ties in accordance with the norms and regimes of British morality. Like colonial powers to govern and tame racialized unruly bodies and sexualities, “disgust,” and “immorality,” the law was introduced by the colonialists and brought into effect in India in 1861. Framed around themes of “revulsion,” “irrational,” and “unconstitutional,” the five judges unanimously agreed that Section 377 attempts to pinkwash the violence of Hindu nationalism and the appropriation of the decolonizing discourse with regards to homosexuality.

After decades of hard work, struggle, grassroots and legal activism by queer communities (and their allies), the arrival of the judgement on 6 September 2018, when the Supreme Court of India decriminalized consensual sex between adults of the same sex, was a monumental text. This cannot be decried as a return to Victorian morality, for sure. Indeed, by ending the 158-year-old ban on “carnal intercourse against the order of nature,” the Supreme Court ruling is, indeed, a crucial milestone in India’s shedding of its colonial legacies.

The Supreme Court ruling is a monumental text. This cannot be decried as a return to Victorian morality, for sure. Indeed, by ending the 158-year-old ban on “carnal intercourse against the order of nature,” the Supreme Court ruling is, indeed, a crucial milestone in India’s shedding of its colonial legacies. Pre-colonial India, therefore, should never be the yardstick for measuring India’s decoloniality. Indeed, overturning colonial laws does not necessarily indicate an anti-imperialist turn in India’s treatment of its minorities, and a solely anti-imperialist reading of the verdict does much to obscure the realities of life under a Hindu supremacist government.

Take occupied Kashmir, the world’s largest militarized zone, and the northeastern state of Assam as examples of colonized territories suffocated by laws granting the Indian army and government-backed militia both extraordinary powers to put down separatist movements as well as immunity from prosecution. In recent years, India’s brutality in these regions has brought it closer to Israel, the two, after all, have much in common: policing national security threats, a dependent media, and laws enabling police brutality. In 2016 alone, Israel arms sales to India, which included surveillance drones, bombs, and missiles, reached $1.6 billion. Since 2003, Israel has also provided Indian forces with training in counter-insurgency operations and security methods. In fact, the tactics used by Indian forces in these regions are remarkably similar to those Israel employs in the occupied Palestinian territories: arbitrary arrests, extra-judicial killings, enforced disappearances, curfews, collective punishment, administrative detention, torture, rape, and sexual abuse, the suppression of freedom of speech and assembly, house demolitions, and so forth. The fear, felt by many queer activists and their allies, is that gay rights will be used by Hindu ideologues to perversely and divert attention from such repressive and authoritarian practices. It is on the killing fields of Kashmir and Assam that the “world’s largest democracy” and the “Middle East’s only democracy” have found each other.

The Supreme Court ruling is a monumental text. This cannot be decried as a return to Victorian morality, for sure. Indeed, by ending the 158-year-old ban on “carnal intercourse against the order of nature,” the Supreme Court ruling is, indeed, a crucial milestone in India’s shedding of its colonial legacies. Pre-colonial India, therefore, should never be the yardstick for measuring India’s decoloniality. Indeed, overturning colonial laws does not necessarily indicate an anti-imperialist turn in India’s treatment of its minorities, and a solely anti-imperialist reading of the verdict does much to obscure the realities of life under a Hindu supremacist government.