MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

From Margins to Method: Queer Theory as a Critical Paradigm for Analysing Societal Ideology

Abhimanyu Dev Singh Billawaria, Department of English, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara
Ajayshree Singh Sambyal, Department of History, Govt. Degree College, Kunjwani, Jammu, J&K
Vinay Kesar, Department of Management Studies, University of Jammu
Dr. Vijay Saigal, Associate Professor, Department of Law, University of Jammu
Dr. Afiya Tabassum Malik, Assistant Professor, Dogra Law College (Autonomous), Jammu, J&K
Corresponding author's email id:abillawaria@gmail.com, ajaysambyal21@gmail.com, vinaykesarmba@gmail.com, vijsag76@gmail.com , afiyatabassummalik@gmail.com

Abstract
Queer theory prominently emerged as a distinct field is derived from post-structuralism and largely from deconstruction. Queer theory would contradict traditional perspectives that social history has recognised as sick, deviant and crime. Starting in the 1970s, various authors brought deconstructionist critical approaches to think on issues of sexual identity, particularly heteronormativity and non-heteronormative sexuality. Fuss, in "The Politics of Inside/Out", opines that the concept of "coming out" and being visible has been normalized. The queer theory was also shaped by Anglo-American cultures in the HIV/AIDS activism during 1980s and contemporary feminism of early 1990s. The Queer theory is heavily influenced by the works and ideas of Lauren Berlant, Michael Warner, Leo Bersani, Judith Butler, Lee Edelman, Michel Fouccault, Jack Halberstam, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. This paper explores the evolution and widening of platform of the Queer theory as an independent discipline in sociological, historical, literary, cultural, and legal studies and how it is not theory of sexual minorities but as general social theory to analyse the society as whole. The paper further examines the jurisprudential turn in queer theory, particularly its application within Indian constitutional jurisprudence, where the judiciary has employed queer theoretical frameworks to articulate the rights of gender identity and equality, most notably in the *Navtej Singh Johar* and *NALSA* judegments.

Keywords: Sexuality, LGBT, homosexual, homosexuality, heterosexual, heterosexuality, sexual history, Queer, gays, lesbians, bisexuals, AIDS, drag culture, washroom, bathroom, urinary, identity, sexual minority, the Other, thirdness, third gender, feminine, masculinity, heteronormativity, jurisprudence, Section 377, NALSA, right to privacy, dignity

Introduction

The seed of evolution of the Queer theory; which has now turned into a vast academic arena; lies in 1969 Stonewall Riots when police raided New York Stonewall Tavern – a popular gay-meeting spot. As a result many LGBT organisations sought legal rights for equality and health for gays and lesbians. Many artists and Hollywood starts, like Andy Warhol, Rock Hudson, Jasper Jones, etc. declared their homo-sexuality publically to support the movement. Queer theory has now become an important discipline in Cultural Studies. It challenges the old and conventional concept of Queer as Deviant, 166 sick or criminal, while encouraging sexuality as identity as important part of critical analysis in cultural context. Now-a-days, Queer not only refers to gays or lesbians but it also includes trends, identities, bisexuality, sado-masochism, drags, transgenders, etc. The emergence of Queer Theory marks a decisive intellectual shift in the way sexuality, identity, and social norms are conceptualized within contemporary critical discourse. Far from being a narrowly defined framework concerned only with sexual minorities, queer theory operates as a radical epistemological intervention that questions the stability of identity categories, the naturalization of heteronormativity, and the socio-cultural mechanisms through which bodies and desires ar thee regulated. Rooted in post-structuralist thought and deeply influenced by deconstruction, queer theory destabilizes the binaries that have historically governed understandings of gender and sexuality, such as male/female, heterosexual/homosexual, and normal/deviant. (Mishra, S. (2024). The Fluidity of World Order and Break from Past: Opportunities and Challenges. Social Development Issues, 46(1), 45-68).The intellectual genealogy of queer theory can be traced back to the late twentieth century, particularly the 1980s and 1990s, when scholars began to challenge essentialist notions of identity. However, its socio-political roots lie earlier, most notably in the aftermath of the 1969 Stonewall Riots in New York City, a pivotal moment that catalyzed the modern LGBTQ+ rights movement. The Stonewall uprising was not merely a protest against police brutality but also a symbolic rupture in the dominant discourse that had long pathologized non-heteronormative identities. It marked the beginning of a collective resistance against institutionalized discrimination and gave rise to a new language of identity, visibility, and rights.In its early stages, discussions around sexuality were largely framed within medical, legal, and religious discourses that classified homosexuality as deviant, pathological, or criminal. Queer theory disrupts this legacy by interrogating the very categories through which such classifications are made. Drawing significantly on Michel Foucault's analysis of power and discourse, queer theorists argue that sexuality is not an innate or fixed attribute but rather a socially constructed phenomenon shaped by historical and institutional forces. Foucault's concept of the "discursive explosion" of sexuality reveals how modern societies have not suppressed discussions of sex but have instead produced an abundance of discourses that regulate and define it.Building upon this Foucauldian framework, queer theory further expands its critique by examining how identities are performatively constituted. Judith Butler's notion of gender performativity challenges the idea that gender is a stable or natural category, proposing instead that it is repeatedly enacted through social practices and cultural norms. This performative understanding of identity undermines the assumption of a coherent and unified self, revealing instead a fluid and contingent process of becoming. In this sense, queer theory does not simply seek to include marginalized identities within existing frameworks but aims to fundamentally reconfigure the frameworks themselves.Another crucial contribution to queer theory comes from Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, whose work highlights the epistemological instability of sexual categories. Sedgwick demonstrates that the binary opposition between heterosexuality and homosexuality is not only reductive but also deeply embedded in the cultural logic of modern Western societies. These categories, she argues, are marked by ambiguity, contradiction, and overlap, challenging the notion that sexual identities can be clearly defined or neatly separated. Such insights underscore the central premise of queer theory: that identities are not fixed entities but dynamic and contested sites of meaning.The term "queer" itself has undergone significant transformation, evolving from a derogatory label into a reclaimed identity and critical category. Its contemporary usage reflects a deliberate resistance to normative classifications and a refusal to be confined within rigid identity boundaries. Queer theory thus embraces ambiguity, multiplicity, and fluidity, positioning itself as an anti-normative framework that resists closure and categorization. It is this openness that allows queer theory to extend beyond the study of sexuality and engage with broader questions of power, knowledge, and social organization.Importantly, queer theory also intersects with other critical frameworks, including feminism, postcolonial theory, and critical race studies. These intersections enrich its analytical scope and enable a more nuanced understanding of how different axes of identity and oppression interact. For instance, the concept of intersectionality highlights how experiences of sexuality are shaped by factors such as race, class, gender, and geography, thereby challenging universalizing narratives within queer discourse. This intersectional approach is particularly significant in non-Western contexts, where local cultural, historical, and legal frameworks influence the articulation of queer identities in distinct ways.In recent years, queer theory has expanded its reach into diverse disciplines, including literature, sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, and even legal theory. It has provided scholars with innovative tools to analyze texts, practices, and institutions through a critical lens that foregrounds issues of normativity and marginalization. In literary studies, for example, queer theory enables the exploration of non-normative desires and identities within texts, revealing subversive narratives that challenge dominant

