 12 (December 1994): 7-9.
23. Whitam, 982.
24. Lorna Barile, “Pagsanjan and Puerto Galera Revisited,” *National Midweek*, January 15, 1992, 12-15.
25. Eric Catipon, “Cruising,” *Sunday Times Life Magazine*, February 21, 1993, 3-6.
26. Cora Lucas, “Breaking Free,” *Sunday Times Life Magazine*, March 27, 1994, 7.
27. Doreen Jose, “UP Offers Course on Gay Literature,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 8, 1994, 1.
28. Oskar Atadero, “Philippine Gays Go Mainstream,” *Mr. & Ms.*, July 19, 1994, 16-17.
29. The clamor for gay rights in the Philippines has apparently been heard by certain magnanimous souls. One such soul is Congressman Reynaldo A. Calalay of Quezon City, who has just filed a bill providing for a “third sex” sectoral representative in the House of Representatives. See Ceres Doyo, “Encounter: Rep. Reynaldo A. Calalay, A Champion of Gay Rights,” *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, September 24, 1995, 10-11.
30. Gerard Ramos, “Going, Going ... Gay,” *Philippines Free Press*, August 6, 1994, 26-27.
31. Venir Turla Cuyco, “No-Gay School Policy,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, July 25, 1995, 9.

PHILIPPINE GAY CULTURE: AN UPDATE AND A POSTCOLONIAL AUTOCRITIQUE

1. This chapter was read by the author at the “Queer Asian Sites: An International Conference of Asian Queer Studies,” convened by the AsiaPacifiQueer Network and the Trans/forming Cultures Center at the University of Technology, Sydney City Campus, Sydney, Australia, February 23, 2007.
2. See my *Philippine Gay Culture: The Last Thirty Years* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1996).
3. Benita Parry, “The Institutionalization of Postcolonial Studies,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, ed. Neil Lazarus (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 70.
4. From 1996 to 1997, *The Evening Paper* carried the weekly gay and lesbian section, “Gayzette,” which I edited. The same paper carried a weekly feminist (sometimes

lesbian) section, “Kawomenan.” The most popular soft-porn magazine of the period was undoubtedly *Valentino*. The first commercially available gay newspaper, *ManilaOut*, also came out in the late 1990s. The past five years saw the appearance of gay lifestyle glossies, foremost of which are *GPQ*, *Icon*, and *L Magazine*. For a short survey of the “Filipino gay magazine phenomenon” and a history of *Valentino* in particular, see Michael Kho Lim, “When the Politics of Desire Meets the Economics of Skin: The History and Phenomenon of a Filipino Gay Magazine,” <http://bangkok2005.anu.edu.au/papers/Lim.pdf> (accessed September 14, 2007).

5. These publications included *Mr. & Ms.*, *Philippines Free Press*, *Evening Paper*, *Manila Standard*, *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, and *Philippine Star*—all of them nationally distributed. Some of these avowedly gay and lesbian opinion-writers are Oscar Atadero, Malu Marin, Ana Leah Sarabia, Danton Remoto, Michael Tan, John Silva, Jose Javier Reyes, and most recently Manuel Quezon III.
6. The particular column by Isagani Cruz that started it all was titled “Don We Now Our Gay Apparel,” and it came out in the August 12, 2006 issue of the *Philippine Daily Inquirer*. Quezon’s subsequent responses took such bitchy and sarcastic titles as “Oblivious in Cloud-Cuckoo Land” and “The Grand Inquisitor.”
7. Michael Tan, an outspoken gay columnist in the *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, devoted a column critiquing these homophobic ads. See Michael Tan, “Goodbye Billy,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, October 23, 2001.
8. Some of the more memorable lesbian and gay celebrities interviewed during this period were Repertory Philippines’ Zeneida “Bibot” Amador, cultural scholar and academic Nicanor “Nick” Tiongson, AM radio commentator Tita Swarding, hairstylist and makeup artist James Cooper, socialite and newspaper columnist Louie Cruz, television and film director Jose Javier (“Joey”) Reyes, transsexual beautician-turned-millionaire Ian Valdez, lesbian musician DJ Alvaro, and former matinee idol Rustom Padilla, who dramatically outed himself on a reality TV show that aired on Channel 2. See, respectively, the following: Ara Abad Santos-Bitong, “Bibot Diaries,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, December 11, 2004, C4; “St. Nick Against the Moral Terrorists,” Interview with Nicanor Tiongson, *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, April 1, 2001, D1; Pennie Azarcon de la Cruz, “When Machismo Gets Machismis,” *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, February 11, 2001, 6; Joy Rojas, “Taking It Like a Man,” *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, February 24, 2002, Q2; Wilhelmina Paras, “Dancing Out of the Closet,” *Asiaweek*, August 7, 1998, 36; Oliver M. Pulumbarit, “How Joey Reyes Stays Forever Young as He Turns 50,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, August 22, 2004, A34; Patrick Magalona, “Ian Valdez: Baklang Palaboy na Milyonarya na Ngayon,” *ManilaOut*, no. 2 (2000): 20; Eric S. Caruncho, “Music Makers: Life Is Queer,” *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, June 27, 2006, Q8; and Alwin M. Ignacio, “This Beautiful Man,” *L Magazine*, vol. 2 no. 1 (2006): 68-69.

