

1. Gender, Gender Bias and Manifestations

Gender

Gender is a distinction of biological and/or physiological characteristics typically associated with either males or females of a species in general. In the study of humans, socio-political issues arise in classifying whether a sex difference results from the biology of gender. This article focuses on quantitative differences which are based on a gradient and involve different averages. For example, men are taller than women on average, but an individual woman may be taller than an individual man. The existence of a gender difference does not necessarily identify whether the trait is due to nature or environment. Some traits are obviously innate (for example, reproductive organs), others obviously environmental (for example, given names), while for others the relationship is either multi-cause or unknown.

Daniel Dennett says "modern humans have inherited natural traits that were adaptive in a prehistoric environment; including traits that had different advantages for males versus females" (25). Evolutionary theory of sex considers gender differences as a result of distinct specialization of the sexes, performing relationship with preceding generations and with the environment. Theory explains ethological and psychological sexual dimorphism, more efficient 'education' or 'training' of females during the course of ontogenetic adaptation as well as greater conformism of females well known to psychologists. Gender role theory and Alice Eagly claims that "boys and girls learn the appropriate behavior and attitudes from the family and overall culture they grow up with, and so non-physical gender differences are a product of socialization" (110). These are not all mutually exclusive theories: it is possible that gender differences are partially innate but are then reinforced and exaggerated by the environment. Some feminists see gender differences as caused by

patriarchy or discrimination, although difference feminism argues for an acceptance of gender differences. Conservative masculinists tend to see gender differences as inherent in human nature, while liberal masculinists see gender differences as caused by patriarchy or discrimination.

Gender Identity

Gender identity is a person's own sense of identification as male or female. The term is intended to distinguish this psychological association, from physiological and sociological aspects of gender. Gender identity is how one personally identifies as or her gender regardless of his or her sex characteristics. It does not have to be either man or woman, but can be a combination of feminine, masculine and androgynous feelings. However, it is now thought that the innate gender identity, although powerfully influenced by the sex of the genitalia and the gender of rearing, is not determined by these factors. There is evidence that sex differentiation of the brain may be inconsistent with other sex characteristics, resulting in individuals dressing and/or behaving in a way which is perceived by others as being outside cultural gender norms; these gender expressions may be described as gender variant. Gender Identity does not refer to the placing of a person into one of the categories male or female; but without including the concept of interaction with society at large the term has no meaning. We are social beings. Masculinists cite one-sided legislation, selective enforcement, and neglected civil rights as examples of discrimination against men and boys.

Stereotype

It is a preconceived idea that attributes certain characteristics (in general) to all the members of class or set. The term is often used with a negative connotation when referring to an oversimplified, exaggerated, or demeaning assumption that a particular

individual possesses the characteristics associated with the class due to his or her membership in it. Stereotypes can be used to deny individuals respect or legitimacy based on their membership in that group.

Stereotypes often form the basis of prejudice and are usually employed to explain real or imaginary differences due to race, gender, religion, ethnicity, socio-economic class, disability, occupation, etc. A stereotype can be a conventional and oversimplified conception, opinion, or image based on the belief that there are attitudes, appearances, or behaviors shared by all members of a group. Stereotypes are forms of social consensus rather than individual judgments. Stereotypes are sometimes formed by a previous illusory correlation, a false association between two variables that are loosely correlated if correlated at all. Stereotypes may be occasionally positive.

It specifically describes men and boys that are personal and human, unlike male which can also be used to describe animals, or masculine which can also be used to describe noun classes. When masculine is used to describe men, it can have degrees of comparison more masculine, most masculine. The opposite can be expressed by terms such as unmanly, epicene or effeminate. A typical near-synonym of masculinity is virility and the usual complement is femininity.

Traditional Gender Role

Traditional gender role cast men as rational, strong, protective, and decisive while they caste women as emotional (m irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive. These gender roles have simply been used to show men's supremacy over women. From these so-called gender roles, women have been excluded from equal access to leadership and decision-making positions (in the family, as well as in politics, academia, and the corporate world). Paying men higher wages (salary) than women

for doing the same jobs and convincing women that they are not fit for careers in such areas as "mathematics and engineering male dominated society puts women in low position" (Tyson , 85). Low position long occupied by women in patriarchal society has been culturally produced. For example, it is patriarchal assumption that more women rather than men suffer from hysteria as it is socially defined as a woman's problem. But hysterical behavior in men won't be diagnosed as such. Women are really oppressed by the traditional gender roles which undermines her self-confidence and assertiveness. Even in literature, female characters are stereotyped either as "good girls" (gentle, submissive, virginal, angelic) or 'bad girls' (violent, aggressive, defiled, monstrous etc).

Patriarchal ideology suggests that there are only two identities a woman can have. If she accepts her traditional gender roles, she is a 'good girl', if she doesn't she is a 'bad girl'. These two roles also refer to as 'madona', and 'whore' (prostitute) or 'angel' and 'bitch'. Ironically, men sleep with 'bad girls', but they don't marry them. "Bad girls" are discarded because they don't deserve better. They are not good enough to bear a man's name or his legitimate children. The 'good girls' on the other hand, is rewarded for her submissive behavior in the society. The repressive attitude towards women's sexuality is still visible in our language today. For example, we use negative word 'slut' to describe a woman who sleeps with a number of men while we use the positive word "stud" to describe a man who sleeps with a number of women. Same is the case in the world of fashion too. Hence, traditional gender roles have made women 'subordinate', 'inferior', 'marginalized' and 'other' in various social platforms.