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

ideologies. Similarly, in sociological and cultural contexts, it offers insights into the ways in which everyday practices reinforce or resist normative structures. In legal studies, queer theory has emerged as a powerful tool for interrogating the role of law in constructing, regulating, and potentially emancipating sexual and gender identities. Despite its significant contributions, queer theory is not without its critiques. Some scholars argue that its emphasis on fluidity and anti-identitarianism may overlook the material realities and political struggles faced by marginalized communities. Others point to its predominantly Western origins and question its applicability in diverse cultural contexts. Nevertheless, these critiques have also contributed to the evolution of queer theory, prompting scholars to adopt more inclusive and context-sensitive approaches.In essence, queer theory represents not merely a theoretical framework but a critical mode of inquiry that challenges the very foundations of how society understands identity, desire, and normativity. It invites us to rethink established categories, question taken-for-granted assumptions, and imagine alternative ways of being and belonging. As this paper seeks to demonstrate, queer theory is not confined to the study of sexual minorities but functions as a broader social theory that interrogates the structures and processes through which all identities are constructed and regulated.

Theorizing the Queer

Since 1860s, the two twin-key-terms that have become the central to the discourse on sexuality are the connotations of Homosexuality Heterosexuality. According to Tony Purvis, these terms have a semantic legacy and a political usage- in the discourses and institutions like the church, military, and law. After World War II and particularly post 1960, heterosexuality and homosexuality have been examined through the usage of words like gays, lesbians, straight, bisexuals and there has been a ‘queering' of all these terms. Within Heteronormative frames of reference, the Homosexuals were identified in terms of pathology and sickness while lesbian and gay are acts of self-nomination and record a later history and different sets of relationships. With reference to Michel Fouccault and his The History of Sexuality (1976), Tony Purvis states that Foucault points out the error of seeing the past as either more or less repressed or more or less liberated than the present. He finds that Foucault's examination of the last three centuries indicates that in the field of sex and sexualities, one sees a 'discursive explosion' Church and state institutions incited a proliferation of discourses ensuring that every aspect of daily life was sexualized. Power in Foucaldian term is exercised in innumerable ways and is exercised through the machinery of production, in families, limited groups and institutions. So even analysis of 'a certain form of knowledge regarding sex, is not in terms of repression or law, but power. Foucault says – "More than the old taboos this form of power demanded constant, attentive and curious presences for its exercise; it presupposed proximities; it proceeded through examination and insistent observation; it required an exchange of discourses, through questions that exhorted admissions, and confidences that went beyond the questions that were asked." (Leitch 2018:1437). Foucault's study of sexuality during three centuries highlighted how through these institutions a new harassment of marginal sexualities began which in 167 Foucaldian terms entailed an incorporation of perversions and a new specification of individual. Tony Purvis points that how a subject thinks and writes about sex and sexuality and how they try to relate to the material and cultural dimensions of sex has undergone alteration. He quotes- "If the sexed subject of early 20th century, sexology and medicine was figured as either heterosexual or homosexual, as normal or as aberrant, as healthy or as pathological, in the last twenty years such 'queer’ deviations and perversions have been deployed to contest sex-gender norms, celebrate sexual differences, and dislodge a heteronormative framework that assumes that perversions and inversions were illnesses which only heterosexual subjects experienced."(Waugh 2010:429) In 'The Epistemology of the Closet', Eve Sedgwick, demonstrates show the oppressive and marginalised binary sexual system emerged in the context of definitional ambiguity and ambivalence. She challenges that the binary framework and categorizations of homosexuality and heterosexuality have been powerful in shaping the culture and the subjectivity. According to her, sexualities have never been clearly defined, marked as they are by haziness, indistinctness and conflict. Speaking of gays, she states - "Even at an individual level, there are remarkably few of even the most openly gay people who are not deliberately in the closet with someone personally or economically or institutionally important to them. Furthermore, the deadly elasticity of heterosexist presumption means that like Wendy in Peter Pan, people find new walls springing up around them even as they drowse." (Gilbert 2007: 684). Judith Butler in her 'Gender Trouble' questions the 'heterosexual matrix’ that ‘grid of cultural intelligibility through which bodies, genders and desires are naturalized.'(Waugh 2010:430). Purvis finds how Butler raises a number of question – "Can we refer to a 'given’ sex or 'given' gender without first inquiring into how sex and /or gender is given...? And what is ‘sex’ anyway? Is it natural, anatomical, chromosomal, or hormonal? Does sex have a history? Does each sex have a different history, or histories?” (Waugh 2010: 430). 168 She proposes that, "The sex/gender distinction and the category of sex itself appears to pre-suppose a generalization of 'the body’ that pre-exists the acquisition of its sexed significance. This body often appears to be a passive medium that is signified by an inscription from a cultural source figured as 'external' to that body. Any theory of the culturally constructed body, however, ought to question – 'the body as a construct of suspect generality when it is figured as passive and prior to discourse."(Leitch 2018: 2378). Power works persistently through gendered roles. Boys learn not to cry or weep; girls are told that the certain behaviours can make her a tomboy. Butler believes identity is a trap, a hardening into rigid, binarized categories of much more heterogeneous possibilities. Butler believes that the price of identity's straitjacket are high. The Deviants those with non-heterosexual desires like, bisexuals, homosexuals, hermaphrodites, so labelled pay an exorbitant price in the form of internalized sense of guilt and external sanctions. But these nonheterosexual desires and acts cannot be erased. Therefore, Butler encourages for a loosening of the categories, a new perspective of our fixation on identity. She calls for actions that will ‘resignify’ our received interpretations and meanings-actions that will lead to a 'proliferation' of the 'constitutive categories' into which all selves are now constrained to fit. Heterosexuality can be enforced only through the renunciation of all non-heterosexual desires and is expressed through homophobia and which Kristeva calls discourses of 'abjection. Kristeva’s 'The Powers of Horror', designates the 'abject' as that which has been expelled from the body, discharged as excrement, literally rendered the ‘Other'. Iris Young apt Kristeva to show how the operation of repulsion consolidates 'identities' based on the instituting of the 'Other' or a set of ‘Others’ through domination and exclusion. The disciplinary production of gender effects a false stabilization of gender in the interest of the heterosexual construction and regulation of sexuality within the reproductive domain. It hides the gender discontinuities that runs raging within heterosexual, bisexual, gay and lesbian contexts in which gender does not mandatorily follow from sex and desire or sexuality. So Esther Newton challenges the fabricated gender identity through the example of the drag. Drag is a double inversion of gendered identity. The Drag says, - “My outside appearance is feminine but my essence inside (the body) is masculine”. At 169 the same time it symbolizes the opposite inversion: “My appearance outside' (my body, my gender) is masculine but my essence 'inside' (myself) is feminine”. Both claims to truth contradict each other and so displace the entire enactment of gender significations from the discourse of truth and falsity. Michael Warner coined the term "heteronormativity” in the early 1990's which describes both certain sex acts and 'many practices that are not sex’, such as family, romance, citizenship, national character and says that as part of the hegemonic order it projects a 'monoculture' that dominates all alternative sexual cultures or groups, is determinative of one's social life and isolates and demonizes the 'others'. Warner says – "A complex cluster of sexual practices gets confused, in heterosexual culture, with the love plot of intimacy and familialism that signifies belonging to society in a deep and normal way. Community is imagined through scenes of intimacy, coupling, and kinship. And a historical relation to futurity is restricted to generational narrative and reproduction. A whole field of social relations becomes intelligible as heterosexuality, and this privatized sexual culture bestows on its sexual practices a tacit sense of rightness and normalcy. This sense of rightnessembedded in things and not just in sex- is what we call heteronormativity." (Leitch 2018: 2457-58). In ‘Sex in Public’, Warner and Lauren Berlant emphasize the way in which many cities cultivate

