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Abstract: This paper critically analyses the construction and deconstruction of ‘mothering’ and ‘parenthood’ through the perspectives of dialectical discourses ranging from medical epistemology, media and social norms. Contemporary developments such as the decriminalization of LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning) sexuality might not ensure an extended social confirmatory role of a ‘mother’ or a caregiver. Stretching to such concerns, homosexuality and transsexuality as a sexual behavior has been quite debatable through the historical authoritative notions of disciplinary boundaries, questioning the social validation of the ‘body’ and ‘identity’ in terms of pathological progression and popular representations of role internalization and generalization. The inner conflict within the systemic forces of legality and culture remains an ineradicable journey of contesting between spaces of struggle and assertion from varying movements of sexual and behavioral possibilities to a demarcation of limitations.
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INTRODUCTION: THE DISCOURSE OF ‘MEDICINE’

The contextual interpretation of socio-political debates enables one to explore the range of sexualities manifesting typologies of classification. The contagious metaphor of sexual expression largely oscillates between the concept of the body as an object on one end and inert subjective consciousness on the other end. The ‘body’ is intertwined into the binary of time and space constructing the apprehension of the dangerous ‘other’. The discourse of medical prescriptions and social values ranging from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century have largely relegated sexuality to the norm of conventional procreation and reproduction while adding on the impossibility of extending validity to alternate forms of sexual identities and practices. The question which needs to be posed at the moment resorts to – ‘Can we imagine a gay or a transgender person fulfilling the role of a ‘mother’? Can one assume them taking the responsibility of the family as a social institution beyond the dynamic of being mere reproductive? If we do not allow things to fall into such perspective, how can we possibly resonate with the notion of equality and justice?

Certain historical examples do reinforce aspects of the social status quo clubbed with the perplexity of medical judgments and value-opinions. Sarah Curtis and Ann Taket in their extensive account on ‘Health and Societies’ identified some socio-economic, cultural and political factors which constructed concepts of ‘health’ evolving from naturalist essentialism of diseases to the current socio-ecological perspectives of medical pluralism. Quoting Moore from the early underdeveloped conception of homosexuality he stated that ‘Homosexuality is to a very large extent an acquired abnormality and propagates itself as a morally contagious disease’ (Curtis and Taket, 1996, p.52). The psychiatric rhetoric constructed homosexuality as a mental illness exalting homosexuals as...
irresistible in impulses and the psychiatrist as the sane. The construction of heterosexuality as a normative sexual behavior often made the self-conception of the ‘deviant’ homosexuals as powerless. The medical knowledge intermeshed deeply into the power structures of the society while interlocking the symbolization through sexism and silence of the ‘diseased’ body. Homosexuals reflected apprehensions of contradictory discourses across the same mechanism of patriarchal power structures, adding into the categories of white and blacks, femininity and masculinity. It is interesting to note how the American Psychiatric Association (APA) in 1952 issued - ‘Homosexuality, together with ‘other sexual deviations’, was included among the sociopathic personality disturbances: “these disorders were characterized by the absence of subjectively experienced distress or anxiety despite the presence of profound pathology” (Curtis and Taket, 1996, p.53). The model of causality in such propositions received several backslashes from the homophile movement rejecting its adoption as morally wrong and scientifically questionable. Transformational potential made its space in the 1990s when the ‘World Health Organization removed homosexuality per se from the International Classification of Diseases’ (Drescher, 2015, p.571). But if we consider a shift of explanations from the domain of medicine and psychiatry to other institutional apparatuses such as the law and media, then what is still limiting in terms of status?