Gender Discrimination

It refers to the prejudicial treatment of an individual based on biological sex. It

is a gender stereotype model, also referred to as sexism or sexual discrimination. Such practices have shown favoritism to a particular child and many cases it has resulted to the negligence or disregard to the female sex. Preferences of male child, opportunities and choices for the male child are some of the examples of gender discrimination

Gender equality means the same status, rights and responsibilities for women and men. It means equal participation of men and women in all fields without discrimination on the basis of sex. Gender equality approach looks at equal representation of men and women in the work place and other areas of concern.

Similarly, liberation means individual freedom from exploitation or slavery. This concept of liberation came out of the feeling of domination and oppression existing in the society due its hierarchical system, - class, caste, races and sex etc. The socialist thinker in their theories of class struggle explains that the dominant group dominates the oppressed group and exploits them. They regard that these oppressed group must be liberated for an egalitarian\ socialist society. In the feminist theory liberation means freedom from male domination. Women's Liberation Movement, during the late 1960s were targeted towards elimination of all forms of domination, some of them were the nature of family and private property.

Emancipation means freedom from political, legal and moral restraint. Women's emancipation means freedom from the restrictions from the community or society and obtaining all the rights and opportunities with respect to men. Most of the critical thinkers advocate for emancipation by arousing critical consciousness. Women's consciousness raising group in Women's Liberation Movement deemed for women's emancipation by freeing them from all bondage \ obligations even from the family.

The most predictable form of violence experienced by women as women, is

when the women of one community are sexually assaulted by the men of the other in an overt assertion of their identity and a simultaneous humiliation of other by 'dishonoring' their women. In this respect "the rape and molestation of Hindu, Sikh and Muslim women before and after partition probably followed the familiar pattern of sexual violence and of attack, retaliation and reprisal"(Menon and Bhasin 41). The violence against women during partition cannot be separated from the violent hostility that erupted between Hindus and Muslims at that time. The repertoire of violence on all sides included profaning everything that was held to be of sacred and symbolic value to the other-from pig and cow slain in front of mosques and temples to the circumcision of non-Muslim men, and the forced consumption of beef by Hindus-and this extended to sexually violating their women. The preoccupation with woman's sexuality formed part of the contract of war between the three communities, Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims.

Women's bodies were targeted as the battlefield during the partition of India and its rampant violence. As a matter of fact, in a world raven by ethnic and communal conflicts in which women are not only the victims but also the weapons of war. "From Bangladesh to the Balkans, from Cambodia to Colombia, Peru to Liberia, Rwanda to Somalia and Uganda, the ravaged bodies of women has become 'envelope to carry the message of conquest from one group of men to another" (Menon and Bhasin 75). As Bapsin Sidhawa observes elsewhere, women are the "living objects on whose soft bodies' victors and losers alike vent their wrath enact fantastic vendettas, celebrate victories"(1990: 380). During the partition violence both losers and victors regarded female's soft body as an object of wrath. In the male-dominated society like India, if a raped woman speaks of her shame could accept the fact that she can no longer occupy any available and acceptable social space. A woman raped can no

longer belong to any of the known categories of virgin, wife or widow and are thus effectively erased from the social register. During the partition violence hundreds and thousands of women had undergone same experience. Thus was the day of partition of India especially for the woman.

Similarly, one might agree that feminists ought to work to end all forms of oppression - oppression is unjust and feminists, like everyone else, have a moral obligation to fight injustice - without maintaining that it is the mission of feminism to end all oppression. One might even believe that in order to accomplish feminism's goals it is necessary to combat racism and economic exploitation, but also think that there is a narrower set of specifically feminist objectives. In other words, opposing oppression in its many forms may be instrumental to, even a necessary means to, feminism, but not intrinsic to it. For example, bell hooks argues:

Feminism, as liberation struggle, must exist apart from and as a part of the larger struggle to eradicate domination in all its forms. We must understand that patriarchal domination shares an ideological foundation with racism and other forms of group oppression, and that there is no hope that it can be eradicated while these systems remain intact. This knowledge should consistently inform the direction of feminist theory and practice. (hooks 22)

On hooks' account, the defining characteristic that distinguishes feminism from other liberation struggles is its concern with sexism:

Unlike many feminist comrades, I believe women and men must share a common understanding - a basic knowledge of what feminism is - if it is ever to be a powerful mass-based political movement. In *Feminist Theory: from margin to center*, I suggest that defining feminism

broadly as "a movement to end sexism and sexist oppression" would enable us to have a common political goal...Sharing a common goal does not imply that women and men will not have radically divergent perspectives on how that goal might be reached. (hooks 1989, 23)

hooks' approach depends on the claim that sexism is a particular form of oppression that can be distinguished from other forms, e.g., racism and homophobia, even though it is currently (and virtually always) interlocked with other forms of oppression.