9. Examples of such frank discussions of the gay sexual subculture, promiscuity, prostitution, gayspeak, “rave parties,” and sexually transmitted diseases, and family-related issues, are the following: Blue Arden, “How Fathers Cope with Gay Sons,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 13, 2001, F1; Jose Javier Reyes, “In the Company of Fairies,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 15, 2001, G1; Edwin Valdez Vinarao and Michael Remir H. Macatangay, “The Other Goods in the Mall,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, August 15, 2001, C2; Ramon Tulfo, “On Target: Beaten Up by a Faggot,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, September 28, 2002, A36; Miguel Garcia, “Learning a Lesson the Hard Way,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 6, 2002, F3; Rina Jimenez David, “At Large: Can You Tell Who’s Gay?” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, August 22, 2004, A16; 2BU! Correspondents, “Chuva Chuk Chak Chenelyn Chenelyn Chika,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 6, 2002, D3; Desiree Caluza, “It’s the first Gay Outing Saturday in Chilly Baguio,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 10, 2004, A1; and Michael L. Tan, “Pinoy Kasi: Save the Filipino Family,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 15, 2000, A16.
10. Examples of “confessional” articles that treat the question of gay and lesbian outing during the period are the following: “Lea and Amy: Love Conquers Homophobia,” *ManilaOut*, no. 1 (2000): 28; Mark Peter Zamora, “Anticipating Gay Fatherhood,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 13, 2001, F2; Bino A. Realuyo, “Dear Country,” *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, June 11, 2000, E1; Mozart A.T. Pastrano, “The Rite of Manhood Called Boy Bayot,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, February 28, 2001, E4; John L. Silva, “End Page: The Origins of My Dress Code,” *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, February 24, 2002, 7; and Jade Lopez, L.J. Palma, Sam Tongson, and Gina Ramos, “Homo... What?” *Philippines Free Press*, July 13, 1996, 18.
11. Among the many gay authors whose books appeared in this decade we can include: essayists Louie Cano, Danton Remoto, and Jose Javier Reyes; fictionists Ernesto Carandang II, Ian Casocot, Vicente Groyon III, and Gerardo Torres; poets Romulo Baquiran Jr., Ronald Baytan, Carlomar Daoana, Jaime Doble, Eugene Evasco, Alex Gregorio, Nestor De Guzman, Ralph Semino Galan, and Lawrence Ypil; and playwrights Ed Cabagnet, Nicolas Pichay, Rody Vera, and Rene Villanueva.
12. *Temptation Island ... Live* was put up by Madiraka Events and Services and ran for the whole month of May in 2004 at the Republic of Malate. It was adapted by Chris Martinez from the original screenplay by Joey Gosiengfiao, and its cast included the following: Tuxqs Rutaquio, John Lapus, Peter Serrano, Raymond Sydney, Face Sales, Romnick Sarmenta, Floy Quintos, Danny Ramos, and Christian Vasquez.
13. See the related articles on this queer restaging of Nick Joaquin’s famous play: Cora Llamas, “New Musical Blurs Gender Lines,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, August 6, 2001, E3; and Alex Vergara, “Portrait as Sisters’ Act,” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, February 25, 2002, E1.

14. For some of the better-written reviews of *Zsazsa Zaturannah Ze Muzikal*, see Roel Hoang Manipon, "Zsazsa Zaturannah Zings," *L Magazine*, vol. 2 no. 1 (2006): 49; Francis Martinez, "Zsazsa Zaturannah Inside Out," *L Magazine*, vol. 2 no. 1 (2006): 50-51; and Francezca C. Kwe, "Zsazsa Zaturannah Off the Page," *L Magazine*, vol. 2 no. 1 (2006): 52-53.
15. For news coverage on this pioneering film festival, see the following related articles: "Pink Festival Celebrates Gay Pride," *Inquirer Libre*, May 28, 2004, 8; Vives Anunciacion, "Festival Queens: Second International Gay and Lesbian Film and Video Festival," *Inquirer Libre*, July 5, 2004, 8; and "Gay Films: UP Seeing Pink," *Inquirer Libre*, July 5, 2004, 13.
16. Some of these outstanding films were the following: *Markova: Comfort Gay*, *Aishite Masu*, *Ang Lalaki sa Buhay ni Selya*, *Miguel/Michelle*, *Paraiso ni Efen*, *Pusong Mamon*, *Happy Together Forever*, *Sibak*, *Burlesk King*, and *Twilight Dancers*.
17. These digital-format indie films include the stylistically erotic *Duda*, *Bathhouse*, *Masahista*, *Ang Lalake sa Parola*, *Daybreak*, and *Ang Lihim ni Antonio*; the lesbian family drama *Kaleldo*, and the wonderful and internationally acclaimed *Ang Pagdadalaga ni Maximo Oliveros*, which, among other things, tackles the controversial issue of pubescent gay sexuality. For reviews of *Ang Pagdadalaga ...*, see Marcus Iñigo Laurel, "Budding but not yet Blooming," *L Magazine*, vol. 2 no. 1 (2006): 8-10; and J. Neil C. Garcia, "Paradoxical Philippines: On *Ang Pagdadalaga ni Maximo Oliveros*," *L Magazine*, vol. 2 no. 1 (2006): 13-14.
18. For commentaries on the changing attitudes toward gay and lesbian representations on Philippine television, see Nestor U. Torre, "Gays on TV," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 25, 2005, A 31; and Arvin Adina, "Boob Tube Reflects Changing Gay Image," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, November 6, 2002, D2.
19. For GMA 7's press release on this show, see "Out," iGMA tv (News and Public Affairs), <http://64.41.100.97/npa.html> (accessed September 15, 2007).
20. That the reason for the show's cancellation was not that it was rating poorly (it was the best-performing program in its time slot) but that the advertisers all decided to mysteriously pull out was among the insights shared in a candid interview with Jigz Mayuga, who hosted *Out!* together with JM Cobarrubias and Awi Siwa. For a text of the interview, see Diana A. Uy, "The Colorful Life of an Ex-TV Host," *Manila Bulletin Online*, <http://www.mb.com.ph/issues/2005/04/18/SCTY2005041832950.html> (accessed September 14, 2007).
21. "Controversies: Out of the Closet," *Asiaweek*, October 5, 1994, 33.
22. See "Statement of the First National Lesbian Rights Conference, December 7-9, 1996," <http://hain.org/badaf6/lesbian-rights.htm> (accessed February 3, 1998).
23. See *Tabi-tabi sa Pagsasantabi: Kritikal na mga Tala ng mga Lesbiana at Bakla sa Sining, Kultura, at Wika*, eds. Eugene Y. Evasco, Roselle V. Pineda, and Rommel B. Rodriguez (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 2003).

