

## FROM WOMB TO TOMB: TRANSFORMATION INTERROGATED

ANANDITA BISWAS

**Abstract:** The transformation-from 'wild' to the 'civilized', 'forest' to the 'decorousness' and 'unsophisticated' to the 'domesticated' refers not to any transformation of barbarian or slave but of woman-'nature's default gender'(Oakley, 1972). However, the referred dichotomous binary represents in reality, the condition of both women and slave. Sita to Draupadi, Hetal Parekh to Bilkis Banu, transformation is in a labyrinthine oblivion. The outrageous, bloodthirsty and wild Goddess Kali occupies the undomesticated forest while her another incarnation Gauri is tender and sophisticated positioning herself in the domestic realm. The unclenching of Draupadi, is not merely the unclenching of a woman, it represents the collapse of civilization, the transformation from field to the forest, from Gauri to Kali, where dharma is abandoned and *matsya nyaya* reigns supreme (Pattanaik, 2010).

**Introduction:** Three thousand years ago, a woman cried and yelled:

*I have no husbands, no sons, no brothers, no father, no relatives, not even you, Madhusudana. As if free from all grief, you all stood by while vile men insulted me.*

Draupadi, not only through supernatural intervention saves herself from the indignation of virile men but also protects her husbands from further humiliation. *Menstruating tormented and trembling, with blood flowing, and wearing but one garment, I was dragged into the assembly of the Kurus...*

Another 'virtuous woman', at another point of history abandoned her life after repeated throttling and character assassination by her husband. She committed ritual suicide. She takes an oath:

*Since I have never thought of any other man but Rama, let the Goddess Madhavi [the Earth] split open before me.*

Either you stand disgraced and stripped off or you end up your life, your much awaited, expected and desired longing for respect and dignity will be at a bay. Here Sita no more represents the wife of the husband Rama, but a servant; Draupadi, no more bejeweled the crown of the Hastinapur, but stood there as a slave in a blood stained, blood-thirsty "wild" apparition. The much adorned and revered heavenly marital relation between Sita and Rama, the exquisite espousal between Draupadi and her five husbands stand repudiated and questioned. The avenging longiloquence and repeated ascertainment of 'dharma' represent not just a mere 'refusal of order' but portrays an expression of counter-aggression against a figure of authority. The counter aggression and interrogation is still continuing, even after three thousand years of women's emancipatory schema.

After three thousand years down the line, a woman and her friend board a bus after a sweet reminiscent moment not knowing some hungry, lustful and vile men are awaiting to 'torment and feed' her like a beast. Those men dragged her to the rear of the bus, beating her with an iron rod and raping her while the driver continued driving, crossing and trampling over

all ethics and humanity. After all, the food is a woman's 'body'. Medical reports of the 23 year old paramedical student confirmed that she suffered serious injuries to her abdomen, intestines and genital due to the assault and doctors further clarified that the damage indicated that a rusted wheel jack handle might have been used for penetration. Reports further stated, that one of the accused men admitted to have seen a 'rope-like' object, assumed to be her intestine being pulled out by other assailants. This time there was no supernatural intervention to save her bodily integrity and protect her self-identity.

*We had fed the heart on fantasies.*

*The Heart's grown brutal from the fare,*

*More substance in our enemies*

*Than in our love; W.B. Yeats*

The heinous act and bestiality demonstrated by those men took the nation and the world off-guard. To many, this incident opened the era of a new world without morality.

The very female body is a contested arena all over the world. It is manufactured diversely in various contexts yet it is maintained and maimed as a site where power is enacted. The body is however, very much personal but the meaning and constructions attached to it are socially and culturally determined. Body as a biological object was an instrument to be directed and also as a means of distraction to be controlled.

Early feminists like Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and Harriet Taylor Mill (1807-1858) in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, looked at the concept of 'body' with suspicion. It was however, due to the time frame and historical context that compelled them to consider their bodies as commodities groomed and maintained, to

enable them to lure men into matrimonial alliance in order to secure material means to live, "so that he may fall in love with one them..." Jane Austen's characterization of Mrs. Bennet actually transcends the anxiety of a mother in all ages, time and space. "The business of her life was to get her daughters

married...an unmarried man of large fortune-four or five thousand pounds a year. What a fine thing for our girls" (Austen, 1999).