Feminism's objective is to end sexism, though because of its relation to other forms of oppression, this will require efforts to end other forms of oppression as well. For example, feminists who themselves remain racists will not be able to fully appreciate the broad impact of sexism on the lives of women of color. Furthermore because sexist institutions are also, e.g., racist, classist and homophobic, dismantling sexist institutions will require that we dismantle the other forms of domination intertwined with them. Following hooks' lead, we might characterize feminism schematically (allowing the schema to be filled in differently by different accounts) as the view that women are subject to sexist oppression and that this is wrong. This move shifts the burden of our inquiry from a characterization of what feminism is to a characterization of what sexism, or sexist oppression is.

There are a variety of interpretations, feminist and otherwise, of what exactly oppression consists in, but the leading idea is that oppression consists in "an enclosing structure of forces and barriers which tends to the immobilization and reduction of a group or category of people" (Frye 10-11). Not just any "enclosing structure" is oppressive, however, for plausibly any process of socialization will create a structure that both limits and enables all individuals who live within it. In the case of oppression, however, the 'enclosing structures' in question are part of a broader

system that asymmetrically and unjustly disadvantages one group and benefits another. Therefore, although sexism restricts the opportunities available to and so unquestionably harms both men and women (and considering some pairwise comparisons may even have a greater negative impact on a man than a woman), overall, women as a group unjustly suffer the greater harm. It is a crucial feature of contemporary accounts, however, that one cannot assume that members of the privileged group have intentionally designed or maintained the system for their benefit. The oppressive structure may be the result of an historical process whose originators are long gone, or it may be the unintended result of complex cooperative strategies gone wrong.

Leaving aside further details in the account of oppression, the question remains: What makes a particular form of oppression sexist? If we just say that a form of oppression counts as sexist oppression if it harms women, or even primarily harms women, this is not enough to distinguish it from other forms of oppression. Virtually all forms of oppression harm women, and arguably some besides sexism harm women primarily (though not exclusively), e.g., body size oppression, age oppression. Besides, as we've noted before, sexism is not only harmful to women, but is harmful to all of us.

What makes a particular form of oppression sexist seems to be not just that it harms women, but that someone is subject to this form of oppression specifically because she is (or at least appears to be) a woman. Racial oppression harms women, but racial oppression (by itself) doesn't harm them because they are women, it harms them because they are (or appear to be) members of a particular race. The suggestion that sexist oppression consists in oppression to which one is subject by virtue of being or appearing to be a woman provides us at least the beginnings of an analytical tool

for distinguishing subordinating structures that happen to affect some or even all women from those that are more specifically sexist. But problems and unclarity remain.

First, it is necessary to explicate further what it means to be oppressed "because you are a woman". It is the idea that there is a particular form of oppression that is specific to women? Is to be oppressed "as a woman" to be oppressed in a particular way? Or can we be pluralists about what sexist oppression consists in without fragmenting the notion beyond usefulness? Two strategies for explicating sexist oppression have proven to be problematic. The first is to maintain that there is a form of oppression common to all women. For example, one might interpret Catharine MacKinnon's work as claiming that to be oppressed as a woman is to be viewed and treated as sexually subordinate, where this claim is grounded in the alleged universal fact of the eroticization of male dominance and female submission. Although MacKinnon allows that sexual subordination can happen in a myriad of ways, her account is monistic in its attempt to unite the different forms of sexist oppression around a single core account that makes sexual objectification the focus. Although MacKinnon's work provides a powerful resource for analyzing women's subordination, many have argued that it is too narrow, e.g., in some contexts especially in developing countries sexist oppression seems to concern more the local division of labor and economic exploitation. Although certainly sexual subordination is a factor in sexist oppression, it requires us to fabricate implausible explanations of social life to suppose that all divisions of labor that exploit women (as women) stem from the "eroticization of dominance and submission" (58). Moreover, it is not obvious that in order to make sense of sexist oppression we need to seek a single form of oppression common to all women.

Second problematic strategy has been to consider as paradigms those who are oppressed only as women, with the thought that complex cases bringing in additional forms of oppression will obscure what is distinctive of sexist oppression. This strategy would have us focus in the U.S. on White, wealthy, young, beautiful, able-bodied, heterosexual women to determine what oppression, if any, they suffer, with the hope of finding sexism in its "purest" form, unmixed with racism or homophobia, etc. (Spelman 52-54). This approach is not only flawed in its exclusion of all but the most elite women in its paradigm, but it assumes that privilege in other areas does not affect the phenomenon under consideration. As Elizabeth Spelman explains:

. . . no woman is subject to any form of oppression simply because she is a woman; which forms of oppression she is subject to depend on what 'kind' of woman she is. In a world in which a woman might be subject to racism, classism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, if she is not so subject it is because of her race, class, religion, sexual orientation. So it can never be the case that the treatment of a woman has only to do with her gender and nothing to do with her class or race. (52-53)