24. For an analysis of this march's significance, especially in relation to the framework of "gay rights," see my "Philippine Gay Rights," in *Slip/pages: Essays in Philippine Gay Criticism* (Manila: De La Salle University Press, 1998), 60-64.
25. This march received much media attention. The newspaper and magazine articles that covered it include the following: Nati Nuguid, "All About Rights," *Philippines Free Press*, July 13, 1996, 16; Choong Tin Sieu, "Revolution by Stages," *Asiaweek*, August 7, 1998, 38; Nati Nuguid, "Acceptance, Not Just Tolerance," *Philippines Free Press*, July 13, 1996, 14; and Anna Leah Sarabia, "Filipino Lesbians and Gays Make History," *Gayzette, The Evening Paper*, March 8-10, 1996, 29.
26. See "Encounter: Rep. Reynaldo A. Calalay, A Champion of Gay Rights," *Sunday Inquirer Magazine*, September 24, 1995.
27. See the related articles: Dinah Macatiis, "Lesbian and Gay Rights Act of 1999 Languishes in Congress," *ManilaOut*, no. 2 (2000): 12; "Prohibiting Discrimination on the Basis of Sexual Orientation (On Senate Bill 18631 and House Bill 9095)," *ManilaOut*, no. 2 (2000): 38.
28. See Ross von Metzke, "Gay Communist Rebels Marry in Philippines," February 28, 2005, www.gmax.co.za/look05/02/08-philippines.html (accessed September 14, 2007).
29. For an overview of the last decade's worth of accomplishments on the Filipino LGBT rights movement, see: "LGBT Rights in the Philippines," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_rights_in_the_Philippines (accessed January 12, 2007).
30. The reason given by the Commission on Elections is that Ang Ladlad lacked a truly national constituency, and that Remoto, who heads it, and many other well-educated and middle-class gays like him do not comprise an oppressed sector at all.
31. Neil Lazarus, "Introducing Postcolonial Studies," in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 5.
32. Arif Dirlik, "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism," *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 2 (1994): 328-56.
33. Andrew Smith, "Migrancy, Hybridity, and Postcolonial Literary Studies," in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 260.
34. Vincent B. Leitch, general ed., "Introduction to Theory and Criticism," *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001), 25-26.
35. John McLeod, "Introduction," *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. John McLeod (London: Routledge, 2007), 7.
36. Peter Childs and Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* (Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall, 1997), 17.
37. This threefold model was first proposed by Michel Pêcheux in relation to the "collusion/resistance" question of language and ideology. See Michel Pêcheux,

Language, Semantics and Ideology, trans. Harbans Nagpal (London: Macmillan, 1982).

38. For more on this “national” deployment of Butlerian performativity, see my essay, “Sexuality, Knowledge and the Nation-State,” in *Performing the Self: Occasional Prose* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 2003), 3-15.
39. Even the early and possibly most eloquent champion of anticolonial nationalism declares that a national culture is not and should not be seen as a folklore, nor as an “abstract populism,” but as something that belongs to the present as well as to the future. See Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1968), 43.
40. Childs, 197.
41. An example of the elision of cultural—and indeed, national—localities under the convenient and homogenizing description of “queer postcolonial theory” may be seen in the work of Martin F. Manalansan IV, whose study of the “global gay modernity” of Filipino gay men living in New York City conflates the experiences of Filipino immigrants to America with the cultures and socialities of Filipinos living in the Philippines. His queer postcolonial ethnocentrism is such that, in his book, *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*, Manalansan haphazardly surveys the various Filipino efforts at theorizing kabaklaan in the Philippines, and faults them for their essentialist presuppositions that do not take into account the diasporic issues that beset Filipino American bakla queers like himself. This is a disingenuous move, for it neglects to register the fact that these local theorizings of Philippine-specific kabaklaan do not even pretend to pertain to the diasporic question; moreover, while it condemns local Filipino scholarship for its naive and “essentialist” presuppositions, by positing a sameness across the transnational divide between Filipinos in the Philippines and Filipino immigrants to the United States it is in fact promoting its own devious—and neocolonial—essentialism. For an interesting review of Manalansan’s book, see Peter A. Jackson, review of *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 36, no. 2 (2005): 328-30.
42. Parry, in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 75, 78.
43. Tamara Sivanandan, “Anticolonialism, National Liberation, and Postcolonial Nation Formation,” in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 64.
44. Laura Chrisman, “Nationalism and Postcolonial Studies,” in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 196.
45. Robert J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 6.

