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The rating in the Internet Movie Database (www.imdb.com) for Ang Lee’s *Brokeback Mountain* is 7.7 (March 2015). The film that concerns me here, Bill Condon’s *Gods and Monsters*, does not really lag far behind, with a 7.5 rating. Considering the number of voters—233,193 for Lee’s film, but only 10% of that number (23,613 users) for Condon’s film—the [admittedly silly] question to be asked and answered is why so few spectators have been attracted by *Gods and Monsters* when the ratings suggest it is as good a film as *Brokeback Mountain*. As an admirer who has rated both films a superb 9, I wish to consider here which factors have pushed *Gods and Monsters* to the backward position it occupies, in terms of public and academic attention received, in comparison to the highly acclaimed *Brokeback Mountain*. 
Which factors limit the interest of audiences, reviewers and academics as regards *mainstream* films about gay men?

**AGEISM:** term coined by physician and psychiatrist Robert Neil Butler “Age-ism reflects a deep seated uneasiness on the part of the young and middle-aged—a personal revulsion and distaste for growing old, disease, disability; and fear of powerlessness, ‘uselessness,’ and death” (1969: 243).

**LOOKISM:** The prejudice in favor of young-looking, attractive persons.

**HOMOPHOBIA:** Irrational fear of, aversion to, or discrimination against homosexuality or homosexuals

This consideration is, I hope, not unreasonable but founded on the fact that both films aim at making stories about gay men part of Hollywood’s mainstream production. My question, then, can be rephrased as which factors limit the interest of audiences, reviewers and academics as regards mainstream films about gay men? The most likely answer is that the main limiting factor is, as I’ll show, ageism. This specific type of prejudice conditions both LGBT and heterosexual audiences, compounded in the case of the former with lookism and with homophobia in the latter.
The success of *Brokeback Mountain* seemed to herald the end of homophobic barriers in mainstream cinema, by which I mean cinema addressed to a large audience (unlike, then, so-called ‘queer cinema’). Ten years later, however, and despite the undeniable cultural relevance of Ang Lee’s film, gay romance is by no means an established mainstream subject in cinema. The excellent script by Larry McMurtry and Diana Ossana, based on an acclaimed short story by E. Annie Proulx, published in *The New Yorker* in 1997, had been around for a few years before the film was finally made. There were serious doubts, precisely, that mainstream audiences would welcome a romantic gay story which, in addition, seemed to attack central notions about American masculinity by dealing with two men in the American West.
I am here carefully avoiding the use of the word ‘cowboy,’ following instructions from the author herself, E. Annie Proulx. In her own view, “Brokeback Mountain” needs to be classed among the stories she has written “examining rural Western social situations,” inspired by her academic training as a historian with a focus on “rural North American hinterlands” (in Testa 2005: website). She grants that her two protagonists, Ennis and Jack, are both “beguiled by the cowboy myth, as are most people who live in the state” of Wyoming (in Testa 2005: website) though they fail to measure up to it: Ennis is just employed as a ranch hand, whereas Jack fails to establish himself as a rodeo star, eventually becoming a tractor salesman.
In another interview Proulx comments that she noticed men staring at other men in bars, and she “started thinking what it might be like to grow up in the ‘40s, ‘50s, and ‘60s if you were a gay kid. Wyoming is a homophobic place” (in Winter 2005: website). The brutal murder of gay student Matthew Shepard, killed in Wyoming one year after the publication of “Brokeback Mountain,” attested to the intense local homophobia she describes. The passing of the ‘Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act’ in 2009, brackets thus story and film within the process that made homophobic violence a punishable hate crime in the USA. This might arguably be one of the major factors in the enduring admiration which Lee’s film has garnered since its release...
...at least among rational persons.

Heath Ledger’s untimely death and the cult of youth
Yet, another tragic death of a young man possibly gave the film its final push onto cultural prominence and mainstream popularity. Australian star Heath Ledger, who played Ennis del Mar (the surviving member of the couple in Lee’s film) died in 2008, aged only 28, due to his imprudent abuse of prescribed medications. His untimely death connected somehow with the tragic mood of the film, also because Ledger’s longest relationship was with actress Michelle Williams, whom he met on the set of Brokeback Mountain, in which she played Ennis’s wife Alma. This piece of gossip does connect with the romantic nature of Brokeback Mountain since Ledger’s death and Jack’s murder, no matter how different, reinforce our cult of youth, itself the main source of our ageism.