Recent accounts of oppression are designed to allow that oppression takes many forms, and refuse to identify one form as more basic or fundamental than the rest. For example, Iris Young describes five "faces" of oppression: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and systematic violence (Young 1990c, Ch. 2). Plausibly others should be added to the list. Sexist or racist oppression, for example, will manifest itself in different ways in different contexts, e.g., in some contexts through systematic violence, in other contexts through economic exploitation. Acknowledging this does not go quite far enough, however, for monistic theorists such as MacKinnon could grant this much. Pluralist accounts of sexist

oppression must also allow that there isn't an over-arching explanation of sexist oppression that applies to all its forms: in some cases it may be that women's oppression as women is due to the eroticization of male dominance, but in other cases it may be better explained by women's reproductive value in establishing kinship structures (Rubin 1975), or by the shifting demands of globalization within an ethnically stratified workplace. In other words, pluralists resist the temptation to 'grand social theory', 'overarching metanarratives', monocausal explanations, to allow that the explanation of sexism in a particular historical context will rely on economic, political, legal, and cultural factors that are specific to that context which would prevent the account from being generalized to all instances of sexism (Fraser and Nicholson 1990). It is still compatible with pluralist methods to seek out patterns in women's social positions and structural explanations within and across social contexts, but in doing so we must be highly sensitive to historical and cultural variation.

2: Third World Feminism and Indian Gender Bias

Third World Feminism

Third World feminism has been described as a group of feminist theories developed by feminists who acquired their values and took part in feminist politics in so called Third World countries. In many different societies women like colonized subjects have been relegated to the position of 'Other', 'colonized' by various forms of patriarchal domination. They thus share with colonized races and culture an intimate experience of the politics of oppression and repression. Women from third world have been engaged in the feminist movements Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Gyatri Chakravarti Spivak, Sara Suleri, Ketu Katrak and Uma Narayan who criticizes western feminism on the grounds that it is ethnocentric and does not take into account the unique experience of women from Third World countries or the existence of feminists indigenous to third world countries. According to Chandra Talpade Mohanty, women in Third World feel that western feminism bases its understanding of women feminism in internal racism, classicism and homophobia. This discourse is strongly related to African feminism. Similarly, Ketu Katrak says that women in postcolonial countries were colonized and this resulted in domination.

Further, Ketu Katrak defines Third World women's body under the title 'Theorizing a Politics of Female Body' and says that women's body has been colonized by patriarchy. So third world women writers try to decolonize their body in their writings and resist the patriarchy through internal and external exile. Mostly women are dominated through language and their sexuality in so called patriarchal society. By using the English language colonizers impose racial superiority as well as they make women linguistically and culturally alienated from the native language and

culture. Ketu Katrak says that, “The uses of English (over indigenous languages, in this case, Shona) imposed by colonialism and how linguistic choices encode cultural belonging or alienation and second the female body and generated inequalities in patriarchal postcolonial society” (1).

The women in the Third World postcolonial societies, become victim of gender inequalities existing both in the indigenous and the colonial culture often simultaneously oppress women. Ketu Katrak who argued that in India, Mahatma Gandhi's resistance to British colonial rule in India during the 1920s and 1930s used specially gendered representations for the purposes of Indian nationalism but ultimately did little to free Indian women from their patriarchal subordination to men. According to Katrak 'Gandhi appropriated images of passive women to promote his campaign of 'passive resistance' to British colonial rule. Both men and women were encouraged to adopt a passivity exclusively associated with femininity, although only for the purposes of breaking colonial authority and not patriarchal authority'(179). Several critics have hinted at a trend towards male chauvinism to many forms of nationalism. Such icons of the nation as mother India or mother Africa are used in nationalist representation to reconstruct the image of the passive female who depends upon the active males to protect her or restore her honor.

Helen Carby explains in her essay “White Women Listen! Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood” that black and Asian women are barely made visible within its discourses. And when they are addressed, their representation remains highly problematic. Western feminism is criticized for the Orientalist way it represents the social practices of other 'races' as backwards and barbarous, from which black and Asian women need rescuing by their western sisters. Further Carby presents the Western feminist horror concerning the arranged marriages of Asian women. In

advocating an end to arranged marriages for Asian women because they are deemed oppressive, Western feminists do not consider Asian women's views and assume instead that their 'enlightened' outlook is the most progressive and liberating.

Indian Feminism

Indian Feminism has been given topic in that most of the feminists belong to India and they have mainly focused on Indian women and their experience. Chandra Talpade Mohanty discusses in her essay 'Under Western Eyes' that the 'Third World Feminisms' address two simultaneous projects: the internal critique of hegemonic 'Western' feminists and the formulation of autonomous feminist concerns and strategies that are geographically, historically and culturally grounded. The first project is one of deconstructing; the second project is one of building and constructing. Mohanty further defines Third World geographically "the nation states of Latin America, the Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, South and South east Asia, China, South Africa, and Ocean constitutes the parameters of the non- European Third World. In addition, black Latin, Asian and indigenous people in USA, Europe, Australia, some of whom have historic links with geographically defined Third Worlds, also define themselves as Third World people"(5). The use of the term "Third World women" by western feminist has been widely critiqued. Mohanty uses the term interchangeably with "women of color" (7). She argues that:

What seems to constitute women of color or Third World women as a viable oppositional alliance is a common content of struggle rather than color or racial identifications. Similarly, it is Third World women's oppositional political relation to sexist, racist and imperialistic structures that constitutes our political commonality. (7)

Although, she uses the term "Third World Women" Mohanty argues that western

feminism appropriate the production of the Third World women as a singular monolithic subject for a 'discursive colonization'(51). Furthermore, western feminism articulate a discursive colonization through the production of Third World difference, a historical something that apparently oppresses most if not all of the women in Third World countries.