46. Parry, in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 78-79.
47. Stephen Morton, "Poststructuralist Formulations," in McLeod, *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, 172.
48. This has been the point of many of the critics of the postmodern-inflected varieties of postcolonial discourse. See Aijaz Ahmad, *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures* (London: Verso, 1992), 43; and Kumkum Sangari, "The Politics of the Possible," *Cultural Critique* 7: 157-86.
49. See one of this new "philosophy's" most important books: Paula M. L. Moya and Michael R. Hames-Garcia, eds., *Reclaiming Identity: Realist Theory and the Predicament of Postmodernism* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000).
50. Linda Hutcheon, "Circling the Downspout of Empire: Postcolonialism and Postmodernism," *Ariel* 20 (4): 149-75.
51. Antonio de Morga, *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, found in *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*, ed. Emma Blair and James Robertson (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark, 1903-09), Volume 16, 130.
52. *The Rizal-Blumentritt Correspondence* (Manila: Jose Rizal Centennial Commission, 1961), 120.
53. Jaime Bulatao, SJ, "Split-Level Christianity," *Manuud*, 1971, 16-33.
54. Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1993), 45, 75, 86.
55. McLeod, in McLeod, *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, 6.
56. According to Benita Parry, it is imperative that postcolonialism perform the following critical tasks, if it is to become truly relevant in these neocolonial and globalized times:
... empirical investigations of economic migrants, ... the substantive and experiential situations of the majoritarian settled populations of the nation-states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America ... [of] the millions of people whose mobility is constrained; who are not part of the reservoir of cheap labor in either the home cities, the Gulf States, or the old and new metropolitan centers; who still engage in subsistence farming, or in extracting raw materials and producing goods for world markets.
See Parry, in Lazarus, *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, 74.
57. Gigi M. David, "Gay Contestant Natigok sa Stage," *Standard Xpress*, December 5, 2006, 2.

INDEX

A

- activo/pasivo, 78, 407
Adam, Barry D., 411
A Different Love: Being Gay in the Philippines, 236-45, 412
Aduarte, Diego, 192
aginging, 191
Aguja, Mario, 429
AIDS, 12, 213, 231-35, 260, 408, 416, 467, 489
Aishite Masu, 503
Akbayan Citizens' Action Party, 428
Ako si Emma ... Babae, 96
alanganin, 74, 476
Alcantara, Jimmy, 331-33
Alcina, Francisco Ignacio, 163-64, 174
Alejo, Albert SJ, 124-26
Alfar, Dean, 336
Alfon, Estrella, 293
Altman, Dennis, 408
Alvaro, DJ, 501
Alyansa Laban sa Kalalakihang Bakla, 413
Amador, Zeneida, 103, 501
androgyny, 257
Ang Ladlad, 430, 504
Ang Lalake sa Parola, 503
Ang Lalaki sa Buhay ni Selya, 503
Ang Lihim ni Antonio, 503
Ang Lunes na Mahirap Bunuin, 492
Ang Pagdadalaga ni Maximo Oliveros, 503
Angara-Castillo, Bellaflor, 428
aniteras, 192
antibakla utopia, xvii
antigay school policy, 419
antigay violence, 351-52
antipornography law, 227
A Portrait of the Artist as Filipino, 423
Aquino, Corazon, 413
Asian Queer Studies, xiii, 431
asog, 165-66, 174
Atadero, Oscar, 501
Ateneo de Manila University, 430, 450
Augustine, St., 131-32
Aunor, Nora, 270
authenticity, 6
autobiography, gay, 289-91, 497
Avenida, 114

B

babaeng bakla, 105-7
 “Babayeng Bana Kini,” 107-8
 babayenon, 192
 babaylan, 154, 162-97, 395
 Babette, 149-50
 “Badaf Forever,” 100
 Bagong Pag-asa, 416
 bakla, 50, 316-23, 330-31
 as phase, 74-76
 etymology of, 462-63
 homosexualization of, 85
 bakla/homosexual dynamic, xvi, xxi-xxii,
 50, 58-59, 62-66, 69-70, 82, 86, 88,
 97, 134
 Balagtas, 30, 74
 Balboa, Vasco Nuñez de, 391
Baligtaran, 229
 bantot, 192
 bantut, 73, 193, 272-75
 Banzhaf, Jane S., 63, 88
 Baquiran, Romulo Jr., 502
 Barrios, Joi, 229
Bathhouse, 503
 bayas, 191
 bayog, 190-91
 bayoguin, 164, 181-83, 191
 bayot, 50, 76-79, 89, 129, 195, 250
 songs about the, 472
 Bayot, Antonio, 300
 Bayron, Edwin, *see* Carlo/Diane
 Baytan, Ronald, 502
 Benavides, Miguel de, 168
 berdache, 167, 174, 190, 254
*Between Men: English Literature and
 Male Homosocial Desire*, 27
 bido, 177, 182

binabai, 191
 binabay, 191
 binabayoguin, 191
 biniboy, 79-80, 467
 biographical criticism, gay, xvi, 25, 29,
 290
 Birion, Juan, 94, 145
 Blair and Robertson, 178
 Blanc-Szanton, Cristina, 158-60, 174
 Blumenfeld, Warren, 132
 bodabil, 81
 Bolinao Manuscript, 497
Bowers vs. Hardwick, 45, 393
Boxer Codex, 181-82
 boyos, 191
Boys in the Band, 91, 372
Boys in the Band II, 142
 Bray, Alan, 49
 Bruning, Jürgen, 396-97, 498
 Buhawi, 184, 484
 Bulatao, Jaime, 450
 burlarse, el, 186
Burlesk King, 503
 butch-femme, 215, 257-60, 390
 Butler, Judith, 265-66

