

GENDERING THE CULTURAL TRAJECTORIES OF INDIA: A WOMAN'S VIEW ON THE OBJECTIVE VICTIMIZATION OF THEM WITHIN SOCIO-POLITICAL SCENARIO!

Suparna Roy

Central Modern College of Education, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Article history:	Abstract:
Published: 10 th March 2022	Queer lens has provided us avenues to perceive everything critically. The term 'queer' is open-ended and it is indeed important to know how this open-endedness of the term 'queer' has made itself politically more efficacious. Marginalization can be considered as a chain of events taking place in a society to create certain restrictions for few and power for the rest. Gender, class and caste are further divided into layers, creating a stratified structure where power dynamics moulds and produces identities, not for recognition but for marginalization, oppression. Masculinity can be understood as those roles which are conditioned in a body, which is assigned 'male at birth' and is expected to be ingrained and followed, so as to maintain the "nude-make-up" of binarized naturality! Sexuality is a spectrum of desire that anatomies experiences at different stages, time and space, and Femininity stands as those socially constructed "natural" rules that makes a 'vagina' grow and become that successful ideal woman for whom all 'phalluses' are waiting. My experiences motivate me to draw the cultural context and social creation of 'gender and sexuality, femininity and masculinity, rape and politics' within Indian framework; how intersectionality of marginalization(s) in these already oppressed sections needs an examination and exploration along with the sense of guilt. Noting Helene Cixuos <i>Laugh of Medusa</i> where she presents in an exhilarating manner how the 'subject position' open to vaginas and phalluses are distinctive within a phallogocentric symbolic order and how therefore the representations and re-presentations of these identities undergoes a crisis, that churns from this clear source of differentiation. Hence, the aim of this article is to analyze and critically perceive how these terminologies acts as devices or political weapon and are situated within Indian cultural framework, so that, the operation of power to produce continues unquestionably.

Keywords: Power, gender, sexuality, society, politics

INTRODUCTORY BACKGROUND

Feminism initially commenced with the middle-class white women's call for political rights including the Suffragettes, where the public and private binary was challenged with the powerful demand of re-claiming the spaces by Women, However, with the passage of time the famous historians Rebecca Walker and Maggie Humm, divided the History of Feminism into three waves, which eventually started including not just women but all oppressive 'bodies'. The immensely crucial and echoing slogan "Personal is Political" was introduced by Carol Hanisch that reflected the dimension and growth of Second wave Feminism; the creation of Feminism(s); however, this aroused too few political complexities. This concept of Feminism(s) could broadly include- Radical Feminism; Cultural Feminism; while the Third wave very carefully focused on the deconstruction of the "inherent-link" between one's sex/gender/sexuality, stating them as choice/performances rather than an authentic ultimate, where one of the prominent personality was Judith Butler, and eventually Jacques Derrida's post-structuralist theory further envisaged our perceptions towards language-sign/signifier and signifies, which presented the fact, that the relation between them is arbitrary and deconstructed the very essentiality of truth/essence/main/centre, which with time and inclusion of queer theory organized Feminism into Queer-post-structuralist and intersectional political standpoint.

INDIAN PROGRESS- A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Working on Indian 'feminism' it initiated with Savitri Bai Phoolé, Kadambini Ganguly, and a few more personalities through educational reformations for women. Eventually caste, class came into consideration and the prominent case of sexual harassment against women in Rajasthan during 1997, noticing the case of Bhanwari Devi the Vishaka Guidelines were introduced. How a woman visualizes this pop-culture and its commoditization of women. In

comparison to the west, Feminism was never a popularly prominent or vocal movement in India. Few revolutionary acts demanding the rights of women and equality for them can be recognized under Feminism if an inclusion has to be drawn. Drawing parity, it is difficult to pin-point as to what Indian Feminism during early nineteenth century could appear to be. But yes few acts like Abolition of Sati could be considered as the first feminist movement. Else than this, gradual participation of women in education pertaining to the field of science can be considered as a Feminist step, as women were not allowed to receive Education, and even if they were, the subjects were very much limited to home reformations, decorative works like stitching, music, painting, etcetera. Few Women during that time marked an enriching path of revolution for others, and tried presenting that under no circumstances women should be treated unequally like-

- a) Kamini Roy
- b) Kadambini Ganguly
- c) Anandibai Joshi
- d) Muthulaxshmi Reddy