Women's attention to their bodies took the form of 'manufacturing' them as objects for others' appraisal and the precariousness which Wollstonecraft imagined have been resurrected in feminist work up to the present day. Wollstonecraft's 1792 text, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* is simply a reflection of 'disciplining of the female body.' "To preserve personal beauty, is woman's glory. The limbs and faculties are cramped with worse than Chinese bands, and the sedentary life which they are condemned to live, whilst boys frolic in the open air, weakens the muscles...artificial notions of beauty, and false descriptions of sensibility have been early entangled with her motives of action" (Wollstonecraft, 1988).

Women's propinquity with body/nature is substantiated by biological essentialist and determinist paradigms that define woman according to her reproductive physiology. She is therefore languid and acquiescent, receptacle for the desires of the male and incubator for his offspring; she is a creature driven by emotion and instinct and a slave to her reproductive organs/hormones.

The body of a woman is an arena of extreme power-play. It is a site etched with culturally and socially determined practices and norms. Susan Bordo (1947) highlights that it was feminism that first inverted the old metaphor of the 'body politic' to the 'politics of the body':

"The human body is itself a politically inscribed entity, its physiology and morphology shaped by histories and practices of containment and control" (Bordo, 1993).

According to feminists, women have been subjected essentially through the medium of their 'bodies'. Moreover, ideologies centering gender and sexist reasoning emanate from perceived biological differences between the sexes substantiated by dualistic paradigms that have dominated political thought from the philosopher of Greece to the Enlightenment and which are still continuing. Judith Butler (1956) one of the most important contemporary theorists of deconstructive feminism questions the established notion of "femaleness" which is taken for granted in society. Butler argues that gender distinctions are valid only if we accept a social system based on binary oppositions i.e. seeing woman as opposed to man; "feminine" as the opposite of "masculine" (Janainati & Groves, 2013).

Women being restricted to the 'private' domain and considered as "non-rational" is not deduced from any philosophy but patriarchal assumptions. The presumption of 'men' and 'women' as 'opposites' is substantiated by antithetical categories like 'mind-

body', 'culture-nature', 'spirit-matter'. In the mind-body categorization and consequent codification, mind is separated from the body, where the body is conceived of merely as the crude vessel of the more "intellectual" mind. Mind and reason are considered to be superior to the emotions and senses and therefore, delineated from one another. Man is superior as he represents mind and therefore, culture: the rational, unified, thinking subject. On the other hand, woman is body and thus portrays nature: irrational, emotional and guided by instinct and physical requirement. Thus, mind i.e. culture i.e. men should 'control' and 'program' the unruly body i.e. nature/ women through mechanisms of knowledge and power.

Early thinking about the difference between men and women was firmly based on some essentialist conviction about gender that posited the obvious classification between men and women on ground of biology. The precept that biology is destiny exhibits the fact that in comparable situations, men portray "masculine" psychological traits like aggressiveness, rationality and assertiveness and women exhibit "feminine" traits such as gentleness, intuitiveness and sensitivity. These differentiation based on "biology" led to the construction and gradual establishment of certain patterns of thought, feeling and behavior specific to each gender" (Janainati & Groves, 2013).

Essentialism perceives men as able to think logically, abstractly and analytically and women are primarily emotional, compassionate and nurturing creature. Essentialist doctrine led to the extreme compartmentalization of woman's and man's domain. It has repercussions on women's private and public life. In private, the essentialist doctrine led to the establishment of rules of conduct for women as wife, mother and daughter. And in the public domain, it was believed that women's participation must be limited and strictly controlled by masculine representation of authority like the husband, father, clergy and law (Janainati & Groves, 2013).

The history of differential treatment of women can be traced back to ancient Greece. Plato (427-347 BC) did not discriminate on the basis of sex in his agenda of education and determination on the selection of vocation on the basis of natural endowment. He in fact, suggested same kind of education in his *The Republic* for a boy and a girl, so that women like men could become guardians, philosophers-rulers. He too, however, possessed strongly some essentialist understanding of woman as a category. While justifying his stand of woman as guardians, he exemplifies that female dog as good guard (Vinod & Deshpande, 2013). Aristotle (384-322 BC) outrightly denied citizenship to women on the belief that they lacked in deliberative capacity. He declared that "women were women by virtue of a certain lack of

qualities.” He even went to the extent of saying “modest silence is woman’s crown.” Excluding women from public space denies them their right to interact with other men and women which is a gross human right violation. This marginalization and petrified subjugation deprive them of discussion, rationalization, questioning, partaking or influencing the decision-making process of men. This exclusion of females who are considered as incapable of holding public decision-making process relegates them to the sphere of “domestic alone.” This is nothing but an extreme case of intellectual exploitation and monopolization of space. Women are still considered: “Frailty, Thy Name is Women!”