C

Cabagnot, Ed, 502
 Calalay, Reynaldo, 428, 500, 504
 Calderon, Sofronio, 120
 call boys, 114-17
 camp, 43, 204-212, 265
 Can't Live in the Closet (CLIC), 416
 Cannell, Fenella, 266, 269-92
 Cano, Louie, 502
 canon, Philippine homosexual, 30-31
 Carandang, Ernesto II, 502

Carlo/Diane, 80, 215-21
 Casaje, Lito, 30
 Casocot, Ian, 502
 Castro, Pio de, 363
 category mistake, xvi
 Catholic Church, 130, 387, 414-15, 475
CCP Encyclopedia of Philippine Art, 335
 celibacy, 133, 177, 377
 Cendaña, Percival, 425
 Cervantes, Behn, 423
 Charings, 100, 134
 Chinese, and homosexuality, 388, 393.
 See also Sangleyes.
 Chirino, Pedro, 196
 Cine Café, 64, 463
Close Encounters with the Third Sex, 100,
 336, 372
Closet Quivers, 64, 463
 cobarde, 191
 Coco Banana, 93
 Cole, Fay-Cooper, 480
 Combes, Francisco, 172, 175-79
 Coming Out, xviii, 25, 29, 37, 143-45,
 203, 213, 230, 238-45, 259, 261, 339,
 354-56, 406, 495-96
*Coming Out: International Gay and
 Lesbian Writings*, 406
Confesionario Copioso, 169
 constructionism, 14-16, 18-19, 116
 constructionism vs. essentialism, 154-55,
 247-56
 containment, 8-9, 389
 Cooper, James, 501
 Cordero-Fernando, Gilda, 30
 counter-identification, 440
 Covar, Prospero, 123-24
 Crowley, Mart, 91
 cruising spots, Metro Manila, 473
 Cruz, Louie, 501

cryptohomosexual reading, 34
*Cubao 1980 at Iba Pang Mga Katha: Ang
 Unang Sigaw ng Gay Liberation sa
 Pilipinas*, 284, 361-86
*Cubao Pagkagat ng Dilim: Mga Kwentong
 Kababalaghan*, 262-64
 cultural materialism, 460

D

d'Angheira, Pietro Martire, 391
 daetan, 166
Damas de Noche, 229-30
 Daoana, Carlomar, 502
 Davidson, Arnold, 256
Daybreak, 503
 De Guzman, Nestor, 502
 De La Salle University, 425
De Orbo Novo, 391
 deconstruction, 213
 depth model, 119, 263
 Desquibel, Pedro Hurtado, 173
 determinism vs. voluntarism, 15
 diaspora, 433
 Dickens, Charles, 28
 Dios, Honorio Bartolome de, 292
 Dirlik, Arif, 433
 dis-identification, 439
 diversitarianism, 247
 Doble, Jaime, 502
 Dollimore, Jonathan, 10-11, 27, 83, 207-
 10
 Dolphy, 75, 137-40
 Douglas, Alfred Lord, 170
 drag, 266
Duda, 503
 dynamic nominalism, 85

E

Eat Bulaga, 205
 Elope, Ponciano. *See* Buhawi.
 Encarnacion, Juan Felix de la, 192
 Encarnacion, Jun, 263
Encyclopedia of Homosexuality, 400
 englishes, 301
 Enriquez, Mig Alvarez, 30
 Enriquez, Virgilio, 464
Epistemology of the Closet, 42, 53, 410
 equivalency, xix
 erastes, 329
 eromenos, 329
 Errington, Sherry, 162, 166
 Espejo, Tony, 91, 372
 essentialism vs. constructionism,
 25, 53. *See also* minoritizing vs.
 universalizing.
 Estrada, Joseph, 427
 ethnic model, 42-43
 eunuchs, 175
 Evangelio, Albert Claude, 495
 Evasco, Eugene, 502
Evening Paper, The, 500
 Eviota, Elizabeth Uy, 24, 197
 Exodus International, 416

F

Fanon, Frantz, 446
Fefita Fofonggay, 89
 feminism, 21-22, 43, 229
 Fernandez, Doreen, 363
 Filipinoness, 161, 434, 440
 first pleasurable experience theory, 15
 Fletcher, John, 328

Florendo, Abe, 204-6
 Flores, Jose, 300
 Foucault, Michel, 44, 170, 329, 376
 Francisco, R.S., 99
 Freudianism, 408