The first-wave of Feminism in India could probably trace itself with the contribution and evolution brought by Savitribai Phule (1831-1897). She was not only the first female teacher in India, but also opened school for female education, took care of child widows, untouchables, sexually assaulted and pregnant women. Eventually social contributions were reflected with simple literary writings that got feminist touches like *Amar Jibon (My Life)* by Rassundari Devi. Eventual contributions by other prominent women like Swarnakumari Devi echoed feminist ideologies. Since then struggles took more concrete shape and vice, and marched toward reclaiming the 'space' once again. Gradual intersectionality and inclusivity framed Feminism in relation to caste, race, class, etcetera, where figures like Bhanwari Devi and her contribution to Vishakha Guidelines emerged as a prominent achievement in the field of Indian Feminism. The presence of Feminism(s) and Patriarchies has constructed the scuffles more perilous as forms and dimensions started oppressing under various representations. Today, Queer communities, (dis)ability and many other fields has been a part of this immemorial struggle for equality, and today Feminism in India has both strong position yet popular backlashes! From here, we move to the understanding of the term 'Queer', its journey, the political representation of this identity, how it works as a conscious ability of protest and representational policy within identity politics. And perhaps, we will also try deciphering empirically why application of the theory has still not been practically functioning.

QUEER THEORY AND IT'S URGENCY

Presenting ourselves as a more radical political identity, the use of the term 'Queer' stands crucial. We do not desire to associate this term with the way we identify our 'bodies' to expose the complex historical essence it carries rather to 'reconstruct' a politically motivated conscious redamation of what I choose to be. To trace the operation of Queer politics, it is important to visualize the history of the term Queer. The word 'queer' has made quite a long journey in terms of the definitions it intended and has touched on meanings which are radically different yet somewhat linked. The initial meaning of the word dates back to 1508 Scotland, where it meant "strange, peculiar". Close to 1812, the word evolved to mean 'to spoil, ruin' and was used as a verb. Only after hundred years, in 1935, it started being used as a noun in the place of "homosexual", obviously in a derogatory sense which was similar and synonymous to the previous usages and meanings. Undoubtedly, the term is now used as a unifying term that recognizes many complex identities that makes up the LGBTQ community. In fact over the last thirty years 'queer' has emerged in academia, politics, and identity of inclusion and using it politically. On an apparent level 'homosexual', 'gay/lesbian' and 'queer' all means the same but one must understand that there are distinctive differences between the three. 'Homosexual' is more of a biological/medical term used more formally. 'Gay' can be used both for male and female and is used considering this meaning than of "happy". Gertrude Stein was the first writer to use the term 'gay' in sexual context, when she wrote, "They were gay, they learned little things that are things in being gay, they were quite regularly gay". While 'queer' is a more political terms which includes the other two terms even. It tries to articulate some of the possibilities of "sexual non-conformity". The word 'queer' is self-critiquing. But queer theory strives to open up a universal emancipatory struggle beyond the reach of capitalism's power of commoditization. Queer theorist Judith Butler regards the term queer

My understanding of queer is a term that desires that you don't have to present an identity card before entering a meeting. Heterosexuals can join the queer movement. Bisexuals can join the queer movement. Queer is not being lesbian. Queer is not being gay. Queer is an argument against certain normativity, what a proper lesbian or gay identity is.

Why is this theory required within Indian cultural spaces? What makes this concept eventually a mandate within Indian framework of identity and body politics? No wonder, that within any operating domain of power-dynamics 'culture functions as an excuse' of continuation. The sufferings of LGBTQIAA++ people eventually draws our attention to the numerous intricate designs based on which our society is practically performing, which tends to be so

fragile that the fear of losing its space cramps the identities the bodies are free to be with. The issue of sexuality requires a politically conscious statement and Queer theory assists us to build this consciousness. Within the phallogocentric symbolic order of Indian community and fundamentalism the power-dynamics and discourse provides no *space* to the Queer people; the issues of Drag Queens are from considering. They are minimized within the peripheral sections; amidst the absent they more invisible, and the layers continues. Starting from the police force to political agendas all tries to curb these identities with rules, laws, and categories in ways that could ultimately string them within the social maintenance of heteronormative structure. Practical functioning of this theory will fragment all the networking that was crucially practiced over years to build this 'untouched-natural reality' of man and a woman. Since, my focus delves more particularly of a Woman's perception it is crucial to discuss the concept of women and Gender theory in India.