**Tales about star-crossed young lovers**

Producer James Schamus: “From early on, Focus said the film was aiming for the same female fans with upscale tastes who loved Titanic [1997]”

Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet taught audiences to sympathize with tragic love stories about star-crossed young lovers cut short by premature death, a model repeated very successfully a few years before Brokeback Mountain by James Cameron’s hit film Titanic (1997), which Leonardo Di Caprio made right after playing
Romeo in Baz Luhrman’s effective, sentimental adaptation (1996). No wonder then that, as CEO of Focus Films, producer James Schamus aimed Ang Lee’s film at a ready-made, receptive audience: “From early on, Focus said the film was aiming for the same female fans with upscale tastes who loved Titanic.”

**Stopping Time: Perfect Love**

*Stopping Time: Perfect Love*

*Brokeback Mountain* is not, like Shakespeare’s and Cameron’s stories, chronologically compressed, quite the opposite, as it narrates a twenty-year long romance. Nonetheless, the romantic point it makes is quite similar: what could have degenerated into a gradual estrangement and a final separation suddenly becomes, thanks to fatality, the perfect impossible love.

Jack and Ennis are trapped by two unsurpassable obstacles: one, social (namely, the impossibility of living openly in 1960s and 1970s America as a couple) and the other personal, as Ennis is unable to overcome the terror instilled by his father when he forced him, as a boy, to witness a brutal homophobic attack. Unable to deal with this combined pressure, their love is on the brink of exhaustion, reduced for years
to a series of clandestine meetings. Just when a dead end is reached, demanding a final decision about their future together, the lethal homophobic assault against Jack happens. And, thus, the love story ends.

“An event movie” (Ruby Rich)

Heterosexual audiences welcomed this new recycling of the romantic trope, regardless of whether the protagonists were two men, possibly because the bulk of the audience was, as expected, the female Titanic-oriented target audience. Also, audiences in general no doubt sympathized with the anti-homophobic message. Even LGTB spectators could do little to resist what Ruby Rich calls an “event movie that sought with old-fashioned ambition to straddle marketplaces and move beyond self-identified audiences.” What is, after all, the alternative, she asks: “Mutually exclusive niches in our increasingly niche-fueled society?” (Rich 2013: 199)
Truly gay?: “I’m not no queer”

“the story of traditional men who love in spite of their own masculinist assumptions and heterosexist paradigms, who love without becoming gay” (Keller and Goodwyn 2008: 33).

Paradoxically, and most importantly, Ennis and Jack are manly in a rather traditional sense. Keller and Goodwyn conclude that both men stay, despite their gay romance, within the limits of hegemonic masculinity, though, I would add, on the fringes. Lee’s film is, hence, “the story of traditional men who love in spite of their own masculinist assumptions and heterosexist paradigms, who love without becoming gay” (2008: 33). Ennis famously claims “I’m not no queer” (74), a puzzling (or puzzled) double negative and both men marry after the Brokeback Mountain erotic episode, which has prompted views of them as bisexual. Jack’s adventures in Mexico and with other men closer home suggest that he uses his apparently unsuspecting wife Lureen as a convenient cover, whereas Ennis’ separation from the better informed Alma and his lack of any other steady relationship suggest that Jack is the only object of erotic/romantic interest for him.

Nevertheless, their working-class, unrefined lifestyle contrasts with most representations of homosexuality, which up to Brokeback Mountain tended to focus on middle- and upper-class men (as happens in Gods and Monsters). Ennis and Jack,
also very unusually, come, as noted, from a rural environment and connect with the landscape of the traditional Western film, which Lee recycled magisterially for his adaptation. Thus, although their masculinity might serve to radically redraw the stereotypically effeminate representation of gay men on screen, it serves also, or rather, to make them at the same time exceptional as gay men. I believe this is, in the end, the main reason why although *Brokeback Mountain* reached mainstream success whereas gay romance itself has not become an habitual topic for mainstream films. What *Brokeback Mountain* shows is that gay romance needs to deal with manly men and be tragic for it to be accepted by mainstream cinema.