G

Galan, Ralph Semino, 483, 502
 Gamalinda, Eric, 30
 Garber, Marjorie, 28, 141, 210-13, 260
 Garcia, Eddie, 135
 gay, 6, 56-58
 and lesbian theory, 22
 bars, 112, 222
 canon, xviii
 gaycritics, 22
 liberation movement, 5, 40-41, 86,
 363, 371, 386, 406, 436
 literary criticism, 27
 rights, 418
 theory, Philippine, 14-17
Gay Men's Exchange, 416
*Gender Trouble: Feminism and the
 Subversion of Identity*, 265
 gender-crossing, 48, 152-53, 165-97,
 183-85, 254, 479-80
 gender-crossing, comparative, 190, 193-
 95
 gender, Philippine conceptions of, 248-
 49
 gender vs. sexuality, 22-24
 gender-transitive vs. gender-intransitive,
 46, 19-20, 254-56, 410, 436
 Genet, Jean, 9, 279, 383
 Gide, André, 9, 28, 207, 383
*Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the
 Diaspora*, 505

global North, 432, 446
 global South, 421, 446-47
 globalization, 432-33, 444-46
 Gloria, Ricardo, 460
 Goldberg, Jonathan, 179-80, 391-94
 Goldin, Nan, 491
 Gonzalez, N.V.M., 30, 298
 Gosiengfiao, Joey, 91, 502
 Gough, Jamie, 258
 Greekness, 311-16
 Gregorio, Alex, 502
 Groyon, Vicente III, 502
 Guerrero, Wilfrido Ma., 30, 92, 278, 336,
 372
Guys4Men, 437-39

H

Hacienda Margarita, 114
 Hacking, Ian, 85
 Hagedorn, Jessica, 30
 Hall, Marguerite Radclyffe, 9
 Halperin, David, 45-46
*Hanggang Dito na Lamang at Maraming
 Salamat*, 90-91, 282, 334-60, 372
Happy Together Forever, 503
 Hart, Donn V., 77-79
 Healthy Interaction and Values (HIV)
 workshop, 231-33
 Hemingway, Ernest, 28
 hermaphrodite, 75
 heteronormativity, 118
 Hirschfield, Magnus, 96
 history from within, 7
 Holmes, Margarita Go-Singco, 47, 235-
 45, 412
 hombre mugerado, 192
 homo/hetero, 398, 435

homophobia, 6, 26
 homosexual identities, 253
 homosexual panic, 43, 49, 461
 homosexuality, etiological explanations
 for, 469
 homosociality, 30, 33, 48-49
 Honasan, Alya, 233
 Hontiveros-Baraquel, Risa, 429
 humanism, 312-14, 432
 humorization, 143
 Hwang, David Henry, 99

I

identification, 439
 identity politics, 379
 Iletto, Reynaldo, 128-29, 159, 475
 imperialism, 268, 421, 438, 443
 impersonation, 207
 imposture, 207
 individual, gay as, 146
 Integrated Performing Arts Guild
 (IPAG), 334
Intermisyon, 495
 International Conference on Population
 and Development (ICPD), 415
 inversion, xv, 43, 47, 70-71, 86, 102, 116-
 20, 136, 188, 214, 221-22, 251, 258,
 381, 390, 410, 496
 Itiel, Joseph, 67-70, 128

J

Jackson, Peter, 398-99, 505
 Jade Vine, 93
 "Joana Montegracia," 454
 Joaquin, Nick, 33-34, 87, 114, 298, 423

Jocano, F. Landa, 160
 Johnson, Mark, 73, 266-67, 272-75
 Jorgensen, Christine, 95
 Juan, Anton, 30, 423

K

Kaleldo, 503
Kaming Mga Talyada, 95
Karga Mano, 463
 Karnes, Eddie, 403
 kathoey, 153, 397-99
 KATLO, 93, 237
 Kinsey, Alfred, xxii, 42, 44-45, 86, 240, 380
 Kirk, Kris and Ed Heath, 264-65
 Kulturkreis, 397, 498
Kumbersasyon, 336
Kung Paano Ko Pinatay si Diana Ross, 229-30, 336

L

Lacan, Jacques, 28
 ladlad ng kapa, 144-45, 147
Ladlad: An Anthology of Philippine Gay Writings, 29, 287-88, 423, 459-60
 Lady Valerie, 223-24
 Lamangan, Joel, 424
 Lapuz, Lourdes V., 476
 Las Casas, Bartolome de, 392
 Lawrence, D.H., 28
 Layumas, Rune, 475
 Lazarus, Neil, 432-33
 Lean Alejandro Lecture Series, 459
 Lesbian Advocates of the Philippines, 429

Lesbian and Gay Legislative Advocacy Network (LAGABLAB), 428
 Lesbian and Gay Rights Act of 1999, 428
 lesbian, 101-4
 lesbian history, sources for, 471
 LGBT Studies, 426
 Library Foundation, The, 237
 Likosky, Stephan, 406
 Lim, Alfredo, 413
 Lim, Michael Kho, 501
 Linmark, R. Zamora, 423
 Longos, Pacita, 87
 loob, xxiii, 72-73, 119-30, 210, 251-52, 261, 404
 as psychospiritual depth, xxiv, 73
 loob/labas, xviii, 123, 127, 136, 341, 389, 449, 465
Looking for the Pre-Hispanic Filipino, 175

M

M. Butterfly, 99
 maaram, 160
 Madrigal-Vazquez, Chito, 293-95
 Magsaysay, Ramon, 293-95
 Mailer, Norman, 28
 Malate, 413
 male homosexual identities, 5
Male Homosexuality in Four Societies, 246
Male Homosexuality in Thailand: An Interpretation of Contemporary Thai Sources, 398-99
 Manalansan, Martin IV, 193, 505
 manananggal, 217-18
 manang bali, 178
 Mananzan, Sister Mary John, 157
Manila Standard, 453
 Marcos, Fely Luz, 90, 144, 335