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

counter public spaces for non-normative cultures. Since ‘queer culture' has almost no institutionalizes matrix for its counter intimacies, they stress, we need to have their zones as well. Judith Jack Halberstam in 'Female Masculinity’ draws attention to what she addresses as ‘The Bathroom problem'. She opines that feminist theorizing has removed the notion that anatomy is destiny. But we still suppose that people who are not male are female and vice-versa. Why do we not have multiple gender options, multiple gender categories, and real-life non-male and non-female options for embodiment and identification? Halberstam says – "Ambiguous gender, when and where it does appear, is inevitably transformed into deviance, thirdness or a blurred version of either male or female." (Leitch 2018: 2542). 170 Hence, the bathroom problem occurs in cases of masculine females and invariably security is called in. Having one's gender challenged in a woman's restroom is frequent. In bathroom confrontations, the gender ambiguous person first appears as not-woman, but then the person appears actually even more scary, not-man. (spoken in a voice not -male). Not-man and notwoman, the gender ambiguous bathroom user becomes gender deviant. Jacques Lacan uses the term ‘urinary segregation' for such a situation. The terms ‘Ladies' and ‘Gentlemen', Lacan says, describes the relations between identities and signifiers; naming confers rather than reflects the meaning. Mariorie Garber in 'Vested Interests' says on the perils of cross-dressing. And says that the restroom is a 'potential Waterloo' for both female-to-male (FTM) and Male-to-female (MTF) cross dressers and transsexuals. Thus, consequently cultural binarism leads to cultural paranoia of being in the wrong place. We need to create a third space within which all binaries become unstable and deconstruct the signifier inherent therein. Counternormative and counter-hegemonic discourses have encouraged to give the third gender their legitimate space. As Halberstam argues, it is important to ponder about gender variations such as male femininity and female masculinity not simply to create another binary, but as alternative models of gender variations where female masculinity is not simply the opposite of female femininity, nor is it a female version of male masculinity.

The theorization of the “queer” emerges from a critical dissatisfaction with fixed identity categories and the normative frameworks that sustain them. Rather than functioning as a stable descriptor of sexual identity, the term “queer” operates as a disruptive analytical tool that resists closure, coherence, and categorization. It challenges the epistemological foundations upon which identities such as “heterosexual” and “homosexual” have been historically constructed, revealing them not as natural or universal truths but as contingent products of specific discursive, institutional, and historical processes.The conceptual roots of this disruption can be traced to the nineteenth century, when the categories of “homosexuality” and “heterosexuality” began to crystallize within medical, legal, and religious discourses. As scholars such as Jeffrey Weeks and Jonathan Katz have demonstrated, these terms did not simply describe pre-existing realities but actively produced new ways of understanding and organizing human sexuality. The emergence of these categories marked a shift from viewing sexual acts as behaviors to interpreting them as indicators of identity. In this transformation, individuals came to be defined by their desires, and sexuality became a central axis of subject formation.