**Mainstream comedy and the gay couple: *Modern Family* (2009–)

Mainstream audiences may have welcome Cameron and Mitchell's domestic gay life in the popular TV comedy *Modern Family* (2009–). Yet, clearly, the comedy around this couple depends on their not being manly, particularly in contrast to Mitchell’s patriarchal father, Jay.
Ageism and lookism: Limits of romance

“At first glance Jack seemed fair enough with his curly hair and quick laugh, but for a small man he carried some weight in the haunch and his smile disclosed buckteeth, not pronounced enough to let him eat popcorn out of the neck of a jug, but noticeable” (74).

Ennis, “high–arched nose and narrow face, was scruffy and a little cave–chested, balanced a small torso on long, caliper legs, possessed a muscular and supple body made for the horse and for fighting” (74). [From “Brokeback Mountain,” E. Annie Proulx]

Let me insist again that Brokeback Mountain is also a film about youth. The couple fall in love when they’re not yet twenty; precisely twenty years later Jack’s realization that his youth is fast slipping by and that his dream of an outdoors life with a male companion will not materialize precipitates the misencounter with Ennis in their last meeting. Since Jack’s life ends shortly thereafter, we don’t see him nor Ennis age, although his rough life and Jack’s death do age Ennis prematurely, as we see on screen.

Proulx could have displaced her story a few decades and have her protagonist meet, for instance, in their forties. Yet it is crucial for her purposes that passion overcomes the couple in their youth (they meet in 1963) and that Jack is killed in 1983, before the AIDS crisis erupted, forcing gay love and sex to face a completely different scenario. What I wish to stress for the purposes of my argumentation is that ageism conditions the way we perceive love stories, including no doubt Lee’s film. Also lookism, as actors Jake Gyllenhaal and Heath Ledger are handsome men, far more attractive, as you can see from the quotation, than the characters Proulx fabulated. The sexual passion that grips Jack and Ennis during their summer as shepherds on
Brokeback Mountain might certainly involve two nice-looking, fit men in their forties, yet there is no way that the famous sex scene, so often parodied, could have involved two older individuals, or two less attractive young ones. Ageism and lookism, rather than sexual orientation, then, set the limits within the representation of sex and romance operates in the mainstream.

Since they are young and handsome, audiences, whether queer or not, find no problem to accept Jack and Ennis’ romance (unless they are homophobic). Their homosexuality is, thus, made secondary to their age, personal attractive (and even good health). We do know there are old couples, gay or otherwise, yet fictional romance excludes them so far, with few exceptions.
In contrast to Proulx’ focus on youth and romance, American novelist Christopher Bram, a gay man himself, chose as his protagonist an old, terminally ill, gay man, imagining a story in which homophobia is much more effectively undermined. This old gay man is a fictionalized version of real-life British film director, James Whale, famous for his 1930s horror films *Frankenstein* and *Bride of Frankenstein*; a previous knowledge of Whale’s work and life is not, however, really required to enjoy Bram’s elegant novel and Condon’s atmospheric film adaptation.
Bram supposes that Whale, who committed suicide by drowning in the pool of his Los Angeles home in 1957, aged only 68, established during the last two weeks of his life a peculiar friendship with his (fictional) 26-year-old American gardener, Clayton Boone. Faced with immediate physical and psychological decay because of a series of minor strokes Whale decides to die. Yet, lacking the courage to commit suicide, he fantasizes that Boone, whom he assumes to be a violent and homophobic loser, can be pushed to murder him as if he were his own Frankenstein monster. Ironically, far from eliciting hatred, Whale’s conversations with the young man (with the excuse of a drawing the dying man cannot really sketch) end up eliciting Boone’s respect and admiration, thus putting an end to his homophobia.
Despite the important lesson Bram teaches us about terminal illness and death, all the traits foregrounded in the characterization of his protagonist make Condon’s film adaptation film less palatable for mainstream audiences. Why? Because he is old. This is paradoxical (or hypocritical) since Bram’s topic—how to keep one’s agency to the end in view of physical and mental decay—concerns all individuals, which is not the case with homophobia. LGTB audiences, on their side, prejudiced by lookism, may fail to see that Bram and Condon offer the portrait of an essentially happy, satisfied old gay man, very much a novelty at the time of the film’s release and still so today.
Also, of course, the film lacks romance. Although Clayton’s torso is much on display and Whale certainly admires his rugged, handsome looks, there is no carnal desire but, rather, a desire that the young man culminates the older man’s death wish. As Bronski puts it, “[t]he most basic reversal in the film” of the Death in Venice imitative plot, is that Whale’s interest in the young Clayton Boone “is more about Thanatos than Eros” (1999: 13).