GENDER THEORY AND THE CONCEPT OF WOMEN

Gender as a social concept and order is highly problematic and the definition provided to the identities considered and accepted under Gender within this phallogocentric order is critically complex, and patriarchally irreversible. To sustain the natural and permanent three-tier structure of sex/gender/desire, our culture produces the culturally 'unintelligible' lot, and is further omitted from the visual vicinity of social representation resulting in production of the 'intelligible lot', whose components are- Men and women; very affirmative and strictly 'untouched natural model'. Furthermore, as Nivedita Menon regards in *Seeing Like a Feminist* that, how all these creation is just like a 'nude-make up' histogram, where years of practice has shaped it as the 'untouchable natural'. Heterosexualization of desire depends on the production of intelligibly separate and hierarchised binaries. But as Judith Butler said in *Gender Trouble* (1990), that there is nothing 'natural about one's "sex"', it is very much a floating subject and changeable as per required. But problem arises when a continuum is generated from genitalia's, where, as per Butler sex (male or female) is considered to cause gender (man/woman); thereby, constructing some organized structures of identity creation. Butler emphasizes the fact that the concept of identity is free floating and not connected to one's essence; rather is a set of performance that a person chooses or opts as per their wish. Referring to this we can also remember Mary McIntosh, who in one of her article- *Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity* said, "The way forward, instead, involves recognizing that gender attributes are performative rather than expressive" (McIntosh, 114). Women, as a specific gender construction, then focus on the inferior definable stratus, more appropriately defined with patriarchal quotations of the 'self-less', which is further channeled as the ideal position that a body with vagina should possibly aim and target in their life. The absence of women within linguistic and political representation is something that Butler in *Gender Trouble* clearly states, where her understanding of what a Woman is stands, "Women are the sex which is not "one". Within...a phallogocentric language, women constitute the *unrepresentable*...women represent the sex that cannot be thought, a linguistic absence and opacity" (Butler, 13). The concept and the identity of women is a mixed genre of inherent oppression that is desired by the encoded patriarchal definition to sustain. The problem lies when the identity of women as a political device accepts this definition imposed by patriarchal laws of creation. Doing so, we generally omit the very possibility of reframing the definition of what a woman is or can possibly be; the flexibility of an identity is somewhere damaged when repeated constrictive patterns are implicitly applied to produce and reproduce them. In India, this marked definition of a woman which is obviously patriarchally embodied has become such a standard of acceptance and celebration that women are hardly unlikely to adhere, for this definition keeps mutating to fit the bodies of women within the stated political dimension of normative structures. But, what happens to those who deviate from such fragile yet unified structures of control and regulation of the body-identity-sexuality of a woman? How then is their "freed" body curbed down with numerous social measures to fix something that appears to be lacking?

SEXUALITY AND THE REGULATING ALERT!

The crisis within Indian political framework exists due to mainstream sustenance; however, the crisis frames multifaceted networks and sectors while marginalization only takes shape in this way. My focus stands on sexual marginalization and what can be done to bring a future without crisis, but is sexuality is separable from class, caste, geo-location, education, and religion? No, all are interlinked and interconnected; hence, it is crucial to visualize how regulations on sexuality have been an alert, from the historical notes, which validates the struggle of diversified 'sexual orientation' within the cultural spectrum of India. While to mention few, scuffles of Queer politics and voice in the west included-

- Trikone (US),
- Kush Khayal (Canada),
- Shakti Khabar (UK),
- Shamakami (US) and Dost (UK).

In India, similar struggles started were initiated by-

- Gay Scene (Calcutta), Fun Club (Calcutta), Counsel

- Club/Pravartak (Calcutta),
- Freedom (Gulbarga), Boinbay Dost (Bombay), Udan (Bombay), Kush Club (Bombay),
- Aarambh (Delhi), Sakhi (Delhi), Red Rose (Delhi), Saathi (Delhi)
- Good As You (Bangalore), Men India Movement (Cochin),
- Sisters (Madras),
- Gay Information Centre (Secunderabad)