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) Hamlet

In a patriarchal set-up, with culturally assigned subordinate status and in a relationship dominated by men, even if women were to perform what men perceive as a “masculine function”, it is bound to be resisted. Thus, even today, the Haryanvi males with regard to the participation of women in the public sphere (in army) comment:

“Ab yeh keh rahe hain ki ladkiyon ko bhi fauj mein bharti ker do...Bhai voh mahina apna mahavari sambhalegi ya bachchon ko sambhalegi ya fauj mein ladayee karegi, bandook uthayegi...Bilkul dimaag kharab ker diya hai inhone...”

(Now the demand is that the girls must be recruited in the army. Brother, you tell me would these girls be able to manage their menstruation every month and look after their children, or pick up the gun and fight in the army? Surely, they are out of their minds) (Chowdhury, 2014).

In a thoughtful article published in the Economic and Political Weekly by Maithreyi Krishnaraj (Krishnaraj, 2008) an important aspect of gender discourse came into limelight. Some years ago, Ann Oakley wrote a book, ‘Sex Gender and Society’ (Oakley, 1972). She elucidated how the basic ground plan of the human body is a female one, even if at the conception, the chromosomes may be XY rather than XX. The primary ingredient to the making of a male is the supply of the male hormone or androgen (testosterone) after the first few weeks of pregnancy. Until eight weeks old, every foetal brain looks female. Thus, female is nature’s default gender setting. A huge testosterone surge beginning in the eighth week will change the unisex brain by killing off some cells in communication centers and growing new more cells in the sex and aggression centers (Oakley, 1972). Brizendine, a medical doctor illustrates that female brain has more of those “circuits” that signify a predominance of affective qualities while the male brain is “deficient” in these and therefore has greater concentration on the logical and abstract thinking. Therefore, women have proclivity of nurturing, tenderness, and more concerned with relationships

while men have leanings for more abstract thought. However, biology do not predetermines the gendered roles.

“One is not born woman,

One becomes this.” Simone de Beauvoir (1908-86)

It is the social norms and customs that impose sex specific behavior. Experience, practice and interaction with others modify neurons and brain wiring. Individuals modify their life experience, imposed on the mind by meaning external to which undergoes the gradual process of internalization by the brain. Individuals gradually are moulded and etched by social institution and culture that override biological edifice. From the very ‘womb’ and thereafter infancy, boys and girls are treated differently (through prenatal sex discernment) and are indoctrinated into the belief system of gender specified role being subsumed by perceptions, beliefs and values that structures and manufactures the adult men and women with their specified gender baggage.

The body, according to Foucault ever remains a foci for power and female body or the ‘women’ has been consciously condemned to be inferior and thus need to contained, controlled and to a great extent subjugated through the use of special disciplinary techniques legitimized by political, social and economic forces. Time and again, ‘womanliness’ has been judged and measured as something as ‘victims of a pathological physiology (Balsamo, 1996) or as “misbegotten male” (Tseelon, 1995) or even as “the ‘other half’ necessary evils for reproduction” (Bailey, 1993). Even if we look into medical or other sciences women’s subjectivity has been legitimized and have tried to comment and prescribe since 19th century about which activities are suitable for them or even on their dressing and fashion to preserve the so called ‘womanliness’ and also about preserving precious energy for giving birth to healthy child. What I have tried to show here is to point out its role playing as an agency of social control and determination of social identity which according to Foucault is imagination of ‘the hysterization of women’s bodies’ (Foucault, 1998). There is an intricate relationship between Foucault’s analysis on power, body and sexuality which expands in the form of disciplinary power which is often exercised and experienced not only in the domain of politics but reaches to the very intimate levels to the multi level forms of social control over the body and mind of women at large. Thus it is quite evident that Foucault’s concept of power emanates at the very micro level power relations, where power percolates within the social body and can be grasped at local levels and experienced within day to day practices what Nancy Fraser rightly argues it to be the ‘politics of everyday life’. Sawicki also commented on this argument and

analyzed power relation and politics which are best experienced “in the institutions of marriage, motherhood and compulsory heterosexuality, in the ‘private’ relationships to themselves and their bodies (Sawicki, 1998). Nancy Fraser on the other hand argues that Foucault’s theory of power and its analysis towards eyeing the problems in this respect “widens the arena within which people may collectively confront, understand and try to change the character of their lives” (Fraser, 1989).