The binary characterization of gendered dominant society relegated ambiguous definitions throughout the decades of clinical history. Though the attempt for inclusiveness strives its umbrella for broader viewpoints, it also potentially restricts its move to the narrow usage of the ‘body’. Guido Alexander Sanchez in his analytical paper quoted the problematic of ‘transgender’ through references from various establishments of clinical importance – ‘The American Medical Association (AMA) and Centre for Disease Control’s (CDC) definition of transgender in an analysis of HIV-positive tuberculosis… report states transgender persons to be people who are heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual and maybe cross-dressers or preoperative and postoperative transsexuals…and a support network which includes biologic male house members who appear as women and members who neither cross-dress nor are transgender’ (Sanchez,2002,p.4). This form of knowledge dissemination reduces the specific paradigm of lived experiences and personalities which transgender can possess. Over the years, the anatomical explanations have changed to explore shifts in psycho-social identities, rights and justice apart from the bedrock of ‘gender pathology’. But normative metaphors for transsexuality and transgender still lurks within the debates of gender politics, mass-media discourses and parenting.

A demystification of medical knowledge took place later with the revisioning of concepts and ideologies of ‘health’ towards homosexuality and even transsexuality. Queer identities were confined to less policing and repression in the later decades through the advocacy of scientific experimentation in sexual conduct among animals. But the processes of present or absent fertility still lingered to dominate the scene of sexual politics where women were surrounded with the metaphors of production-menstruation as failed reproduction and menopause as the end of production. Such definitions naturalize the narrow boundary of ‘motherhood’ to be determined by the medical typification of the ‘body’ and the presence of uterus but not necessarily the paradigm of ‘care’ and ‘nurture’.

Can we de-gender the notions of care and love while creating spaces of liberation and pleasure of exercising the ‘self’ in varied contexts? The debates over LGBTQ parenting not only engulf the dilemma of social and medical deviation but also reproduces ‘emotion’ in terms of conventional gendered morality, representing ‘women’ in a heterosexual relationship. A dent in the historical limitations of gendered roles invited extensive debates in the socio-political scene of the Indian context. The next section traces the issue through the interventions of legal processes making references to sexuality, marriage, family, media and structures of kinship.

LEGAL BATTLES FOR INCLUSION: INDIVIDUALITY AND SOCIAL ORDER

The interrelationship between gender and masculinization reflected a long historical justification through the colonial order of the state. In the framework of such ideological standpoints, the colonial rule cast the political identities of the colonized in terms of ‘femininity’ enclosed within spiritual primitive spaces. Ashis Nandy recounted an elaborate study of age and sex categorization inflicted by the colonialists, creating a homology of sexual and political dominance for the non-Western Indians. The subordination of the colonized made latent enforcement of misconstrued conception easily transmissible such as ‘Purusatva’ or masculinity, ‘Naritva’ or
femininity and ‘Klibatva’ or hermaphroditism, ordered in terms of decreasing significance (Nandy, 1983, p.8). Such explanations insisted on the non-acceptance of fluid and fragmented identities of human beings while legitimizing the universal discourse of sexual politics.

The analytical and political tool of understanding realities cannot exist independently of the practices which transform ‘differences’ into ‘oppression’. The challenges of reconceptualization and struggles re-casted social relationships where the objectified ‘powerless’ did find some spaces for empowerment. The Supreme Court of India on 6th September, 2018 passed a historic judgment putting an end to the criminalization of the same-sex acts between the consenting individuals, bequeathing the LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning) community a legal recognition. Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code earlier stated same-sex relationships as an ‘unnatural offence’, synthesizing the maladjustment in an ambivalent narrative- ‘Whoever voluntarily has carnal intercourse against the order of nature with any man, woman or animal, shall be punished with [imprisonment for life], or with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine’ (Central Government Act). The decriminalization of such acts ensured the establishment of sexual pluralism and social justice with an entitlement to exercise certain rights of citizenship in a democracy such as Article 14 (equality and equal protection of laws), Article 15(1) (non-discrimination), Article 19 (1) (a) (freedom of expression) and Article 21 (life and personal liberty) (Najafi,2018,p.1). The adaptation of the Constitution to the ever-changing circumstances did proclaim a new era of freedom but sexuality and gender may or may not necessarily coincide together when the bedrock largely lies in terms of the meanings of existence recreated by being ‘man’ and ‘woman’, their bodily construction and the attached exaltation of ‘family’. Sex and gender, homosexuals and transsexuals cannot be at disposal through similar definitions but involves complex discussions of bio-power. Knowledge-creation interpreted ‘motherhood’ through a woman’s body, giving birth to a baby and continuing the hierarchal succession of the family. Although the law decriminalizes alternate sexuality, the absolute right of LGBTQ parenting is still debatable. It is imperative to recognize that the sexual orientation of a parent might not be a viable criterion of determining the doing of ‘emotion’. But legal prospects store limitations of rights and responsibilities in terms of LGBTQ parenting. The Supreme Court in April 2014 recognized the Constitutional Rights of transgender people and allotted them the status of ‘third gender’. However, adoption laws are still a major setback for transgender aspirants. A blog post reflects such position – ‘Rose Ventakesan, a transgender activist based out of Chennai, told HuffPost India that trans- women adopt children but that’s usually an informal kind of adoption…In the absence of the endorsement of law, in most practical situations, legal adoptions are pretty much a far-off dream. The Central Adoption Resource Authority (CARA) website provides an online registration form for couples and single men and women who want to adopt. The applicant category on the page offers just three options for adoptive parents: male, female, couple’ (Dasgupta, 2017, p.1). So, the choices made around parenting eloquently reshape the political, social and economic landscape as the right of parenting also designates ‘whom’ society should recognize as parents.