Michel Foucault’s seminal work on the history of sexuality provides a crucial theoretical foundation for understanding this shift. Foucault challenges the “repressive hypothesis,” which suggests that modern societies have suppressed sexuality, and instead argues that the modern era has witnessed an unprecedented proliferation of discourses on sex. Through institutions such as medicine, psychiatry, law, and education, sexuality has been subjected to continuous scrutiny, classification, and regulation. Power, in Foucauldian terms, does not merely prohibit but produces; it generates categories, identities, and forms of knowledge that shape how individuals understand themselves and others. Thus, the figure of the “homosexual” emerges not simply as a person who engages in certain acts but as a distinct type of subject, constituted through discourse.Building upon this Foucauldian insight, queer theory interrogates the ways in which these categories are sustained and naturalized within cultural and social frameworks. Tony Purvis, for instance, highlights how the binary opposition between heterosexuality and homosexuality has been embedded within institutional practices and ideological systems, reinforcing a hierarchical structure in which heterosexuality is positioned as normative and desirable, while homosexuality is relegated to the margins as deviant or pathological. This binary logic, however, is inherently unstable, as it depends on the very differences it seeks to suppress.

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s work further exposes the fragility of these binary constructions. In *Epistemology of the Closet*, Sedgwick argues that modern Western culture is structured by a pervasive and contradictory set of assumptions about sexuality, particularly the distinction between heterosexuality and homosexuality. She demonstrates that this binary is not only reductive but also riddled with inconsistencies, ambiguities, and overlaps. The “closet,” as Sedgwick conceptualizes it, is not merely a private space of concealment but a fundamental structure of knowledge that shapes social relations, language, and identity. Even in contexts where homosexuality is openly acknowledged, the logic of the closet persists, producing new forms of visibility and invisibility, disclosure and secrecy.

If Sedgwick reveals the epistemological instability of sexual categories, Judith Butler extends this critique by questioning the ontological status of gender itself. In *Gender Trouble*, Butler introduces the concept of the “heterosexual matrix,” a regulatory framework that aligns biological sex, gender identity, and sexual desire into a coherent and intelligible system. Within this matrix, bodies are expected to conform to culturally sanctioned norms, and deviations from these norms are rendered unintelligible or abject. Butler’s theory of performativity challenges the notion that gender is an inherent or pre-discursive reality. Instead, gender is understood as a repeated performance, constituted through stylized acts, gestures, and behaviors that create the illusion of a stable identity.This performative understanding of gender has profound implications for queer theory. It suggests that identities are not fixed essences but ongoing processes, open to variation, subversion, and transformation. The possibility of “resignification,” as Butler proposes, allows for the reworking of dominant meanings and the creation of new forms of identity that resist normative constraints. In this sense, queer theory is not merely descriptive but actively political, seeking to disrupt the mechanisms through which power operates and to imagine alternative modes of being.The notion of “abjection,” developed by Julia Kristeva, further deepens this analysis by examining how identities are constituted through processes of exclusion. The “abject” refers to that which is expelled or cast out in order to maintain the boundaries of the self. In the context of sexuality, non-heteronormative desires and identities are often positioned as abject, serving as the constitutive “Other” against which normative identities are defined. Iris Marion Young builds on this idea to show how social groups consolidate their identities through the exclusion and marginalization of others, reinforcing systems of domination and inequality.

Queer theory also engages with the concept of heteronormativity, a term popularized by Michael Warner to describe the pervasive assumption that heterosexuality is the default or normal mode of sexual expression. Heteronormativity extends beyond individual sexual practices to encompass a wide range of social institutions and cultural practices, including family structures, legal systems, and narratives of citizenship. It shapes not only how individuals relate to one another but also how they are recognized and valued within society. Warner’s analysis reveals how heteronormativity operates as a “monoculture,” marginalizing alternative forms of intimacy and community.

In collaboration with Lauren Berlant, Warner further explores the notion of “publics” and “counterpublics,” highlighting how queer communities create alternative spaces of belonging that challenge dominant norms. These counterpublics are not merely physical spaces but also discursive formations that enable new ways of imagining intimacy, kinship, and social relations. In the absence of institutional recognition, queer cultures often rely on such spaces to sustain themselves, fostering forms of connection that exist outside the boundaries of normative frameworks.

Judith Halberstam’s work on gender variance introduces another critical dimension to queer theory by challenging the binary understanding of gender. In *Female Masculinity*, Halberstam examines forms of masculinity that are not tied to male bodies, thereby destabilizing the association between gender and biological sex. The “bathroom problem,” as Halberstam articulates it, serves as a powerful example of how rigid gender norms are enforced in everyday life. Public restrooms, divided into “male” and “female,” become sites of surveillance and regulation, where

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

individuals who do not conform to normative gender presentations are subjected to scrutiny and exclusion. This seemingly mundane space thus reveals the broader mechanisms through which gender is policed and controlled.

The performative and unstable nature of gender is further illustrated through practices such as drag, which expose the constructedness of gender identities. As Esther Newton and others have shown, drag performances do not simply imitate gender but parody and exaggerate it, revealing its artificiality. By embodying multiple and contradictory gendered identities, drag disrupts the assumption that gender is a natural or coherent essence, instead presenting it as a theatrical and contingent performance.At its core, queer theory resists the impulse to define or stabilize identity. It embraces ambiguity, multiplicity, and contradiction, positioning itself as an anti-identitarian framework that challenges the very notion of fixed categories. This resistance is not a rejection of identity per se but a critique of the ways in which identities are imposed, regulated, and constrained within normative systems. By questioning the boundaries of identity, queer theory opens up new possibilities for understanding the self and its relation to society.Furthermore, queer theory extends beyond the analysis of sexuality to interrogate broader social structures and forms of knowledge. It examines how power operates through language, institutions, and cultural practices to produce and regulate identities. In doing so, it aligns with other critical frameworks, such as post-structuralism and deconstruction, which seek to uncover the instability and contingency of meaning. Queer theory thus functions not only as a critique of heteronormativity but also as a broader analytical lens through which to examine the organization of social life.In conclusion, the theorization of the queer represents a fundamental challenge to the ways in which identity, desire, and normativity have been traditionally understood. By destabilizing binary categories, interrogating the operations of power, and embracing fluidity and multiplicity, queer theory redefines the terrain of critical inquiry. It transforms the study of sexuality from a marginal concern into a central site of theoretical and political engagement, offering new ways of thinking about the self, society, and the possibilities of resistance.