Foucault’s theories have been of much relevance to feminism as it challenged the paradigms of western thought of Enlightenment. He critiqued the classical ways of thinking about the subject as a rational, unified being with a fixed core or essence, arguing that “Nothing in man-not even his body-is sufficiently stable to serve as a basis for self recognition or for understanding other men” (Foucault, 1991). There is no ‘natural’ body or pre-discursive, essential human subject which is “amputated; repressed; altered to a whole technique of forces and bodies” (Foucault, 1995). However, the cultural insistence on a male/female dichotomy reduces the female body in relation to the male automatically leads to more rigorous policing of women’s (docile) bodies and specific apparatuses of control.

Women as ‘the other’ is inferior become the ‘unknowable, enigmatic and disquieting’ creature as well. She represents the subordinate being that must be investigated and dissected until her secrets are laid bare open and divulged. The female body has been subjected to pass through the scrutinizing gaze of the human sciences that led to the ‘pathologising’ of the female body.

The ‘culture’ has been especially concerned with highlighting differences spectacularly on the body by repeatedly drawing attention to the arenas of ‘otherness’ such as breasts, waist, buttocks and hips. Women as ‘the other’ of men were and are still decorated with ornamented surface that entails enormous amount of discipline, implantation, inoculation, grooming under the ever assertive surveillance of patriarchal culture and male gaze.

“Kumari chapi panchali vedimadhyat samutthita  
Subhaga darshaniyangi vedimadhya manorama  
Syama padmalasaksi nilakunchita murdhaja  
Manusam vigraham kritva saksad amara varnini  
Nilopalasamo gandho yasyah krosat pravayati  
Ya bibharti param rupam yasya nasty upama bhuvi”  
(Bhattacharya, 2013)

Draupadi’s entrance into the Great epic focuses not on her intrinsic qualities or her dynamic intellectualism rather emphasis is on her physical appearance.

(Moreover, the princess from Pancala rose up from the middle of the sacrificial fire. She was beautiful

and enchanting; she had a lovely body and a waist the shape of the sacrificial altar. She was dark, had eyes like lotus leaves, and dark, wavy hair. She was a goddess who had taken on a human form. Her scent, like that of a blue lotus, perfumed the air for the distance of a mile. She possessed the most beautiful figure; none was her equal on earth.)

Vyasa had categorically mentioned that the “creator” had so fashioned her that her loveliness transcended the ‘beauty of all existential entities. The kings in the svayamvara hall were portrayed as so tormented by the arrows of desire that even friends hated each other’.

Patriarchy and consequent commoditization is thus responsible for constructing a social system that ascribes a particular sexual status, role and temperament for each gender resulting in sex/gender hierarchy. ‘Masculine’ traits are attributed to dominant social roles and ‘feminine’ is associated with submission and dependence. If she is ‘deviant’, she deserves to be punished and that punishment is sanctioned by religious scriptures, social fatwas and cultural norms. Imrana, for instance, had been the victim of the practice of haraam (prohibited). Religious leaders who constituted the panchayat of her husband’s village, Charthawal passed the judgment that as Imrana had been raped by her father-in-law, Mehboob Ali, she is not allowed to live with her husband anymore as she had become his “mother” after the rape and that she would have to divorce him (Tripathi, 2007). It has become a general practice that rape victims are made to marry the rapist clarifying that it punishes the perpetrator. It also substantiated another practice that the child born out of such union (violence) gets a name- the father’s name and therefore an identity. The person who denigrates the bodily integrity of the woman is ‘ordered’ to become her husband. The life destroyer is perceived as the life savior. The woman is now compelled to spend her whole life with the most dreadful man with the most gruesome memory. Isn’t this a further punishment to the woman?

Beauvoir illustrates how a woman experiences her ‘body’ throughout the different stages of her life. In childhood, the young girl’s body is experienced in a different way from that of a young boy. He is encouraged to climb trees and play rough games. She is encouraged to treat herself as a puppet, “a passive object...an inert given object” and inculcates in her the techniques to please others. It is just the beginning of the way in which women live their bodies as objects for another’s gaze, something which has its origin not in anatomy but in “education and surroundings”. The consequence of living a body as an object of another’s gaze is an inhibited intentionality, her spontaneous movements inhibited, “the exuberance of life...restrained” ...“lack



of physical power” leading to a “general timidity”. Beauvoir’s description of the way in which women experience and live their bodies in such an objectified way, internalizing the gaze of the other and producing their bodies as objects for others, has been one of the most important contributions to the study of body politics.