**CONCEPTUALISING KINSHIP AND SOCIAL PARENTING**

Is ‘motherhood’ a determinant of normative sexual role-relationship? This question can charge varying identities while being reflective through social abnormality. The ontological presence of ‘LGBTQ parenting’ invites a wide degree of alternative opinions and contestations over the family as a social institution. Today, ties of kinship acquired a different meaning apart from the cultural approach which many ethnographers referred to as a focal point of social research. The biological and social relationship, as two axes of kinship, always stood in terms of the hierarchical formation of social structure. The idea of ‘relatedness’ is not only an act of physical inhibition but also subjects to individual consciousness and cognitive identity of familial inheritance. Procreation or the sexual union of man and woman has been attributed in the realm of ‘nature’, extracting explanations for ‘family’ as well as the gendered role of a mother as well as a father. The approach of ‘motherhood’ from the patriarchal system to feminist theories of bodily liberation have not simplified the navigation of biology and the meanings of reproduction. The metaphorical representation of childbirth produces prescriptions for appropriate behavior during pregnancy and labor. The act of ‘mothering’ also shapes extensive life opportunities which have been explored through the cultural approach as being pointed by Mercer and Stainton- ‘The cultural context in which childbirth occurs provides norms that influence attitudes, values, and interpretations of personal and interpersonal
experiences’ (Choudhry, 1997, p.533). Motherhood as an elevation of social status is being recognized as a socially powerful role with the birth of a ‘son’ and eventually culminates into an expectation that a woman will become ‘mother’ one day.

But is it possible to espouse such status for a ‘gay’ or a transgender ‘man’ irrespective of gendered differentiation in roles and sexual orientation? The nurturance of children most likely reflects the domestication of tasks in expectation for women but the concept of ‘home-based task’ or ‘emotion work’ reproduces the status of men in quite an insignificant way. Expression of emotionality reproduces constructed hierarchies and gendered ideologies. If we recapitulate the feminist tradition of the U.S scholars, they criticized the importance women attached to love, which is the exploitative economic bond between men and women. Men find it difficult to change their emotional behaviour and might even find spaces for personal development (Duncombe & Marsden, 1993, pp.229-233). Reclaiming perspectives through the socio-cultural context of India, Habibullah Ansari also ruminated that earlier sons ‘abstained from playing with their own children in front of their parents’ (Ansari, 2011, p.40). This indicated the effective clashes of the public-private domain into the ‘affective’ processes of relationship building and parenting.