Gender identity and sexual orientation in Indian politics is restricted from practice and expression! The social and political institutions in India follows a normative structure of morality creating a code that is morally influential on sexual discourse, and here any diversion from the same can be compared to what Michel Foucault described in *History of Sexuality*, "Doubtless acts "contrary to nature" ...an extreme form of acts "against the law; they were infringements of decrees..." (Foucault, 38). Therefore, we can see how to curb the identities our mutating patriarchy has evolved a web of patterns against which numerous institutions were developed to combat and claim their deserving 'space'. From here, we also can link as to why India celebrates Rape Culture? Rape is a device that showcases the power of one anatomy over the 'othered' anatomy; within this Brahminical system anyone outside a cis-white-heterosexual-brahmin man is the othered. Does not matter what IPC section 375 has stated the definition of Rape as, basically it is a power discourse that is used in forms of 'curing' and 'maintaining' accepted social structures. As such, the mainstream and popular display of the flesh has been celebrated in a manner that has stimulated and functioned as a catalyst in fixing the identity of what and how a body of women must be perceived. Rape has an important connotation in India. It not only echoes the male superiority but also a power of control and dominance of an anatomy over another. Rape and Sex (not the biological one) are terms inherently connected with some idea of 'shame' and a worst fate. Sex has no connection with the desire of a woman; it is perhaps only the male phallus's desire that is taken into consideration for and while entering a vagina. This is further cleared when heterosexual and procreative sex is only focused and accepted. Rape is accepted for it is performed over an anatomy that is designated and established as the 'inferior' one. The discourse around rape is silent and oppressive. The culture uplifting rape celebrates it, and more affirmation is clearly depicted through the lens of pop-culture and cinema, where women are objects of pleasure. Rape survivor has to go through numerous interrogations while the perpetrator is left free to keep on 'raping'. The republic sense of a 'raper' is highly interconnected with India patriarchal culture and its hypocritical systems. Incidents of rape in India are no unknown, where Dalit women, Tribal women, LGBTQIA++ people are considered as commodities who are available for rape. Lesbians are raped by family members to turn them into heterosexual! Tribal women are raped because they do not cover their breasts! Who wrote this logical apprehensive mandates that breasts are to be covered of a particular form of anatomy. The power of breasts are beyond the mothering and sexual norms. It is that political weapon that bleeds the dominance of male supremacy! The Rape statistics in India has doubled in the recent years. Rape is modified and defined as 'corrective rape' to "cure" homosexual people by forcing them to perform intercourse with family members. Tribal Rapes and Dalit rape cases (Hathra's or Mathura) all goes un-hindered and this sexual coercion is typically forged with political and caste dominance, where justice is that ball that never rolls down to the one in need. But, all these theories and its application results in practical disintegration of our worshipped cultural diversity that draws our attention to many layers of experience and the importance of its recognition.

INTERSECTIONALITY

The term intersectionality was coined by Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989, and the meaning which is said in an interview with TIMES quite recently-

...It's not identity politics on steroids. It is not a mechanism to turn white men into the new pariahs. It's basically a lens, a prism, for seeing the way in which various forms of inequality often operate together and exacerbate each other. We tend to talk about race inequality as separate from inequality based on gender, class, sexuality or immigrant status. What's often missing is how some people are subject to all of these, and the experience is not just the sum of its parts.

Intersectionality is therefore to understand, that marginalization does not follow one single mode or pipe to control an anatomy. Intersectionality is to focus on equity to bring up a status of '*in- equality*' not 'inequality'! Intersectionality has provided us with lens to observe how bodies are subjected to subjugation in multifarious ways, and discarding the other oppressions to validate and fight for only one is to omit the intersectional lens of combating with patriarchy. Therefore, to break down to the very source, and to consider that a vagina is oppressed just on the basis of Gender and Sexuality, so let's protest against this and keep a blind eye on caste, class, race, education, language, identity, religion, geo-location, etceteras, then eventually within the process of protesting the accessibility to the medium of protest will make one realize, one is just not marginalized under one shelter and rather plethora of categories; furthermore, considering that all 'vaginas' are just ,subjugated under the box of Gender and sexuality means to omit the caste oppression of a Dalit, the religion oppression for a Muslim, the geo-location oppression for a person from

remote area, the identity oppression for a trans person, etceteras. Thus intersectionality permeates one to visualize the 'anatomy of marginalization' in an inclusive form and creating a healthy space to exhibit the variation of experiences, and not summing them up! Women have assembled themselves within the routine torture and subjugation they face. From houses to workspace, the battering and sexual aggressions are the daily doses that women have 'normalized' for themselves. Eventually with scrutiny of the systems operating globally with its patriarchally structure fundamentalism, we see women stands as 'victims' to a global system of oppression that is constructed through numerous branches like caste, race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, (dis)ability, ethnicity, dialect, education, etcetera. This multiple lines of regulating and controlling the definition of what a woman is intersects and overlaps; hence, creating a network of intricate streams that merges and dominates a single body, where none could share the experience, as it stands individually isolated yet relatable. To further elaborately explain this critical networking of identity politics and social justice we note how Crenshaw in her article "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color" writes-