In the context of west's hegemonic position today, the context of what Anouar Abdel Malek (1981) calls a struggle for "control over the orientation, regulation and decision of the process of world development on the basis of the advanced sector's monopoly of scientific knowledge and ideal creativity"(145). Western feminist scholarship on the Third World must be seen and examined precisely in terms of its inscription in these particular relations of power and struggle. There is, it should be evident, no universal patriarchal framework that this scholarship attempts to counter and resist- unless one posits an international male conspiracy or a monolithic, a historical power structure. There is, however, a particular world balance of power within which any analysis of culture, ideology, and socioeconomic conditions necessarily has to be situated. Abdel-Malek reminds us about the inherence of politics in the discourses of "culture". Contemporary imperialism is, in sense, a hegemonic imperialism, exercising to a maximum degree a rationalized violence taken to a higher level than ever before- through fire and sword, but also through the attempt to control hearts and minds (145-46).

Western feminist scholarship can not avoid the challenge of situating itself and examining its role in such a global economic and political framework. To do any less would be ignore the complex interconnections between first and Third World economics and the profound effect of this on the lives of women in all countries. Feminist writing in the United States is still marginalized (except from the point of

view of women of color addressing privileged white women), Western feminist writing on women in the Third World must be considered in the context of the global hegemony of western scholarship- that is, the production, publication \, distribution, and consumption of information and ideas. Marginal or not, this writing has political effects and implications beyond the immediate feminist or disciplinary audience. One such significant effect of the dominant 'representations' of western feminism is its conflation with imperialism in the eyes of particular Third World women.

Similarly, during the colonial process, women were became the victim in the name of marriage. In Claude Levi-Strauss's theory of kinship structure as a system of the exchange itself is not constitutive of the subordination of women; women are not subordinate because of the fact of exchange but because of the modes of exchange instituted and the valves attached to these modes.

Likewise, scholar Cordilia Fine has written about the effect of development policies on women in the third World. Women are affected positively or negatively by economic development policies, and this is the basis for cross- cultural comparison. She studies the effect of the development process on the "family unit and its individual members"(30) in Egypt, Kenya, Mexico and South Asia. She states that the 'problems' and 'needs' expressed by rural and urban women in these countries all center around education and training, work and wages, access to health and other services, political participation, and legal rights (116).Huston relates all these "needs" to insensitive development policies that exclude women as a group or category. For her, the solution is simple: implement improved development policies that emphasize training for women field- workers; use women trainees and women rural development officers; encourage women's co-operatives. Here, women are assumed to be a coherent group or category prior to their entry into "the development process". Huston

assumes that all Third World women have similar problems and needs. Thus, they must have similar interests and goals. However, the interests to urban, middle-class educated Egyptian housewives, to take only one instance, could surely be seen as being the same house of their uneducated poor maids. Women are constituted as women through the complex interaction between class, religion, and other ideological institutions frameworks.

For Huston, women in the Third World countries have "needs" and "problems" but few if any have "choices" or the freedom to act. This is an interesting representation of women in the Third World, one that is significant in suggesting a latent self-presentation of western women that bears looking at. She writes, "what surprised and moved me most as I listened to women in such very different cultural settings was the striking commonality- whether they were educated or illiterate, urban or rural- of their most basic values: the importance they assign to family, dignity, and service to others"(115).

Western feminist writings on women in the Third World subscribe to a variety of methodologies to demonstrate the universal cross- cultural operation of male dominance and female exploitation. In other words, western feminist discourse, by assuming women as a coherent, already constituted group that is placed in kinship, legal and other structures, defines Third World women as subjects outside social relations, instead of looking at the way women are constituted through these very structures. Legal, economic, religious and familial structures are treated as phenomena to be judged by western standards. When these structures are defined as "under-developed" or "developing" and women are placed within them, an implicit image of the 'average Third World women' is produced. This is the transformation of the (implicitly Western) "oppressed woman" into the "oppressed Third World

women"(40). Third World women as a group or category are automatically and necessarily defined as religious, family oriented, legally unsophisticated, illiterate, domestic and sometimes revolutionary.

Uma Narayan, in *Dislocating Cultures* takes aim at the related notion of nation, identity and tradition to show how western and Third World scholars have misrepresented Third World culture and feminist genders. *Dislocating Cultures* contributes a philosophical perspective on areas of ongoing interest such as nationalism, post-colonial studies and the cultural politics of debates over tradition and westernization in Third World context. She says:

I am arguing that Third World feminism is not a mindless mimicking of western agendas in one clear and simple sense that for instance. Indian feminism is clearly a response to issues specially confronting many Indian women (13).

Issues that feminist groups in India have politically engaged with are the problems of dowry murders and dowry related of women, issues related to women's education, poverty, work, health and with other issues that affect women's lives. White women in the western contexts might be unfamiliar with the violence against women connected to the contemporary functioning of the institution of dowry and arranged marriages.

The Third World women are treated as slave domestic animals who are to be confined within the four walls of house remain submissive, docile and obedient. The Third World man never considers them to be important one. So the suffering of Third World women is of its own kind. White feminist have founded a universal category of women and those who don't share those norms are excluded as others, unable to represent themselves, quite and ignorant.