Undoubtedly, feminist writers have drawn attention to the way in which dominant discourse in society prescribes norms in relation to which subjects regulate their bodies and those of others.

“Our bodies are trained, shaped and impressed with the prevailing historical form of...masculinity and femininity” (Bordo, 2003).

By strict rules of dieting, makeup, exercise, dress and cosmetic surgery, women try to sculpt their bodies into shapes that reflect the dominant societal norms. These disciplinary practices impose the structuring of appropriate gendered bodies and also sometimes endanger bodily integrity.

Andrea Dworkin writes “in our culture not one part of women’s body is left untouched, unaltered...From head to toe, every feature of a woman’s face, every section of her body, is subject to modification” (Dworkin, 1974) clarification, imposition and sometimes grave humiliation. Every aspect of female body is controlled, contained, formulated and maimed in accordance with the patriarchal omnipresent dispensation.

Very often, women’s identification with their bodies and its physical manifestation results in suppression and denial of rights to emotional, mental, psychological and physical spaces. This segmentation between ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’, compartmentalization between mind and body, segregation between the ‘intellectual’ and the ‘crude’ leads to loss of ‘personhood’, loss of control and autonomy over their bodies and of course, eradication of bodily integrity. Women live in continuous threat of violence are discriminated against and exploited, are denied their right to spatial mobility, right to make informed choices over their bodies and sexuality (Mathur, 2008).

The revelation of the bare thigh by Duryodhana or the derogatory remark by Karna referring Draupadi as a ‘whore’, the disrobing, and the abduction by Jayadratha and the lascivious gesture by Kichaka pathetically transgresses bodily integrity and human dignity. The perpetrators of the rape in Delhi expressed verbal contempt for the young woman’s autonomy and freedom to choose to travel with a male friend at night. Their bestial violence was both a punishment for the transgression.

Perhaps the extreme form of disciplining the ‘unruly’, is to deny life because of gender. Despite laws and increase in educational and economic levels, female foeticide is increasing in certain regions of our

country. Foeticide is one of the most inhuman and brutal acts. However, under the Indian Penal Code, the crime against the unborn is not considered as a crime. But the Vedas had considered it as murder. Abortion is traditionally considered the worst of crimes not only because it involves the killing of an unborn innocent but also it denies an ancestor a chance to be reborn (Pattanaik, 2010). Thus, Ashwatthama, was delivered the worst punishment meted out by God for killing the unborn baby of Uttara.

Around 50 men in each of Haryana’s 7000 villages have no prospect of finding a bride locally and the crowding of bachelors happen between the ages of 20 and 29 (Kaur, 2014). The conjecture that these young men have high testosterone levels is one of the causes of violence against women. In fact, more and more people are choosing sex-selective abortion rather than female infanticide. Even, accidentally, when a baby girl is born, she faces, invariably some tortuous suffering by her parents and relatives. Deprivation of basic necessities of life for mere survival is denied to her. Food, education and sometimes even shelter are denied to her. Either she is married off or sold to a pimp where her next innings of drudgery creeps in. Cruelty by husband and his relatives account for the highest number of crimes against woman. Indian marriages have become economic transactions between families. There exist “open auction” and “fixed rates” for prospective grooms. In 1995, the UNDP introduced two new indices: a Gender-related Development Index (GDI) and a Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM). The GEM focuses on opportunities and concentrates on gender inequality in three key areas: political participation and decision-making power, economic participation and decision-making power and power over economic resources. Development index tends to presume that areas having higher gender equality ensure development of women. However, if we go by this parameter, we will certainly get enmeshed into the mathematical conjuration and statistical chicanery. Surely, gender equality index confirms equitable men-women ratio but it does not at all reflect the psychological and mental doldrums a woman undergoes in her everyday life experience. The fear psychosis, the psychological trauma, the convulsive petrified existence in nowhere ensures the development of women. The humanistic dimension of development must therefore, focus on visible and significant change in people’s circumstances. Development entails high degree of capacity, equity, empowerment, sustainability and inter-dependence. Development, when perceived through the prismatic panorama of gender discourse challenges all other established well-fashioned development genres. If a woman is able to survive at all then only the notion of

development can bear any significant meaning. If she is dead in the womb of her mother, there comes no opportunity for her to develop and for the theoreticians to indulge in intellectual cogitation.