The embrace of identity politics, however, has been in tension with dominant concepts of social justice. Race, gender, and other identity categories are most often treated in mainstream liberal discourse as vestiges of bias or domination-that is, as intrinsically negative frameworks in which social power works to exclude or marginalize those who are different. According to this understanding, our liberatory objective should be to empty such categories of any social significance (Crenshaw, 3).

Now, when this spectacle of 'intersectionality' is aligned with sexuality marginalization, within the framework of India, is a demand to comprehend and recognize the sexual bias of not only the 'benchmarked' heterosexuality, rather the spectrum of sexuality, because the social organization of 'desire' tries to standardize one and veil the rest. The multiple oppressive formats and shapes that influences how the sexual orientation of an anatomy should be constructed includes numerous tools of our political enterprises, and that too in a massively different faces like, race, culture, religion, gender, race, etc. So, *when a 'cis-woman' identifies her as 'pansexual' being from a Dalit caste, and remotely backward region, with dialects in her language, being a Muslim, and without proper education, can you imagine her layers of crisis?* Now the benevolent Indian society with its organized order will omit these perspectives/layers of oppression while perceiving the scuffles of her 'sexual orientation'. It is important to include intersectional ways to analyze ones struggle for their sexual identity because, the way an upper-caste Brahmin cis-man can declare that he is 'homosexual', a lower caste Dalit cis-man can never have that accessibility to recognize the 'definition of homosexuality' as the premise of 'access' within the Indian framework is marked and operated based on all these above stated factors and many more. Even, the marginalization of a pansexual cis-woman of an elite class and Hindu religion, will ever be the same of a bi-sexual trans-woman, of a lower class Muslim status, so if I do not recognize the other factors of this person's struggle, I am erasing these factors from the identity only, which is what the India social organization does for their convenience of maintenance of their "nude-make-up". Thus, from Queer lens to intersectional discourses, the Women's voice(s) has enabled that visualization which assists one to perceive the struggles and the history of sexual identity in an intersectional way, to deconstruct the multiple/critical/cultural triadic of oppression.

MASCULINITY AND FEMININITY WITH WOMEN IN POP-CULTURE

Masculinity can be understood as those roles which are conditioned in a body, which is assigned 'male at birth' and is expected to be ingrained and followed, so as to maintain the "nude-make-up" of binarized naturality! Patriarchy, if considered a mutating drug resisting virus the Feminism is an 'antidote' to it. Masculinity studies eventually grew from and simultaneously with feminist studies; however, my approach to 'masculinity' will focus within the Indian framework of visibility and maintenance. Masculinity is not created out of vacuum; masculinity(s) and multiple categories provided us with lens to speculate 'masculinity(s)' under various cultural and tenured dimensions, where (dis)owning masculinity for a Brahmin, able bodied, upper class, educated, urban man to present how it is a socially constructed concept like 'femininity' is easier unlike for a dalit, (dis)able, low class, village man. Masculinity, therefore, is 'intersectionalized' where the upper-class phallus's practice of masculinity is different from a Dalit's masculine behavior! This section of masculine adrenaline creates a standard of gaze(s) that an actual male possessing real masculinity must have. A gaze that must be powerful enough to create fear, lust, uncomfortable desire(s) around and on women; thereby, making them those terrifyingly beautiful objects of 'angelic hell'.

Femininity as Betty Friedan described in her popular work *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), was a Mystique, something that gives immense charming power (though blurred) to the identity of a woman, for which women embracingly thinks "If a woman had a problem in the 1950's and 1960's, she knew that something must be wrong with her marriage or with herself" (Friedan, 150). But how is this philosophy of the West so strongly still applicable for the east identities or more appropriately women? In India, the '*ghorer lokhi*' (angel of the house) is a celebrated theme culturally modernized and willingly celebrated by women all around, just pause and think why? Many women are very similar to what the West understood as a problem that had no name. I am eventually becoming more aware as to how women are strongly demanding the space stored within the house and celebrates this the ideal form of

womanhood; marriage as such modifies its face but compels a woman either to become a 'doshobhujā' (a person with ten hands; to do numerous things simultaneously), and they celebrate it happily by maintaining home and family, rather advises this is how and what a strong woman is; while few dreams of marrying and be the sacrificial power advising adjusting and sacrificing is what women should do for they are strong. Betty Friedan beautifully crafted saying-