It stretches to the point where we can assure possibilities for spaces which terms such as ‘homosexual’ father and mother accrue within the praxis of lived experiences and the political economy of parental arrangements through legalization. It is not possible to assert a unified category to LGBTQ parenting and families as it is also imperative to consider the ‘origin of parenting relationship to the child—firstly, families with children born into previous heterosexual relationships of one or both of the parents (blended families) and secondly, families into which children were born deliberately or were adopted after the parents openly declared their homosexual orientation’ (Polaskova, 2007, p.206). The phenomenon of ‘acceptance’ might release more chances for lesbians in terms of the apparent reproductive processes such as conception, pregnancy and delivery of the baby, requiring less medical attention and legal protocols than a transgender or a gay man involved in parenting. Digital and media discourses have constructed the depiction of non-normative families while juxtaposing the dynamic shift of ‘differential’ relationships and possibilities of motherhood without a womb.

THE LENS OF MEDIA: SOCIO-PATRIARCHY AND EMERGING VOICES

Existential realities often transmit into a circle of power that takes cognizance of consciousness and subjective appellation of individuals not only through the control of external agents but also intrinsic self-knowledge. Individualities of different forms have been objectified through the medium of national cinemas either relegating a discourse of victimization or powerlessness on some groups of people or empowerment for the other. ‘Eunuchs’ - the term often invites metaphors for fear, shame, blame and ambiguity. They remain at the threshold of non-normative sexual orientation which often attracted derisive ridicule through the characters of Indian cinema. Queer umbrella be it in the form of gay, lesbian and transgender survived as figures of joke where many actors either cross-dressed with deliberate soft movements of the hand to be ‘funny’ and added humor to non-prominent roles. Although the screen time for ‘eunuchs’ were less important and rarely added much value, a change in Indian film-making did try to open spaces of possibilities in terms of their lived experiences and personal temperament. The question which emerges now succumbs to – Is it favorable to envisage the identity of one through his/her sexual desires? Can we possibly attempt to construct the role-relationships beyond the categorization of the ‘body’ and its eminent consubstantiation within the psycho-social proximity? The operation of meanings through the reproduction of ‘queer’ stigmatization circulating the patterns of knowledge dissemination in Indian films and media. The ‘hijra’ identity is more eloquently cinematized in the South Asian context and is generally referred to as the ‘culturally acceptable socio-sexually groups of people of the Indian sub-continent (i.e. India, Bangladesh and Pakistan) who do not conform to conventional notions of male-female gender dichotomy but combine or move between the two. ‘Hijras’ are either born intersexed or hermaphrodite and some turn to the ritualistic process of castration performed by a traditional provider, a katial ((Islam Khan, Morshed Khan, Rahman and Gourab, 2016, p.1). Their status inflicted a loss of ‘manhood’ and male sexual ability, subjecting them as effeminate in the notions of power structures and communication. Overlooking aspects of power within the dynamic of sexuality and gendered experiences would be a mere simplified approach.
More often Indian cinematic culture tried to portray ‘hijra’ identity through sexual relationships and rejection. But Mahesh Bhatt in his remarkable film ‘Tamanna’ tried to evoke stories of compassion, familial bond and nurture through the larger than life character of a ‘hijra’ while not additionally highlighting the mere problematic of sexual distortion. The film was released in 1997, a period much before the emergence of ‘queer’ rights and legal conversations. The backdrop of the film is rooted in 1975 where Tiku, a transgender, played by Paresh Rawal, witness a woman leaving a child in the garbage can. After attending his mother’s funeral and wandering being emotionally desolate, he picked up the baby and raised her as his child, Tamanna. Tamanna, played by Pooja Bhatt, portrayed a character of nodal importance, being the lifeline of Tiku. The economic disparity of Tiku is portrayed well through his hardship of being a make-up man to losing out his livelihood with the changing demand of the market. Tiku’s close friend, Salim Bhai, played by Manoj Bajpayee, consistently reiterates the statement - ‘Hijra’s cannot bear children. So how can he be a parent to ‘Tamanna’ legally?’ The juridical framework produces discursive mechanisms of institutionalizing ‘gendered’ spaces and prescriptions, for instance, a power dynamic between a transgender man and a ‘man not being identified as a transgender’vii is well-reflected. If we follow Michel Foucault’s conception of power, he instills it beyond the capacity of agents and analyses it from the point of resistances.Tiku’s struggle to raise a child irrespective of his objective constraints well-establishes Foucault’s view - ‘Power cannot be considered as a function of consent but prior or ‘permanent’ consent (Foucault,2010,p.788). It is through such imposition of consensus itself that power is exercised. In the interplay of actions upon actions, the element of freedom is important to be taken into account as it is only upon free beings that power can be exercised. Power and freedom may not come face to face but freedom may be a prior condition for the exercise of power. Power moves beyond the body of the ‘agent’ to different socio-structural hierarchies in the deployment of several disciplinary discourses.