In my view, the odd bonding between Whale and Boone reveals, just as Brokeback Mountain does, that manliness is not the prerogative of heterosexual men—though Bram’s novel offers a much more positive message. If being a ‘real man’ is about being in control of one’s own life, then, paradoxically, by deciding to commit suicide old James Whale appears to be a far more self-assured, manlier man than the much younger Ennis, who rejects a life with Jack for fear of rampant homophobia. Although Clayton ignores Whale’s terminal condition, he does make an effort to shed prejudice. He realizes that the ‘old homo’ is quite manly, from the way he smokes cigars, to, oddly for him, his experience as a combatant during the Great War—as Boone cannot initially conceive that a gay man can also be an effective soldier. When
he starts seeing the old man as a man rather than primarily as a homosexual, Boone starts feeling sympathy, paradoxically quite the opposite of what Whale seeks.

Unfortunately, Whale, overwhelmed by his wish to die, can only read Boone as a stereotyped violent American low-class loser. Since Clayton does not respond to his provocations—“I gather that killing is an American rite of passage. One’s not a real man until one’s killed another man”—he makes, in despair, the terrible mistake of assaulting him in a distressing, dismal scene. Horrified when the old man finally begs “I want you to kill me,” Clay, by then in tears, can only respond “I’m not your monster.” Only then does Whale find the courage to face death.

Finding courage to face the monsters

“The future is just old age and pain. Good-bye all and thank you for all your love. I must have peace and this is the only way.”

(James Whale’s real goodbye note)

What, then, is ultimately ‘wrong’ with Condon’s film? Bram offers in his novel a straightforward, unidealised portrait of Boone as a typical heterosexual American loser, a man possibly destined to remain a loser for life despite the profoundly emotional, eye-opening experience of meeting Whale. This portrait stresses the idea that as a man, gay Whale is far better adjusted than heterosexual Boone—indeed, Whale is the kind of successful self-made man which Boone will never be but that he wishes he were.
The wrong ending...

Whale’s death happens for Boone’s benefit, shocking him out of his loser status; the chance is thus missed to insist on the central theme of the old gay man’s personal choice.

Condon, regrettably, confuses this characterization by adding an epilogue showing Boone as a happy husband and father. Accepting that, somehow, he was Whale’s monster, Boone is last seen lurching in his alleyway—a moment suggested by actor Brendan Fraser. Condon’s silly ending unfortunately suggests that Whale’s death happens just for Boone’s benefit, shocking him in addition out of his loser status; the chance is thus missed to insist on the central theme of the old gay man’s personal choice and agency. Whale’s suicide is, I grant, not easy to sympathize with. Yet, his is the story of an individual who refuses to become a victim either in life or in death. *Brokeback Mountain*, in contrast, tells the story of two individuals who cannot fight their own victimization. We need to wonder, then, why we celebrate Jack Twist and Ennis del Mar. Bram’s and Condon’s James Whale, though old and no longer attractive, is a far better example of individual agency in the face of ageing and death, serene masculinity and satisfied homosexuality.

Sara Martín Alegre,
“Failing to Mainstream the Gay Man: Gods and Monsters”
Condon’s film perhaps appeared too early for it to be seen as a story about human dignity rather than a recycling of *Death in Venice*; also, possibly too early in Ian McKellen’s Hollywood career, though he was already 59. McKellen received an Oscar nomination for playing Whale and was soon after nominated for playing another old (gay?) man: Gandalf in *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* (2001). Apart from the (also ageing) villain Magneto of the *X-Men* film franchise, McKellen, as I have shown, has also recently played a member of an old queer couple together with Derek Jacobi in the provocative, indifferently received BBC camp comedy *Vicious* (2013-). Can, then, ageism, be moderated? Can McKellen, himself a well-known gay activist, lead a reversal in the representation of old gay men? Can the ageing ‘old queen’ be replaced with a more dignified representation? Perhaps. After all, the 7.5 IMDB rating that *Gods and Monsters* maintains more than fifteen years after its release shows that there is room for positive representations of old gay men.
Bram’s celebration of Whale’s balanced personality and even of his death is in deep contrast with Ennis’ sorrow when clutching Jack’s empty shirt. Why we find that shirt so moving is part of our hypocrisy: we prefer a terrible story about rampant homophobia to a story in which an ageing man satisfied with his life reminds us that we all need courage to face the end of our life—whether gay or not.
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