Many Third World women who do not consider themselves feminists know

and acknowledge that women face mistreatment within their social contexts and cultural institutions. Feminist daughters are not the only ones who see that motherlands are spaces where fathers still have most of the privileges and power, and that mothers and mother-cultures relate differently to their daughters than they do to their sons, imposing different demands and expecting different forms of conformity. Third World feminist issues are hardly 'foreign imports' or 'Westernized agendas' imposed by feminists onto contexts where 'culturally authentic' non feminist women would entirely fail to see what the feminist fuss was about. Narayan further writes in her essay "Contesting Cultures" that a number of Third World feminists are middle-class urban women who have entered formerly male professional and political spheres, combined with the fact that they often demand greater equality and participation for women in various arenas of national life rather than a return to "traditional roles", facilities casting them and their political visions as embodiments of the demon "Westernization". Third World women engaged in struggles over women centered issues in Third World contexts women who are not urban or middle-class are ignored and marginalized by an instance on seeing only urban middle-class women as 'feminists'. Third-World feminist struggles, feminists in all nations confront problematic nationalisms and different versions of these 'burdens of history'.

Regarding the texts by postcolonial women writers and culture producers Ketu Katrak argues in his essay 'Politics of the Female Body' is that the female body is in a state of exile including self-exile and self-censorship, outsider ness and un-belonging to itself within indigenous patriarchy (historicized within different cultures and histories) strengthened by British racialized colonial practices in the regions of India, Africa, and the Caribbean. Katrak says "metaphoric connotation of exile, as well as the concept of internal exile of the female body from patriarchy, and external exile as

manifest in migration and geographical relation necessitated by political persecution, material conditions of poverty and forms of intellectual silencing in Third World societies"(2). Female protagonists undergo 'internalized exile' where the body feels disconnected from itself, as though it does not belong to it and has no agency. British colonial (ist) education accompanied by racial superiority leading to linguistic and cultural alienations; the traps of cultural tradition, both colonial and local prejudice against lesbians who endure invisibility for fear of violence, and pressures of motherhood. Several texts demonstrate female bodily exile resulting from 'forgetting' one's native language and cultural ways supported by English language and mores; or from breaking 'tradition'; or for resisting the patriarchal authority of fathers and husbands. Women resist domination and attempt to reconnect with their bodies and commonalities. In resisting exile they often use their female body via speech, silence, starvation, or illness.

Third World women writers respond the complex ways in which women's bodies are colonized. Similar to anti- colonial struggle for independence on the micro political arena, women resist bodily oppressions by using strategies and tactics that are often part of women's ways of knowing and acting. A geographical deteriorating that forces colonizers to depart parallels how women attempt reclaiming their bodies from patriarchal domination. A politics of the body involves socialization involving layers and levels of ideological influences, socio cultural and religions, which impose knowledge or ignorance of female bodies and construct woman as gendered subject or object. Women writers present the struggles of protagonists to resist patriarchal objectification and definition as daughter, wife, mother, grandmother, and mother-in-law. Socio cultural parameters of womanhood- wifeness, mothers of sons valued more than mothers of daughters, infertility, and widowhood are grounded within

economic, political, and cultural norms that consciously and unconsciously constitute an ideological framework that controls women's bodies.

A socially responsible postcolonial critic responds as do the postcolonial women writers analyzed in this study, to material and social conditions and to sexual inequalities in societies where the long arm of British colonialism shook hands with individual patriarchies in exiling women from their bodies. This study probes literary and non-literary representation of female protagonist who resist internal exile from their bodies and who struggle to reconnect with their bodies and communities in working toward a more just society for their families and communities.

Protest against Patriarchy

Male domination can be heavily seen in many cultural systems of the world. It is very easy for males in male dominated societies to keep females under pressure and to take negative benefit due to their dominated position. This pressure and negative benefit can be of any kind. Dominated gender group can influence the lower and pressurized gender group by having more opportunities to earn and having easier access to resources. Negative results of unbalanced male/female domination appear significantly in a society when a young generation gets married and starts new life with his/her marriage partner. It has also been observed in many cultures which have male dominated system that females suffer heavily in different forms of relations like as a mother, wife, daughter or sister etc.

No doubt, societies and nations should develop their cultural and societal system in a way that no gender group is in a position to get dominated authority. The importance of men and their superiority has been a part and parcel of social mores for generations in many societies. Women had always been the less important individuals. When a woman lives in a male dominated society obviously she

undergoes many hardships. It is a wretched condition of women in our society when she has no husband in her life she is not worthy of respect. Society finds faults with anyone who does not adhere to its laws, in other words, they are the transgressors of society. In a male dominated society and under male chauvinism a woman's role is hence viewed through a magnifying glass, and she is always watched by others, especially if she does not follow the rules established by the males.