They learned that truly feminine women do not want careers, higher education, political rights—the independence and the opportunities that the old-fashioned feminists fought for. Some women, in their forties and fifties, still remembered painfully giving up those dreams, but most of the younger women no longer even thought about them. A thousand expert voices applauded their femininity, their adjustment, their new maturity. All they had to do was devote their lives from earliest girlhood to finding a husband and bearing children. (Friedan, 44).

The similar issue still prevails in more than half of the population of India who has been indoctrinated with this mystical power that femininity is associated with. The completeness of woman is only when she can become and adheres to the femininity described as the only identity of woman. Now, this definition of femininity is nothing but strict cultural modulations that through practice channels bodies into two respective domains of man and woman, so that, the social order remains unhindered. In India the definition of femininity is what Friedan in her quote 9as quoted above) popularly accepts and wants every woman to adhere by; that is why today when women (minority population) does not adhere or chooses the more politically conscious identity of 'single woman' society blames them for increase rates of divorces! Therefore, his strict adherence of femininity has produced and reproduced women as objects' both in media and pop-culture that exists to satisfy those gaze(S). Feminism in India is quite different from that of western political outrage

POP-CULTURE AND 'RE-PRESENTATION' OF WOMEN

Female is the sex, not the gender. It is important to deconstruct the teleology of sex/gender/sexuality. If I am to use female as the gender, not women, then linguistic re-presentation of my idea will go wrong. Judith Butler clearly states this difference female and women is not same when we consider their representation. My article is focused on the voyeuristic segment, it requires much focus on 'individual liberty and women 'absent subjects' (women functions as a representational absence- why? Because the representation of women-only takes place from male perspectives; hence, real experiences of women are covered and almost absent when the presentation is considered. Thus they function as 'absent subjects' which require individual liberty before anything else).



Applying the 'cinematic lens' to present the idea of the visual sense of objectification that dominates here, if we are to consider all Bollywood 'item songs', and to name a few- *Chikni Chameli*, and *Fevicol Se*. Here, I will focus on deconstructing the category under which it is assigned. ITEM- the name itself suggests 'objects', where the only portrayal is the female bodies with flesh slogging to attract a gaze. Now, what is this gaze? This gaze as Film studies puts it the 'Male Gaze'; that gaze that desires to visualize particular anatomy from the sense of owning autonomy and pleasuring it. From *Fevicol Se*, the scene where Kareena Kapoor compares herself with the leg of a chicken and demands to be swallowed with alcohol typically portrays a horrendous address and disrespect to women. On the other hand, in *Chikni Chameli*, the depicted meaning of a woman going into the forest with hungry lions to perform intercourse again stigmatizes the heterosexual benchmark and women as objects of pleasure and consumption. The reality and throbbing echoes of sexism supports objectification and gulping of rhythmic exploitation.



Gendering the Gaze(s)!

Remembering *The Crash* novel by J.G Ballard and "Crash" essay by Salman Rushdie, we must take into account the immense voyeuristic gaze that lens can provide on the object of display, where through that lens somewhere the 'body of women' are re-created as the "hyperreal" (Baudrillard, 73), where those imagistic portrayal of that constructed standard flesh soothes and pleases the desires and gazes of those numerous phalluses. Furthermore, analyzing the costumes used here only focuses on certain body parts as lucrative policies of sexualized transactions (lucrative is something that shines in appearance; Bollywood has that glamorous policies (formats socially and legally accepted) of sexual transactions. Now here the crucial question is why women accept this objectification- is the answer just money or something else. We all know to protest and change anything, being aware of the idea is very important. This is absent when you walk into the sphere of visual entertainment. Hollywood works on different political fundamentalism, but here women appreciate beautification as the primary tool. Liberty can never be achieved unless and until every nook and corner, every niche is free. Gender and Liberty, therefore, emerge as an important branch of Liberty as a whole, because Liberty talks about freedom from shackles, and Gender is one of the largest shackles used by Politics-how?