Impunity is the established norm when it comes to violent crimes against women in India. Brutality and cruelty enacted on the bodies of women is quotidian in its nature. In the infamous Naroda Patiya case, one perpetrator Suresh confessed:

“If fruits (saying for girls) were lying, the hungry would eat it. In any case, she (the Muslim girl) was to be burnt hence somebody might have ate (eaten) the fruit...Even I had raped one girl-named Nasimo...I raped on roof and then thrown (threw) her from there. I smashed her, cut her to pieces like achar (pickle)” (Narain, 2014).

Horrendous atrocity committed against Nasimo or ripping apart of the stomach of the pregnant Kaushar Bano by Babu Bajrangji during Gujarat pogrom is nothing but the mirror reflection of extreme atrocities committed against women. The ghastly ‘iron-rod’ tragedy is not ‘exceptional’ but a recurrent incident in deluge of bodily integrity. Even in death, a woman can’t rest in peace. There are people like Riyaz Ahmed ready to dig out corpse with the purpose to impose the masculine penetration in order to subvert women’s autonomy denigrating honour even at death. Both women and men become accustomed in relation to these practical ideologies, rape myths (such as ‘women who were short skirts and tight tops are asking for trouble’) serve to sustain gendered relations of power. The assailants of the rape in Delhi expressed verbal verbosity for the young woman’s autonomy and freedom ‘who dared to choose to travel with a male friend at night’. The penetration of the iron and the pulling out of the intestine was a “punishment” for the transgression and a means to show the victim her ordained place in the social order (Kazi, 2013). The brutality confirms the presence the deep-rooted hatred towards women, particularly those women who dare to cross the boundaries. They are seen as “free for all” and everyone puts on themselves the responsibility of the custody of women’s morality and that they have a right to “teach them a lesson”. When the dominant

culture tacitly sanctions rapes, when society considers women subordinate to men and the gargantuan judicial system can be subverted with money power, rapes will continue to happen and characterized by impunity where development of women will be at a bay and freedom will be a farce. Feminist theorists affirm that rape is only one symptom of the larger problem of a male dominated society (Cahill, 2001). Feminists perceive rape more as a violent mode of action than simply a sexual act. Rape is committed by political motivations to dominate and degrade. According to them, rape is “nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear” (Cahill, 2001:16). Rape serves the function of “ensure[ing] the continued and necessary protection of women by men” (Cahill, 2001: 17). As women face the fear of being raped, they automatically become dependent on men to protect them (Cahill, 2001).

Transformation is a far cry. Until and unless, the female body is considered to be human body with a soul and a mind that responds to affection, love and compassion and repulse at humiliation, torture and subjugation, there will be no transformation whatsoever. A one year old baby girl or a seventy year old nun, the self-respect, self-esteem and dignity of every woman human being is being trampled upon. Before transformation of women, interrogation and transformation of societal norms, culture, taboos, and rules of conduct, mores, and customs is of urgent necessity and a rigorous self assessment by women is also of utmost exigency.

A Woman having no fault of hers, by prophetic conspiracy owns five husbands invites, extreme humiliation and dishonor of a ‘whore’ and a woman crossing her ‘laxman rekha’ enters the public domain at a nocturnal hemisphere circumscribed by societal rules and regulation invites severe and extreme brutality on her ‘self’ and bodily integrity. Transformation is still a distant dream. Transformation will certainly come. And it will come through tremendous interrogation of discourses and overhauling of the entire patriarchal lordship.