Indian Context

While queer theory originated within Euro-American intellectual traditions, its expansion into non-Western contexts has generated new forms of inquiry that challenge its initial assumptions and broaden its analytical scope. In India, the application of queer theory necessitates a careful negotiation between indigenous histories of gender and sexuality and the legacy of colonial legal and epistemic frameworks. The Indian context does not merely “apply” queer theory; rather, it reshapes and rearticulates it, producing what may be understood as a localized and culturally embedded queer discourse.Pre-colonial Indian society presents a complex and often paradoxical landscape of sexual and gender diversity. Contrary to the rigid binaries institutionalized in modern discourse, historical and mythological narratives in India reveal a more fluid understanding of gender and sexuality. Texts such as the *Kama Sutra*, temple iconography, and various Puranic stories depict same-sex desire, gender transformation, and non-binary identities without necessarily categorizing them as deviant. Figures such as Shikhandi in the *Mahabharata* or the Ardhanarishvara form of Shiva embody a conceptualization of gender that transcends binary distinctions. These representations suggest that non-normative identities were not entirely absent or unthinkable within the Indian cultural imagination.

However, this relative fluidity was significantly altered during the colonial period, particularly with the imposition of Victorian moral codes and legal structures. The most notable example is Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, introduced by the British in 1861, which criminalized “carnal intercourse against the order of nature.” This law not only penalized same-sex relations but also reinforced a rigid heteronormative framework that redefined indigenous sexual practices as deviant and criminal. From a Foucauldian perspective, Section 377 can be understood as a mechanism of power that produced and regulated sexual identities through legal discourse, effectively reshaping the social understanding of sexuality in India.The postcolonial trajectory of queer politics in India reflects a gradual but significant shift from invisibility and marginalization to assertion and recognition. Activism around the decriminalization of Section 377 brought together legal, social, and academic interventions that challenged the legitimacy of colonial morality. The landmark 2018 Supreme Court judgment in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018)* marked a historic moment in this struggle, as it decriminalized consensual same-sex relations and affirmed the constitutional rights of LGBTQ+ individuals. The judgment drew upon principles of dignity, privacy, and equality, and in doing so, it echoed many of the core concerns of queer theory, particularly the critique of normative frameworks that regulate bodies and desires.

Earlier In *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India (2014)*, the Supreme Court of India delivered a path-breaking judgment recognizing the rights of transgender persons and affirming the constitutional imperative of non-discrimination on the basis of gender identity. The Court explicitly rejected the binary understanding of gender that had historically structured Indian law and society, holding that "gender identity is an integral part of personality and one's self-identity."

The NALSA judgment drew extensively upon queer theoretical concepts, particularly the critique of gender binarism and the recognition of gender as performative and socially constructed. The Court acknowledged that "sex and gender are not synonymous" and that "gender is a social construct." Citing the work of queer theorists, the Court recognized that gender identity is not determined by biological sex but is a matter of self-identification:"Gender identity refers to each person's deeply felt internal and individual experience of gender, which may or may not correspond with the sex assigned at birth. It is a fundamental aspect of human dignity and autonomy."

Yet, the Indian context complicates the theoretical assumptions of queer discourse in significant ways. Unlike the Western emphasis on identity politics, where categories such as “gay,” “lesbian,” and “bisexual” serve as primary modes of self-identification, Indian sexualities often operate through more fluid and situational identities. Terms such as *kothi*, *panthi*, and *hijra* reflect culturally specific configurations of gender and sexuality that do not map neatly onto Western categories. Gayatri Reddy’s ethnographic work on hijra communities, for instance, reveals a complex social structure that combines ritual, kinship, and identity in ways that challenge conventional understandings of gender.

The hijra community, recognized as a “third gender” in India, occupies a unique position within both social and theoretical discourse. On one hand, hijras have historically been marginalized, subjected to stigma, exclusion, and economic precarity. On the other hand, they have also been accorded a certain ritual significance, particularly in ceremonies related to birth and marriage. This duality complicates the binary logic of inclusion and exclusion, suggesting that marginality in the Indian context operates through layered and sometimes contradictory forms of recognition. From a queer theoretical perspective, the hijra identity destabilizes the alignment between biological sex, gender identity, and social role, thereby exemplifying the performative and constructed nature of identity.

Another significant dimension of queer theory in India is its intersection with caste, class, religion, and regional differences. Intersectionality, as articulated by scholars such as Kimberlé Crenshaw, becomes particularly relevant in understanding how multiple axes of identity shape the experiences of queer individuals in India. For instance, a queer person from a lower caste or economically disadvantaged background may face compounded forms of marginalization that differ significantly from those experienced by urban, upper-class individuals. Similarly, religious and cultural norms play a crucial role in shaping attitudes toward sexuality, often reinforcing conservative values that resist non-normative identities.

In the realm of cultural representation, Indian cinema and literature have played a crucial role in shaping public perceptions of queer identities. Early representations in Bollywood often relied on stereotypes, portraying queer characters as comic relief or moral deviants. However, contemporary films such as *Aligarh*, *Kapoor & Sons*, and *Shubh Mangal Zyada Saavdhan* signal a shift toward more nuanced and empathetic portrayals. These narratives not only humanize queer experiences but also challenge dominant heteronormative frameworks by foregrounding themes of love, identity, and acceptance.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

Literary works, too, have contributed to the articulation of queer identities in India. Writers such as Ismat Chughtai, Vikram Seth, and Ruth Vanita have explored themes of same-sex desire and gender non-conformity, often pushing the boundaries of social acceptability. These texts serve as important sites for queer reading practices, enabling scholars to uncover subversive meanings and alternative narratives that challenge dominant ideologies.Urban spaces in India have also become significant sites for the expression and negotiation of queer identities. Pride parades in cities such as Delhi, Mumbai, and Bangalore represent not only acts of visibility but also forms of resistance against normative structures. These events create temporary "counterpublics," in the sense described by Warner and Berlant, where alternative forms of community and belonging can be imagined and enacted. At the same time, the visibility afforded by such spaces also raises questions about accessibility and representation, as rural and marginalized voices often remain underrepresented within mainstream queer discourse.