However, a possibility of change in the meaning of reproduction can be envisaged with the shift in discursive mediums such as the mass media. In the movie ‘Tamanna’, Tiku’s appearance reflects a non-stereotypical image in terms of his dress code such as a simple ‘pajama’vii and shirt with short hair without any braids or exaggeration of costumes. He lives in a community full of men and women, maintaining a cordial relationship with everyone and especially his close confidante, Salim Bhai. He does not have much anticipation for the ‘hijra’ community as he refrains from interacting with them and is not comfortable in considering himself within the community with visible markers of ‘hijra’ identity, such as long hair, colorful sarees and jewellery.Tiku’s character ties around the threads of juxtaposition between acceptance of non-normative identity to non-acceptance of the broader community representing such identity. Tiku portrays resistance by moving out of his traditional role as a member of the ‘hijra’ community such as performing in auspicious occasions generally on birth and marriages. This might have eventually eased his step towards adopting the role of a ‘parent’. The question which broadly surfaces is - Can we unsettle obligations of gender while determining the act of ‘mothering’? Mahesh Bhatt’s piece projected a possibility of deconstructing the notion of mothering and parenthood and redefining it as a concept of ‘love and nurture’ rather than the mere womb. The challenges Tiku faced in bringing up Tamanna have been depicted minutely through each scene of the movie such as playing with small Tamanna to feeding her with milk, making her sleep in hard circumstances and even being angry at her complaints in school. The emotive and cognitive stance has been depicted by Tiku even if he failed to represent ‘femininity’ socio-biologically.

In terms of the theoretical and socio-pragmatic presumption, ‘motherhood’ instilled women as natural caregiver. But at the same time it cannot be constructed as a unified category with a similarity of experiential denotation. Tiku’s motherhood is an affirmation of ‘power and liberty’ in a constrained space where he tried to disentangle the heteronormative notion of kinship, such as, claiming Tamanna to be his sole support and someone to whom he would rely on his ‘burial’. Motherhood might be an experience of joy and contentment even for some who might not be ‘fitted’ to play such role. Conceptualizing Orna Donath’s piece of doing and undoing ‘motherhood’, she synchronizes McMahon and Arendell’s notion ‘That is, there is no sole connotation or unified experience of motherhood and no single emotion that children inspire in their mothers’. (Donath, 2015, p.341). While emotion denotes an internal psychological matter, the struggle of a transgender person through the portrayal of ‘emotion’ in parenting also engulfs socio-cultural context and gendered ethos. Besides, the stigma of ‘reveal’ always stem to reproduce stereotype and fear from non-normativity which has been depicted through a scene in the movie. While Tiku required a room on rent for Tamanna, he adorned the role of a dancer in need of money. In such a coincidence when Tamanna returned home without informing her father and school authorities, she discovered
Tiku’s identity as a ‘transgender’ and added despair, shame and agony over Tiku being her parent. She uttered—‘I cannot be your daughter’, ‘I am ashamed to call him my parent’ and started questioning her identity. A dent in parent’s identity have enough potential to disturb a child’s identity and social status.