### References:

1. Austen, J. (1990). ‘Pride and Prejudice’, *Collected Works*, Penguin Books, Madrid.
2. Dr. Muktha Manoj Jacob, Teaching English Language Through Literature; Social Sciences international Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 2 Issue 2 (2016), Pg 15-18
3. Bailey, M.E. (1993). ‘Foucauldian Feminism Contesting bodies, sexuality and identity’, in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.), *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and Feminism*, Routledge, London.
4. Balsamo, A. (1996). *Technologies of the Gendered Body: Reading Cyborg Women*, Duke University Press, London.
5. Farhana Khatoon, Post-Independence Educational Development Among Muslims in Urban India: An Estimates of the National Sample Survey Data;

- Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 2 Issue 1 (2016), Pg 206-210.
6. Priyanka Pain, The New Woman Question: the Revolt Beyond and Behind Closed Doors; Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 2 Issue 1 (2016), Pg 8-11.
  7. Bartky, S. (1990) *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*, Routledge, New York
  8. Bhattacharya, D. (2013). *Mahabharater Nari* (in Bengali), Anondo, Calcutta.
  9. Bordo, S. (2003). *Unbearable Weight: Feminism Western Culture and the Body*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
  10. Cahill, Ann (2001). *Rethinking rape*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
  11. Chowdhury, P. (2014). 'Masculine Spaces in Rural Male culture in North India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 49 No. 47, p. 41.
  12. Dworkin, A. (1974). *Women Hating*, Dutton, New York.
  13. Baijnath Kumar Paswan, Rural Women Enterprise: Shg institutions Have Vital Role in Food Production To Improve Health Nutrition; Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 1 Issue 1 (2016), Pg 8-17
  14. Noorazlan Maa, Siti Suriawati Isa, Azlizam Aziz, An Application of Ecoserv Model in Assessing Perceived Service Quality in Outdoor Recreation Programs Towards Private Outdoor Recreation Operator; Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 1 Issue 2 (2016), Pg 14-21
  15. Foucault, Michel (1991). 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History' in P. Rainbow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*, Penguin, London.
  16. Dr. Dhishna Pannikot, Implications of Gender Studies: Studying Male, Female and The Third Genders; Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 2 Spl Issue (2016), Pg 9-11
  17. (1995). 'Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison', in Alan Sheridan (trans.), Allen Lane: London.
  18. (1998). 'The History of Sexuality Volume 1: The Will to Knowledge' (Translated by Robert Hurley, Random House 1978) Penguin, London.
  19. Fraser, N. (1989). 'Unruly Practices: power, discourse and gender in contemporary social theory', Polity Press, Cambridge.
  20. Janainati, C. and Groves, J. (2013). *Introducing Feminism*, Icon Books Ltd, London.
  21. Kaur, R. (2014). 'Sex Ratio, Khaps and Marriage Reform', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 49, No. 31, p. 18.
  22. Kazi, S. (2013). 'State of the Nation', *Frontline*, Vol. 30 No. 1, p.133.
  23. Krishnaraj, M. (2008). 'Between Public and Private Morality', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 43 No. 17, p. 43.
  24. Kymlicka, W. (2015). *Contemporary Political Philosopher: An Introduction*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
  25. Mathur, K. (2008). 'Body as Space, Body as Site: Bodily Integrity and Women's Empowerment in India' *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 43 No. 17, p. 54.
  26. Dr. Bratati Hore, Reflection of Bangladesh Liberation War, 1971 in the Memoirs of Two Women Writers; Social Sciences international Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 2 Issue 2 (2016), Pg 12-14
  27. Narrain, Arvind (2014). 'Sexual Violence and the Death Penalty', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 38-41.
  28. Neha Bhushan, Tsunami of Opinion on Social Media: 'My Choice' Video; Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 2 Issue 1 (2016), Pg 5-7
  29. Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, Gender and Society*, Templeton and Smith, London, (1985). Reprint
  30. Pattanaik, D. (2010). *Jaya Mahabharata*, Penguin Books, New Delhi.
  31. Sawicki, J. (1998). 'Feminism, Foucault and "Subjects" of Power and Freedom' in J. Moss (ed.), *The Later Foucault: politics and philosophy*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, London.
  32. Tripathi, P. (2007). 'Joining forces', *Frontline*, Vol. 24 No. 2, p. 108.
  33. Tseelon, E. (1995). *The Masque of Fertility: The Presentation of Women in Everyday Life*, Sage, London.
  34. Vinod, M.J. and Deshpande, M. (2013). *Contemporary Political Theory*, PHI, Delhi.
  35. Wollstonecraft, M. (1988). 'A Vindication of the Rights of Women', in A. Rossi, (ed.), *The Feminist Papers*, Northeastern University Press, California.
  36. Mandira Rajan Ravindran, An Analysis of Conversation in Hindi of individuals With Down Syndrome; Social Sciences International Research Journal ISSN 2395-0544 Vol 1 Spl Issue (2016), Pg 15-17

Anandita Biswas

Assistant Professor, Political Science, Diamond Harbour Women's University