Digital platforms have further transformed the landscape of queer expression in India, providing new avenues for visibility, activism, and community-building. Social media, online forums, and dating applications have enabled individuals to connect across geographical and social boundaries, creating virtual spaces that challenge traditional forms of surveillance and control. These digital spaces, however, are not free from power dynamics, as issues of privacy, commodification, and exclusion continue to shape online interactions.

Despite these advancements, significant challenges remain. Social stigma, familial pressure, and lack of legal protections in areas such as marriage, adoption, and employment continue to affect the lives of queer individuals in India. Violence and discrimination, particularly against transgender and non-binary individuals, highlight the gap between legal recognition and social acceptance. These realities underscore the importance of grounding queer theory in material and lived experiences, ensuring that it remains responsive to the socio-political conditions within which identities are formed and contested.In conclusion, the Indian context offers a rich and complex terrain for the rethinking of queer theory. It challenges the universality of Western frameworks and emphasizes the need for culturally specific analyses that account for historical, social, and political differences. By engaging with indigenous identities, colonial legacies, and contemporary struggles, queer theory in India evolves into a more inclusive and dynamic field of inquiry. It not only interrogates the structures of normativity but also opens up new possibilities for understanding identity, community, and resistance in a rapidly changing society.

Criticism and limitations of Queer Theory

While queer theory has emerged as a powerful and transformative framework for analyzing sexuality, identity, and social structures, it is not without its limitations and critiques. Its very strength—its resistance to fixed meanings and categories—has also been identified as a potential weakness, particularly when examined in relation to material realities, political struggles, and non-Western contexts. A critical engagement with these limitations is essential not only to refine queer theory but also to ensure its continued relevance and applicability across diverse socio-cultural landscapes.One of the most prominent criticisms of queer theory is its **over-reliance on abstraction and theoretical complexity**. Rooted in post-structuralist philosophy, queer theory often employs dense and highly specialized language that can render it inaccessible to those outside academic circles. Scholars such as Steven Seidman have pointed out that this excessive theorization risks alienating the very communities whose experiences queer theory seeks to represent. The focus on discourse, performativity, and deconstruction, while intellectually rigorous, may obscure the lived realities of queer individuals who face concrete issues such as discrimination, violence, and economic marginalization. In this sense, queer theory can sometimes appear detached from activism, operating more as an intellectual exercise than a tool for social change.

Closely related to this concern is the critique that queer theory tends to **undermine identity-based politics**. By rejecting stable identity categories such as "gay," "lesbian," or "transgender," queer theory challenges the foundations upon which many political movements have been built. Identity politics has historically played a crucial role in mobilizing marginalized communities, enabling them to demand rights, recognition, and representation. However, queer theory's anti-identitarian stance complicates this process by suggesting that identities are fluid, contingent, and ultimately unstable. Critics argue that this position may weaken collective political action, as it becomes difficult to organize around identities that are constantly being deconstructed.Another significant limitation of queer theory lies in its **Western-centric origins and assumptions**. Much of the foundational work in queer theory has been produced within Euro-American contexts, reflecting specific historical, cultural, and political conditions. As a result, the framework often assumes a universality that does not necessarily translate across different societies. In non-Western contexts such as India, Africa, or the Middle East, sexual and gender identities are shaped by distinct cultural traditions, religious beliefs, and social structures. Categories like "gay" or "lesbian" may not adequately capture local experiences, leading to a mismatch between theory and reality. Scholars such as Gayatri Gopinath and Joseph Massad have highlighted how the global circulation of queer discourse can sometimes impose Western identity models onto non-Western societies, thereby reproducing forms of cultural imperialism.

Furthermore, queer theory has been critiqued for its **insufficient engagement with intersectionality** in its early formulations. While later developments have incorporated intersectional perspectives, early queer theory often prioritized sexuality as the primary axis of analysis, overlooking how it intersects with other dimensions such as race, class, caste, gender, and disability. Kimberlé Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality underscores the importance of understanding how multiple forms of oppression operate simultaneously, shaping the experiences of individuals in complex ways. In the Indian context, for example, the experiences of a queer individual from a marginalized caste or rural background cannot be fully understood through the lens of sexuality alone. The failure to adequately address these intersections can result in an incomplete and potentially exclusionary analysis. Another area of critique concerns queer theory's **ambivalent relationship with materiality and embodiment**. While the emphasis on performativity and discourse has been instrumental in challenging essentialist notions of identity, it has also led to accusations that queer theory neglects the material conditions of the body. Critics argue that by focusing on how identities are constructed through language and performance, queer theory may overlook the physical, biological, and affective dimensions of human experience. Issues such as health disparities, access to healthcare, and bodily autonomy require an engagement with material realities that cannot be fully addressed through discursive analysis alone.The concept of **anti-normativity**, central to queer theory, has also been subject to critique. While the rejection of normative structures is intended to challenge systems of power and exclusion, it can sometimes lead to a wholesale dismissal of all forms of normativity, including those that may be necessary for social organization and collective life. For instance, institutions such as family, community, and even legal frameworks, while often implicated in the regulation of sexuality, also provide support, stability, and recognition. Critics argue that an uncritical rejection of these structures may limit the ability of queer theory to engage with reformist or pragmatic approaches that seek to transform rather than dismantle existing systems.

In addition, queer theory has been criticized for its **limited engagement with legal and policy frameworks**. While it offers a powerful critique of normative structures, it does not always provide clear strategies for achieving legal and institutional change. Activist movements, particularly in countries like India, have relied on legal interventions to secure rights such as decriminalization, anti-discrimination protections, and recognition of gender identity. The abstract nature of queer theory can make it difficult to translate its insights into concrete policy recommendations, thereby limiting its practical impact.