But the movie critically rejects the notion of parenthood to be synonymous with heterosexuality through a picturesque of ironic situations- Tamanna’s non-acceptance from her biological heterosexual father who ordered her to be killed for being a ‘girl’ child to acceptance from Tiku who acted as a mother and father to Tamanna. The story also highlights the notion of ‘son preference’ and patriarchal kinship which perpetuates into ‘gender biasness’ and eventually female infanticide with the consent of Tamanna’s biological father. Re-conceptualizing such projections, a transgender parent’s journey can also be established through a child’s responsibility and debunks the essentialism of femininity in prioritizing pregnancy and birth. The directorial piece by Mahesh Bhatt broadened the image of a ‘hijra’ from merely clapping off hands in a certain way to the lived experiences of a transgender person’s life embedded in parenthood and friendship. Tamanna’s legal battle with her biological father to staying with Tiku life-long acquires viewer’s attention to consider the interpretation of ‘parenting’ or ‘mothering’ as beyond the ties of blood and a normalization of adoption facility for single or couple transgenders.

A brief assertion for ‘parenthood’ has also been depicted through the movie ‘Chitrangada: The Crowning Wish’, directed by Rituparno Ghosh which depicts a story of ‘desire’ and ‘transformation’ with a crafted analogy from an excerpt of Mahabharata. Chitrangada’s father, the King of Manipur, received a boon for a son but instead a daughter was born to him, whom he raised as a son. Once on the way to the forest, her eyes fall over Arjuna and she fell in love with him. Then started her journey of desire to transform herself into a beautiful lady and the difficulty of changing her social personality. The ambiguity of choice and identity drew Rudra (Rituparno Ghosh) towards the same tangent where the background of the drama revolves around the character Rudra Chatterjee, a choreographer and theatre artist, dealing with his struggle of being a ‘homosexual’. Rudra over time falls in love with a man Partho, played by Jishu Sengupta, and wants to change his sex for adopting a child. But such ‘desires’ often reflects a metaphor of parody when communicated. While Rudra gave the proposition of changing his sex into that of a ‘female’ and fulfilling the legal protocol of adopting a ‘child’, Partho could not stop his ‘laughter’ stating that ‘A madman doesn’t declare his madness’. Although the drama evoked fewer discussions on the experiences of having a family but still lingers upon the question of ‘Whether one can choose one’s gender and even assert choice of being a ‘mother’. Partho resented Rudra’s idea of ‘artificially turning into a woman’ and the notion of being a ‘mother’ remains quite unacceptable for a ‘homosexual’ man. Chris Brickell in his ‘Sexuality and the Dimensions of Power’ underlines that individual identities are not produced mechanically out of a social structure but ‘one’s sexual world emerges at the intersection of meaning, subjective interpretation and social interaction’ (Brickell, 2009, p.63). Lastly, Rudra decides to discontinue the sex reassignment surgery and just be what he wishes to be. This drama powerfully reproduces and debunks the need for a transitioned ‘body’ in order to move beyond the mythic nexus of sustaining intimate relationships of ‘heterosexuality’ to regret over being a ‘homosexual’.

With the evolving genre and audiences, media industry and legal framework allotted spaces for vocal leadership and non-homogenizing stance in the dynamic of professional and intimate relationships. The turn from mere procreation to substantial romanticism in couple relationships did in turn open claims for gender-neutral roles, parenthood and formation of chosen families.

CONCLUSION: LOCATING ‘EMOTION’

In re-constructing the experience of ‘parenthood’ and ‘mothering’ beyond the stringent limitations of gender, the attempt is to signify ‘emotion’ through the broader scopes of dialectical tensions and personal transformation. ‘Emotion’ and ‘care’ not only provides structures for justification of hierarchies but also might bound one to naturalization and submissiveness. ‘Emotion work’ has the possibility of turning into ‘service work’ for women with culturally acceptable conditions of identity and appropriate rules of feeling in a certain way. But on the other hand, the stigmatization of ‘mothering’ in terms of non-procreative function might constrain the realization and establishment of full rights for the ‘queer’. The structure of ‘emotion’ facilitates different meanings in terms of
doing honorable ‘motherhood’ in a heterosexual relationship to struggle for being a ‘mother’ among the ‘queer’ and subsequently at the intersection of being ‘transgender and lower caste’, ‘gay and lower-caste’, ‘black’ etc.