Marcos, Imelda, 403
 Marcossian dispensation, 26
 Maria Clara, 158
 Marin, Malu, 501
Markova: Comfort Gay, 503
 Martial Law, 5
 Marxism, 26
 Mary Magdalene, 197
Masahista, 503
Maybe I Can Give You Sex, 475
 Mayuga, Jigz, 503
 McCoy, Alfred, 162, 184
 McIntosh, Mary, 458
 Mehan Gardens, 114, 413
Men in Frocks, 264-65
 Men who have Sex with Men (MSM), 59,
 231-45, 255, 406, 412
 Metropolitan Community Church, 415
 Mexico, 406
 Mickley, Richard, 415, 417
Miguel/Michelle, 503
 Miles, Aubrey, 454
 mimicry, 270, 272
 minoritizing vs. universalizing, 46-48,
 408
 misogyny, 302-10
 Miss Gay Peñafrancia, 270
 Miss Gay Philippines, 206, 232, 263
 Montano, Severino, xvii, 29, 208, 276-86,
 292-31, 372
 Moore, Lina Espina, 80
 Morales, Paul, 464
 Morga, Antonio de, 168, 483
 Moro Islamic Liberation Front, 273
 Mother Lily, 218
 muger indigena, 157-58

N

Nadres, Orlando, xvii, xviii, 90, 276-86,
 334, 372, 404, 410-11
 National Democratic Front, 429
 nationalism, 420, 437-52
 nativism, xx, xxi
 Natural Law, 188
 nefandam libidinem, 170
 Neoplatonism, 302-11
 New Criticism, 384
 Noceda-Sanlucar, 191
 Noriega, Bienvenido, 30
Nosce Te Ipsum, 11
 nymphs, 104

O

Oedipus Complex, 53, 328, 332
 ontogeny vs. phylogeny, 16
 organizations, early gay, 473
 Orientalism, 272, 442-43
 orientation, homosexual, 47
Orosman at Zafira, 465-66
Out!, 425, 503
 Outing, 39
 overt/covert, 97-98, 214, 338-58, 404, 410

P

Padgug, Robert, 17
 Padilla, Rustom, 501
 Pagsanjan, 413
 Palanca, Rajit, 495
 Panganiban, Jose Villa, 75
 Paper Dolls, 204

Paraiso ni Efren, 503
 parlorista, 87
 parrang sabil, 273
 Parry, Benita, 443
Pasyon and Revolution, 475
 patriarchy, 49
 Patron, Elena, 96
 Pêcheux, Michel, 504
 pederasty, 77
 Penal Code, 488
Pepe en Phil, 495
 Peralta, Jesus, 300
 Perez, Domingo, 163, 192
 Perez, Tony, xvii, 29, 262-65, 276-86, 292,
 361-86
 performativity, 266, 439-40
 Perry, Troy, 415
 perversion, 83
 Phelan, John Leddy, 388-89
Philippine Daily Inquirer, 421-22
 Philippine Educational Theater
 Association (PETA), 229, 279, 335,
 459
 Philippine gay culture, 2-4, 11, 261
 Philippine PEN, 233
Philippines Free Press, 104
 Pichay, Nicolas, 463, 492, 502
 Pink Film Festival, 424
 Pinpin, Thomas, 170
 Plasencia, Juan de, 163-64
 Ponteñila, Ma. Simeona, 98, 107, 137
 positivism, xv
 postcolonialism, 420-52, 506
 postinversion, 45
 postpositivist realism, 447-48
 poststructuralism, 446, 448
*Power and Difference: Gender in Island
 Southeast Asia*, 162

Pride March, 417, 427
 progress narrative, 141
 Progressive Organization of Gays in the
 Philippines (PRO-Gay), 417-18, 427
 prostitution, 104-5, 112-16
 Proust, Marcel, 279
 proximate, the, 211
 pseudohomosexuality, 474
 psychoanalysis, 28, 315, 323-29
 puit, 169
Pusong Mamon, 503

Q

queer, 443-44, 499
 Quezon Memorial Circle, 417
 Quezon, Manuel L. III, 421-22, 501
 Quran, 172

R

Rafael, Vicente, 124-25, 159, 186, 389
 Rea, Ruvic, 429
 ReachOut Foundation, 427
 real man, 51-52, 54, 369-71
 realism vs. nominalism, 16
 Realuyo, Bino, 423
Remembrance of Things Past, 279
 Remoto, Danton, 430, 459, 501-2
 resistance, 8
 Revilla, Ramon Jr., 429
 Reyes, Jose Javier, 501-02
 Ribadeneira, Marcelo de, 163, 390
 Rizal, Jose, 30, 449
 Roda, 214, 287
 Rosales, Etta, 429