The rise of what Lisa Duggan terms **"homonormativity"** presents another challenge to queer theory. Homonormativity refers to the assimilation of certain queer identities into mainstream society, often through the adoption of heteronormative values such as monogamy, domesticity, and consumerism. While this process has led to increased visibility and acceptance for some segments of the LGBTQ+ community, it has also created new forms of exclusion, privileging those who conform to normative standards while marginalizing others. Queer theory must grapple with this

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

tension between assimilation and resistance, ensuring that its critique of normativity does not inadvertently reinforce new hierarchies within queer communities. Moreover, the increasing institutionalization of queer studies within academia has raised concerns about the **domestication of its radical potential**. As queer theory becomes part of mainstream academic curricula, there is a risk that it may lose its critical edge and become another established discipline. This institutionalization can lead to a focus on theoretical production at the expense of political engagement, reducing queer theory to a set of concepts rather than a transformative practice.

Despite these critiques, it is important to recognize that queer theory is not a static or monolithic framework. It is inherently self-reflexive and open to revision, constantly evolving in response to new challenges and perspectives. The incorporation of intersectionality, the engagement with non-Western contexts, and the dialogue with activism and policy are all indicative of its ongoing transformation. Rather than viewing these limitations as failures, they can be understood as opportunities for growth, prompting scholars to refine and expand the scope of queer inquiry.

In conclusion, the criticisms of queer theory highlight the complexities and tensions inherent in any critical framework that seeks to challenge deeply entrenched systems of power and knowledge. By addressing issues of accessibility, intersectionality, cultural specificity, and materiality, queer theory can continue to evolve as a dynamic and inclusive field of study. Its strength lies not in providing definitive answers but in its ability to question, disrupt, and reimagine the categories through which we understand ourselves and the world around us.

Conclusion& Future Directions of Queer Theory

The Queer theory represents the critical moment in the history of European and American sexuality in which the sexual deviants and sexual minorities who were claimed to be sick or criminal were given identity. The theory allowed huge inter-disciplinary mobility by allowing theoretical concepts in studies of written and spoken words, the environment, materials and various products of culture. Thus the Queer theory is not about the LGBT representation in literature only but all kinds of sexual behaviour to sexual identities and all categories of normative and deviant sexualities. The Queer theory articulates that it should not merely be the homosexuality study of sexual minorities but – "the making of gays/lesbians/subjects- but a study of those knowledge and social practices which organise 'society' as a whole by sexualising – the bodies, desires, acts, identities, social relations, knowledge, culture and social institutions Queer theory inspires to transforms homosexual theories into a general social theory at one standpoint from which to analyse whole society" (Seidman 1994:174)

Queer theory, as this paper has demonstrated, represents far more than a specialized field concerned with non-heteronormative identities; it constitutes a profound reorientation of how identity, desire, and social organization are understood. Emerging from the intersections of post-structuralism, feminist critique, and socio-political activism, queer theory destabilizes the foundational binaries that have historically governed human thought and social practice. It exposes the constructed nature of categories such as gender and sexuality, revealing them not as fixed or natural, but as contingent, performative, and deeply embedded within structures of power.

At its core, queer theory invites a rethinking of normativity itself. By interrogating the assumptions that underpin what is considered "normal," it opens up space for alternative ways of being and belonging. The critique of heteronormativity, one of its central contributions, extends beyond sexuality to encompass a wide range of social institutions and cultural practices. Family structures, legal systems, and narratives of citizenship are all revealed to be shaped by normative assumptions that privilege certain identities while marginalizing others. In challenging these assumptions, queer theory does not merely advocate for inclusion within existing frameworks but seeks to transform the frameworks themselves.

The interdisciplinary reach of queer theory further underscores its significance. In literary studies, it enables the recovery of suppressed narratives and the re-reading of texts through a lens that foregrounds ambiguity, desire, and subversion. In sociology and cultural studies, it provides tools to analyze how everyday practices reproduce or resist normative structures. In legal and political contexts, it informs debates around rights, recognition, and justice. This versatility positions queer theory as a dynamic and evolving field, capable of engaging with a wide array of questions across disciplines.However, as discussed in the preceding section, queer theory must also contend with its own limitations. Its tendency toward abstraction, its complex theoretical language, and its Western-centric origins present challenges that cannot be overlooked. The tension between anti-identitarian critique and identity-based political mobilization remains a central concern, particularly in contexts where legal and social recognition depend upon clearly articulated identities. Similarly, the need to engage more deeply with material realities and intersectional experiences highlights the importance of grounding theory in lived experience.

In this regard, the expansion of queer theory into non-Western contexts, such as India, represents a crucial development. The Indian context not only enriches queer theory but also challenges its assumptions, emphasizing the need for culturally specific analyses that account for historical, social, and political differences. Indigenous categories of gender and sexuality, colonial legacies, and contemporary struggles all contribute to a more nuanced understanding of queerness. This localization of queer theory demonstrates its adaptability and its potential to function as a truly global framework, rather than a universalizing discourse rooted in Western experience.

Looking toward the future, queer theory is poised to engage with a number of emerging areas that will further expand its scope and relevance. One such area is the study of **digital queer spaces**, where online platforms are reshaping the ways in which identities are expressed, communities are formed, and activism is organized. Social media, virtual networks, and digital cultures provide new opportunities for visibility and connection, while also raising questions about surveillance, commodification, and the politics of representation. The digital realm thus becomes a new frontier for queer inquiry, requiring theoretical tools that can account for its complexities.

Another important direction is the intersection of queer theory with **environmental and ecological studies**, often referred to as "queer ecology." This emerging field examines how normative assumptions about nature and reproduction intersect with ideas about sexuality and gender. By challenging the notion of "natural" order, queer ecology extends the critique of normativity beyond human society, opening up new ways of thinking about relationships between humans, non-human entities, and the environment.

The growing emphasis on **trans and non-binary studies** also marks a significant evolution within queer theory. While early queer theory laid the groundwork for challenging gender binaries, contemporary scholarship is increasingly attentive to the specific experiences and struggles of transgender and non-binary individuals. This shift reflects a broader movement toward inclusivity and specificity, ensuring that queer theory remains responsive to the diverse realities of those it seeks to represent.