It is difficult to see unity through perceptions of homogeneity as different heterogeneous forms cannot be accommodated within a single discourse. It should be an interpretative operation to envisage LGBTQ ‘parenthood’ through the lenses of different discursive formations such as medical notions, media and culture. While the historical manifestation of medical knowledge considered homosexuality and transsexuality as a pathological identity and immature sexual impairment, the perception of ‘chosen’ or ‘social’ families was beyond the cognitive conduct of science. The incompatibility of LGBTQ people with possible fertility made spaces for them as ‘other’, intensifying social distancing. But the new assisted reproductive technologies such as surrogacy broadened the options available for ‘parenthood’ irrespective of gender identity. This would encourage more inquiry into the social prism of differential child-bearing and family, revealing more layers into the ‘doing of emotion’.

Similarly, media also manifested a drastic change from projecting ‘queer’ as a matter of ‘comic element’ through the detailing of dress and exaggeration of body movements to shifting stories of rights and social justice. But in terms of legal decisions, several cases of discrimination have been taken in custody decisions and might also lead to the transition of relationships within the family. This has been well resonated through a quoting in ‘Transgender Parenting: A Review of Existing Research’ which mentioned that the main stressors for children during their transgender parent’s “coming out” process were due to tension between the parents and processes of divorce/relationship dissolution that may ensue, rather than stress about the gender transition itself (Stotzer, Herman and Hasenbush, 2014, p.10). The movie ‘Tamanna’ also depicts a point of disclosure when Tamanna finds out about Tiku’s real identity as a transgender, leading to a strain in their relationship for a brief period. This crisis created a sense of normalcy with more capacity of adjustment eventually. On the other hand, ‘Chitrangada: The Crowning Wish’ also reveals a line of contention when Rudra’s parents were disheartened with his decision to undergo sex reassignment surgery. Although Rudra’s character never posed the requirement for something to be ‘hidden’, but his relationships were severely affected by his choice of becoming a ‘woman’ pseudo-biologically.

This article illuminates transition from the discourses of historical propositions to interpretative contemporary spaces of ‘emotion’ and ‘mothering’. The extending possibilities of ‘parenthood’ led to an evolving pattern of relationship between the parent-child and adaptability of varying parenting experiences and challenges among different groups of people. The circulation of emotions determines what one produces might have a viable chance of affecting the others. If the ideology of ‘mothering’ is rooted through the socio-cultural paradigm, then a shift from the conventional norms of ‘emotion’ might reveal more importance of LGBTQ parenting and lead to more impetus on LGBTQ families, foster care and adoption systems. It should cater more to the ‘choice’ of becoming parents and the diversified forms of social parenting. A further inquiry can be instigated into the techniques of new assisted fertility and its degree of approval for the LGBTQ people within speech, silence and processes of life.

**NOTES**

i LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning); Retrieved from -https://gaycenter.org/about/lgbtq/

ii The family is natural because it was established by the Creator as a “universal community based on the marital union of a man and a woman” and “the fountain and cradle of new life, the natural refuge for children, and the first and foremost school to teach the values necessary for the well-being of children and society”; See World Family Declaration- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 16 (3) for more information.

iii LGBTQ refers to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning. This term might have a positive connotation in terms of its association with social movements of acceptance and human rights.
Gay is an adjective, not a noun; it is sometimes used as a shorthand term encompassing gay, lesbian and bisexual orientations (though not transgender people or gender identity). Also, while many lesbians may identify as gay, the term lesbian(s) is clearer when talking only about a woman or women. See Movement Advancement Project (2017) for more information on terminologies.

A man who had his testicles removed (Cambridge English Dictionary). Although the criteria might vary.

The term has been used to demarcate the relationship of superiority and dominance which persists in some form or the other between a man identified as ‘heterosexual’ and a ‘transsexual’ person. The phrase ‘man not being identified as a transgender’ would refrain one from highlighting the mere sexual conditioning of a person and universal connotations.

Soft and loose garments originating from the Indian subcontinent.

‘Mothering’ as a term has been used to determine mothering practices such as childcare and familial duties beyond the mere idea of conjugality.
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