As male chauvinism refuses to recognize woman as competitor in domains of society, in this situation, a woman is not born but made by the society. As Simone de Beauvoir goes:

One is not born, but rather becomes a woman. No biological, psychological or economic fate determine the figure that the human female presents in society; it is civilization as a whole that produces this creature, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is described as feminine. (25, *The Second Sex*)

Thus patriarchal practices which reduce women's status to inferior social beings are further perpetuated by myths and traditions which unfortunately have been embedded in the fabric of society. Patriarchal society promoted two images: woman as the sexual property of man, and woman as chaste mothers of their children. Even though man is a civilized being now, there is still the savageness of primitive man in him. With savage selfishness he treats woman as an object that provides physical enjoyment, social companionship and domestic comfort. Man has subjugated woman to his will, used her as means to promote his selfish gratification, to minister to his sensual pleasure, to be instrumental in promoting his comfort; but never has he desired to elevate her to that rank she was created to fill. He has done all he could do to debase and enslave her mind.

Thus, denied the freedom to act and choose on their own, women remained solely inside the field of vision, mere illusion to be dreamt and cherished. A woman is a woman, and a woman she must remain but not a 'man's shadow-self', 'an appendage', 'an auxiliary' and the 'unwanted and neglected other'. A woman is held to represent the 'otherness' of man, his negative.

Simone de Beauvoir finds man-woman nexus quite unsymmetrical and uncomplimentary for "man represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the common use of man to designate human beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined criteria, without reciprocity"(9).

A woman is never regarded as an autonomous being since she has always been assigned a subordinate and relative position in our society. It is an appalling condition of women that they cannot live without men in our social set-up. As they are considered to be physically weak, and to go ahead in the society, they need protection from males. This is the root cause of females' apathy in our society. As Beauvoir submerges:

Man can think of himself without woman. She cannot think of herself without man. And she is simply what man decrees . . . she appears essentially to the male as a sexual being. For him she is sex . . . absolute sex, no less. She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental the inessential as opposed to the essential. (10)

We find references to this aspect of social life, where husbands dominate their wives, and make them the worst sufferer in the novels. The fundamental humanistic values which bind a man and woman into the bond of togetherness the fidelity and companionship are away in the male-dominated society where gender inequality is

disseminated in each nook and corner.

The novel intends to establish the harmonious society by making aware all the characters that the conflict is prevalent when there is the combination of the people having different views. The patriarchal society seeks to dominate the women. From house to the whole society, there is gender discrimination. The patriarchy doesn't think necessary to take the suggestion from women in their decision. Women have become aware of the patriarchal domination due to the feminist movement. Thus, they do not want to follow the traditional people, rather they intend to escape from such society. Moreover, the novel intends to show the changing society. The society is no more like the traditional one which follows all the rules made by the ruling people.

It is a field of interdisciplinary study, which analyzes the phenomenon of gender. Gender studies is sometimes related to studies of class, race, ethnicity, sexuality and location. Gender is a term referred to the parallel and socially unequal division into femininity and masculinity. The socially constructed aspect of differences between men and women are the concerns of gender studies. Gender studies deal mainly with the social differences between men and women created by the society, which is learned, is changeable over time and varies within and between cultures. Gender studies not only concerned to the individual and personality differences but as the symbolic level to cultural ideals and stereotypes of masculinity and femininity and at the structural level to sexual division of labor in institution and organization.

Therefore, because of the male domination women have been marginalized in their own houses. They do not have their own space. They have been defined by the male. Women have to follow whatever they say. However, because of the feminist movements around the world, women have started to realize that they should make

their own space, they want to prove that they are as capable as men are. They want to develop them socially, economically, politically and psychologically. Consequently Indian feminists have emerged and they have given several ways of women's empowerment. Many women have started to write literature showing the strength of the women that they can achieve what they desire for. About the related characters who have fought against patriarchal society, the next chapter will focus on it. In the third chapter, all the details of women's struggle will be analyzed.

3. Gender Bias in Manju Kapur's *Home*

Indian Gender Role

In this chapter, the researcher intends to focus on the female characters and what they think about their positions in traditional society. In such a society, women are evaluated in terms of their power to produce children. Male characters think that women can be perfect only after they give birth to the children. Women worry when they are not able to produce children. The example can be drawn from the beginning of the novel in which two sisters, Mrs. Sona Lal and Mrs. Rupa Gupta are childless: "Mrs. Sona Lal and Mrs. Rupa Gupta, sisters both, were childless. One was rich, the other poor, one the eldest daughter-in-law of a cloth-shop owner, the other the wife of an educated, badly paid government servant" (1). In these lines, it is noticed that women are judged in terms of their capacity to produce children. They are suffering from the traumatic situation.

Infertility is one of the weaknesses of the female characters that do not lead them to spend their life successfully and happily. The property and education play very minor role in their life. Most of the female characters in the novel *Home* have traumatic situation. They are struggling with their life. They regard home to be the best place to get rid of the trauma. In the title "Home" we can see trauma lurked because it is the displacement from the fragmented mind to sympathize psychologically. There is increase of consciousness in the characters in the novel. When the characters are not happy or they are in dilemma they remember the past incident which was dominated by patriarchal society:

Sona protested for form's sake that Vicky was being spoiled, in her time nobody had heard of tutors. She didn't raise too many objections

though, because in her heart she was grateful to him for her children.

That she couldn't bear to see him was another matter. Her womb had opened when he came. (65)

She thinks that during the ancient time, women were called unsuccessful when they could not bear children. The same thing happens to her as she cannot become mother for several years. The trauma of the past always tortures. Therefore, she feels grateful towards her husband that he gives her children.