Furthermore, the engagement of queer theory with **law, policy, and human rights** is likely to deepen in the coming years. As legal recognition of LGBTQ+ rights continues to evolve globally, queer theory can play a critical role in shaping the discourse around justice, equality, and citizenship. By providing a framework for understanding how laws both reflect and produce social norms, it can inform more inclusive and equitable policy-making.At the same time, queer theory must remain vigilant against the risks of institutionalization and commodification. As it becomes increasingly integrated into academic and cultural institutions, there is a danger that its radical potential may be diluted. The challenge, therefore, lies in maintaining its critical edge while engaging constructively with mainstream discourse. This requires a continuous process of self-reflection, adaptation, and dialogue with other fields and perspectives.

In conclusion, queer theory stands as one of the most significant intellectual developments of contemporary critical thought. Its strength lies in its ability to question, disrupt, and reimagine the categories through which we understand identity and society. By embracing fluidity, multiplicity, and contradiction, it opens up new possibilities for thinking about the self and its relation to the world. As it continues to evolve, queer theory holds the potential not only to transform academic discourse but also to contribute to the creation of more inclusive, just, and equitable societies.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 3642-3648

References

1. Ahmed S. *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2006.
2. Ahmed S. *Living a feminist life*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2017.
3. Berlant L, Warner M. Sex in public. *Crit Inq.* 1998;24(2):547–566.
4. Bose B, Bhattacharyya S. *The phobic and the erotic: The politics of sexualities in contemporary India*. Kolkata: Seagull Books; 2007.
5. Brown G. Urban (homo)sexualities: Ordinary cities and ordinary sexualities. *Geogr Compass.* 2008;2(4):1215–1231.
6. Butler J. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge; 1990.
7. Butler J. *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York: Routledge; 1993.
8. Crenshaw K. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Rev.* 1991;43(6):1241–1299.
9. Doty A. *Making things perfectly queer: Interpreting mass culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; 1993.
10. Duggan L. The new homonormativity. In: Castronovo R, Nelson D, editors. *Materializing democracy*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2002. p. 175–194.
11. Edelman L. *No future: Queer theory and the death drive*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2004.
12. Eng DL. *The feeling of kinship: Queer liberalism and the racialization of intimacy*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2010.
13. Foucault M. *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1, An introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1978.
14. Fuss D. *Inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories*. New York: Routledge; 1991.
15. Gilbert SM, Gubar S, editors. *Feminist literary theory and criticism: A Norton reader*. New York: W.W. Norton; 2007.
16. Gopinath G. *Impossible desires: Queer diasporas and South Asian public cultures*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2005.
17. Gupta A. Section 377 and the dignity of Indian homosexuals. *Econ Polit Wkly.* 2006;41(46):4815–4823.
18. Halberstam J. *Female masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press; 1998.
19. Halberstam J. *The queer art of failure*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2011.
20. Hooks b. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge; 1994.
21. India. (1950). *The Constitution of India.*
22. Jagose A. *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press; 1996.
23. Katz JN. *The invention of heterosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1995.
24. Leitch VB, editor. *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism*. 3rd ed. New York: W.W. Norton; 2018.
25. Love H. *Feeling backward: Loss and the politics of queer history*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2007.
26. Misra G. Decriminalising homosexuality in India. *IDS Bull.* 2009;40(1):20–28.
27. Mortimer-Sandilands C, Erickson B, editors. *Queer ecologies: Sex, nature, politics, desire*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press; 2010.
28. Muñoz JE. *Disidentifications: Queers of color and the performance of politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; 1999.
29. Muñoz JE. *Cruising utopia: The then and there of queer futurity*. New York: New York University Press; 2009.
30. *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India,* (2014) 5 SCC 438.
31. Narrain A. *The right that dares to speak its name*. Bangalore: Alternative Law Forum; 2007.
32. Narrain A, Bhan G. *Because I have a voice: Queer politics in India*. New Delhi: Yoda Press; 2005.
33. *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India,* (2018) 10 SCC 1
34. Newton E. *Mother camp: Female impersonators in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1979.
35. Oswin N. Critical geographies and the uses of sexuality. *Prog Hum Geogr.* 2008;32(1):89–103.
36. Pillai PSA. *Jurisprudence and Legal Theory*. Eastern Book Company, 2018.
37. Preciado PB. *Testo junkie: Sex, drugs, and biopolitics in the pharmacopornographic era*. New York: Feminist Press; 2013.
38. Purvis T. Sexualities. In: Waugh P, editor. *Literary theory and criticism: An Oxford guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010. p. 427–440.
39. Puar JK. *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2007.
40. Reddy G. *With respect to sex: Negotiating hijra identity in South India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2005.
41. Rich A. Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs.* 1980;5(4):631–660.
42. Rubin G. Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. *Soc Text.* 1984;(11):3–44.
43. Secftion 377, Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860).
44. Sedgwick EK. *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1990.
45. Seidman S. *Queer theory/sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell; 1996.
46. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019 (Act No. 40 of 2019).

Statements and Declarations

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest.

Funding Statement: NA

Declaration of Competing Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The authors declare that the data supporting the findings/ conclusions of this study are available within the paper. Any additional data and materials can be obtained from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Highlights

- The study reconceptualizes queer theory as a **general social framework**, moving beyond its conventional focus on sexual minorities to analyze broader structures of identity, power, and normativity.
- It critically examines **heteronormativity and identity construction** through key theorists such as Foucault, Butler, and Sedgwick, highlighting the fluid and performative nature of gender and sexuality.
- The paper extends queer theory into the **Indian socio-cultural context**, exploring indigenous identities, legal transformations, and the tension between Western frameworks and local realities.
- It evaluates the **limitations of queer theory**, including its abstraction, Western bias, and challenges to identity politics, while proposing future directions in digital, ecological, and intersectional studies.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the contributions of scholars such as Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, whose works have informed this study. Sincere thanks are also extended to mentors and Libraries of various educational institutes that were referred to conduct this research.