Rosca, Ninotchka, 30
 Roth, Henry Ling, 178
 Rubin, Gayle, 72

S

Salazar, Zeus, 160-63
 San Agustin, Gaspar de, 169
 San Antonio, Francisco de, 163, 171-73
 San Buenaventura, Pedro de, 191
 San Jose, Francisco Blancas de, 170-71
 Sangleyes, 168, 497
 Santacruzán, 132, 144-45
 Santiago, Carmen, 66-67
 Santos, Aida, 23
 Santos, Bienvenido, 298
 Sarabia, Ana Leah, 501
 Scott, William Henry, 155, 174-75
 Sechrest, Lee and Luis Flores, 62
 Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, 16-17, 20, 27-
 28, 42-43, 48-49, 246, 279, 408, 410
 Self/Other, 442
 Serrano, Fanny, 222
Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, 240
Sexual Dissidence, 27, 46
 Shahani, Leticia Ramos, 227
 Shakespeare, William, 55
Short Time, 336
Sibak, 503
 Sikolohiyang Pilipino, 66, 72-73, 464
 silahis, 134-37, 255
 Silva, John, 101, 132-33, 501
 Sining Kayumanggi Royal Family
 (SKRF), 93
 slippage, xvi
 Smith, Lance Corporal Daniel, 453, 456

*Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern
 Sexualities*, 179, 391
 sodomy, 17, 168-174, 179-80, 391, 393
 solidarity sex, 78
 Soriano, Maricel, 222

Spirit vs. Flesh, 210
 split-level Christianity, 450
 Sta. Cruz, Manila, 322
 stereotypes, 13, 139-40, 368, 424
 Sterne, Laurence, 27
 Stop Discrimination Now, 429
 strategic essentialism, 385
 subjectivity, 9
Super SiReyna, 1
 sward, 87
 Swarding, Tita, 501
 swardspeak, 107-11, 422
Switchboard, 416

T

Taberna Taboso, 115
 Tadiar, Neferti Xina, 378-86
 Tan, Michael, 236-45, 482, 502
 Tana, 87
 Tatad, Kit, 235
 Tausug, 272-75
 Tayabas, 337
Tears in the Morning, 403
Temptation Island ... Live!, 423, 502
 Thackeray, William Makepeace, 28
 Thailand, 397
The Clash of Cymbals, 30, 92, 278, 336,
 372
*The Hispanization of the Philippines:
 Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses*,
 388

The Lesbian Collective, 427
 “The Lion and the Faun,” 281-82, 292-31,
 372
The Picture of Dorian Gray, 279
The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement,
 411
 Third Sex, 76, 82, 94-96, 101-5, 136, 198,
 224, 257, 400
 Third World, 433
 Third, the, 210-13
 Tiempo, Edith L., 30
 Tiongson, Nick, 362-66, 374-75, 379,
 381, 501
 tolerance/acceptance, 13, 68, 82-85, 151,
 400-401
 tomboy, 103
 Torre, Nestor U., 91, 100-101, 336
 Torres, Bobby, 478
 Torres, Gerardo, 502
 Totanes, Sebastian de, 185
 transference, 307
 transgressive reinscription, ix, 10, 207-
 15, 383
 transsexualism, 94-95, 189, 500
 transvestism, 99, 151-52, 165
 transvestophobia, 260
 Turingan, Col. Manuel, 80
Twilight Dancers, 503
 Tyler, Carol-Anne, 257

U

Ugarte Field, 414
 unay, 118
 universalism, xxi
 University of the Philippines, 425
 UP Babaylan, 225-27, 425, 458
 utopia, 316-22

V

Valdez, Ian, 501
 Vera, Rody, 229, 336, 459, 502
 Villa, Jose Garcia, 30
 Villanueva, Rene, 30, 336, 502

W

Waite, Philip, 109
 Whitam, Frederick, 68, 401-2
 Whitam, Frederick and Robin Mathy,
 246
 Whitehead Harriet, 167, 254
 Wilde, Oscar, 170, 207-12, 279, 383
 Wolfe, Barbie Ann, 206
 woman, Philippine precolonial, 157-61

X

xenophobia, 217

Y

Ynfante, Fritz, 91, 140
 Young, Robert J.C., 446
 Ypil, Lawrence, 502

Z

Zsazsa Zaturrnah: Ze Muzikal, 423, 503

THE AUTHOR

J. Neil C. Garcia finished his BA Journalism (*magna cum laude*) in the University of Santo Tomas in 1990. He is currently teaching creative writing and comparative literature at the University of the Philippines Diliman, where he also serves as an associate for poetry in the Institute of Creative Writing. He is the author of numerous poetry collections and works in literary and cultural criticism, including *Our Lady of the Carnival* (1996), *The Sorrows of Water* (2000), *Kaluluwa* (2001), *Slip/pages: Essays in Philippine Gay Criticism* (1998), *Performing the Self: Occasional Prose* (2003), *The Garden of Wordlessness* (2005), and *Misterios and Other Poems* (2005). His *Postcolonialism and Filipino Poetics: Essays and Critiques* (2005) is a revised version of his dissertation in English Studies: Creative Writing, which he completed in 2003. In 2007 he edited for Philippine PEN the poetry anthology *At Home in Unhomeliness*, for which he also wrote an accompanying monograph. He recently finished a Fulbright research grant at the University of California (San Diego), where he studied Asian-American poetics. He is currently working on a full-length book, a postcolonial survey and analysis of Philippine poetry in English.

Although lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people in the Philippines have a distinctive culture, their legal rights are limited. Gays and lesbians are generally tolerated (if not accepted) in Filipino society, but widespread discrimination remains. Filipino gays are known as bakla. Philippine gay culture: binabae to bakla, silahis to MSM. University of the Philippines Press. ISBN 978-971-542-577-3.