Everything is gendered, from the moment you are born until you die. Gender apartheid is a clear device in the political forum because it is only this way that will allow the authority and source of power to restrict in the hands of singular project patriarchy. Gender is nothing but a set of created rules based on which bodies are forced to perform. Apparently, 'force' may seem doubtful if I limit my gaze only to the cinematic display of women. But what if a Dalit woman experience and wants to transform into a man, that is being F-M; will she be able to do so easily and not *force* by society to appreciate what is expected out of her? What never appears as a force, are things that have been 'conditioned' in a way that you don't even doubt. Liberty is incomplete until you doubt every intricate social design critically. Where the issue of performance is eventually lost and cultural destiny takes control, which means- all rules are culturally constructed; culture functions as an 'excuse' to keep going patterns that make ruling easier. Thus, the fixity of gendering was only limited to biology, today people would have gladly recognized what the recent medical research on Genetics focused on. If biology accepts gender as a spectrum, then what is still the issue? Culture, thus it takes control of our destiny). This issue has no specific time and place; Freedom and Gender are reverberating everywhere; an absence of the same is the result of ignorance or avoidance. As John Stuart Mill said in *On Liberty and Subjugation of Women*, "It is accordingly on this battle-field, almost solely, that the rights: of the individual against society have been asserted on broad grounds of principle, and the claim of society to exercise authority over dissentients openly controverted"(Mill, 20).

CONCLUSION

Growing up within a suburban town of Kolkata, India, initially, I was ignorant about how identities are and was strictly binarized within the political framework, and how it is sustained seamlessly without many interrogations. This realization made me arrive at a point that I thought New Gender studies is not something that should strictly be kept within academics; neither it is anything related to one gender identity. This topic is also not something just limited to what Butler, Foucault, Meyer, Sukthankar, Vanita, Friedan and Crenshaw theorized; rather it is a subjective growth of political statistics around us. Gradually, I was coming to parity with a substantial concept- As the belief of Plato and Nietzsche explains that 'everything is an interpretation; there exists no absolute truth' it is important to start working on Derrida's post-structuralist ideas. The urgency to understand how power structures operate identity politics and keep varying as per various geographies is a significant aspect too! We find how the same has resulted in marginalization, branching, and stratifying selected and 'representable identities' in a horrendous format. Liberty is something that academically and politically became a crucial concept for me to comprehend and apply. I started to think that until I can achieve individual liberty; I cannot choose and assist my community on a larger scale. Liberty as an abstract reality and philosophy has always sparked the sense of 'questioning the representational' objectivity associated with 'female bodies'. I believe that if one is suppressed everybody is suppressed; before achieving liberty as an overall mechanism, we first need to achieve that individually; somewhere souls are conditioned in a way to

capture our bodies and punish and regulate it based on the anti-liberal threads of individuality. Remembering Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punishment* (1995), where he states that- "A soul 'inhabits' him and brings him to existence, which is itself a factor in the mastery that power exercises over the body. The soul is the effect and instrument of a political anatomy; the soul is the prison of the body" (Foucault, 30). Therefore, the Woman's perception with her soul remains caged within critical observatories which if given a chance will deliver beautiful negotiations in a decorative network of disparaging voice(s).

WORKS CITED

1. Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. Routledge, 1990.
2. Cixious, Helene. *Laugh of Medusa*. England: Oxford University Press, 2008
3. Devi, Mahasweta. *Breast Stories*. Seagull, 1997.
4. Foucault, Mitchell. *The History of Sexuality*. Penguin, 1976.
5. Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. W.W. Norton & Company, 1963.
6. Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Cornell University Press, 1985.
7. Jackson, Stevi and Jackie Jones. "Contemporary Feminist Theories." Edinburgh University Press, 1998, pp. 280. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366.
8. Loreck, Janice. "Explainer: What Does the 'Male Gaze' Mean, and What about a Female Gaze?" *The Conversation*, 5 Jan. 2016, theconversation.com/explainer-what-does-the-male-gaze-mean-and-what-about-a-female-gaze-52486.
9. May, Georgia. "Male Gaze vs. Female Gaze: 6 Movie Examples, Explained." *whatNerd*, 9 Sept. 2021, whatnerd.com/male-gaze-female-gaze-movie-examples.
10. McIntosh, Mary. "Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity." *Feminist Review*, 1991. SAGE journals, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1057>.
11. Steinmetz, K. (2020, February 20). She Coined the Term 'Intersectionality' Over 30 Years Ago. Here's What It Means to Her Today. *Time*. <https://time.com/5786710/kimberle-crenshaw-intersectionality/>