Referring to the novel, because of male domination, women do not feel happy completely in the present. The life becomes disorderly. Women are anxious with their current life. It happens in the story of Lala Banwari Lal when he goes to the past at the age of seventy: "Lala Banwari Lal was now approaching seventy, but such was his heart, exclaimed the family, that he insisted on taking the boy to Bareilly himself. They would travel by the train, spend the day there, and return the next morning" (75-76). Even in his old age, he is not happy with the present life, but he remembers the childhood.

The main characters of the novel are feeling that there is gender bias. They have experienced violence and separation. The experience is not deleted from their mind though they do not realize consciously. It remains imprinted for a long time. Sometimes it passes to the next generation as the older generation may talk about it several times with their children. The traumatic situation is experienced when Rupa provides love to Nisha:

As Nisha grew, Rupa bestowed careful love on her, mentally standing before the tribunal composed of her sister and brother-in-law, defending herself against neglect on the one hand and stealing the child's heart on the other. The business that had occupied her attention

so successfully seemed more meaningful when she saw Nisha peering into the pickle jars, or testing the sweet and salty aam paper drying in the sun under an old muslin sari. (91)

She provides careful love to her because of the feeling that they are oppressed by the patriarchy. She has experienced in her life that what would happen without the children. She thinks that the child leads her life to the successfulness and the meaningfulness.

Women in the novel do not feel that they are secure in their own home. The life has become meaningless due to the patriarchal norms and values. It does not lead one to the happy life. In the novel, we can experience such thing when: "The misery Sona felt at Raju's performance was exacerbated on parent-teacher day. Every year he did a little worse, belying his promises and her hopes and expectations. This perpetual disappointment drove to violence" (97). It is because of the feeling of feeble that she compares present situation to the past. The violence comes when there is conflict in the mental state.

Similar experience can be found in the novel *Home*. Most of the characters have been affected by the past history or traditional society. It shows the transition between the old traditional and modern society. Yashpal, one of the main characters of the novel experiences such things and affected by the past:

For fifteen years Yashpal had been used to his father's protective shadow. He now felt bereft and abandoned. Speechless, dependent, the state of the old man created a similar helplessness within him. He could not bear it. 'How could this happen to one so good, where is the justice in the world? He mourned to Sona. (117)

It means the past experience has direct impact on one's present. Present is not the

absolute thing but it is the result of past and determined by it. People cannot adjust well in the society remembering the past as Yashpal has done.

Nisha, one of the main characters of the novel feel insecure in her house. She feels that she is responsible to her brother's marriage. She is also conscious that women have to take all the burdens in the family whatever they organize. She represents the Indian women who are dominated by the patriarchal society. The novel covers such thing in the character, Nisha:

The forlorn misery that was Nisha's burden increased with every step made in the direction of her brother's marriage. Had her parents not been so determined to reject Suresh, she could have been reveling in attention as the groom's only real sister, instead of feeling a source of apology and justification. She wished she could disappear into some hole till the wedding was over. (249)

For Nisha, marriage is a burden; it gives pain to the people, especially to the women. Therefore, she is not happy with her brother's marriage.

Gender Bias

Gender refers to the cultural or social role men or women have to play in the given role in the given society. Its meanings and roles are different as per the society. Even in the twenty first century, the roles of men and women are determined by men in the particular society. According to the traditional society, women are defined in terms of binary opposition to men. They are in the right side in contrast to the left. Men and women have relation in terms of strong/weak, head/heart, superior/inferior, rational/irrational, independent/contingent and so on being women in the right side.

Today, women have realized that they are oppressed by the men in their own place. Because of sexual harassment, betrayal, gender discrimination, and the like,

female characters such as Nisha in the novel, *Home*, suffer from gender trauma. In order to tackle it, she is determined to be an independent woman. Not only Nisha other characters like Mrs. Sona Lal and Mrs. Rupa Gupta have also the feeling of trauma of gender. Traditional society looks at women with different angles from that of men. Women are incomplete without the help of male counterparts. Males create such situation in their mind that women think that they cannot attain success without the assistance of males.

Moreover, Kapur's characters, especially women, are psychologically affected that they are weaker in every aspect not only from the male counterparts but also from the white educated women. The third world women are confined to their houses and their tiny problems like having children, spending luxurious life, serving the family and the like. These women only focus on children. Their life is complete only after they are able to produce children, otherwise, their husbands may marry for the second time. One of the main characters of the novel Rupa has also such view about children:

Look at me, thought Rupa. I also don't have children, or half the other things she has. From the time we were children, she was the special one, always noticed for her fairness, her prettiness, and every day I had to hear how well she would marry, while I would be lucky to find anybody, dark and ugly I was. (27)

It shows the women's narrow concept of their life and their position in the family. Women are thought to focus on the physical structure rather than their mental capability.

Third World feminists try to give response to the problems faced by Third World women, such as domestic violence, dowry murders, early marriages, polygamy and other social discriminations, which are different from the problem of western

countries. Third World feminist's argument is that oppression, which is related to colonial experience, particularly racial, class and ethnic oppression, has marginalized women in postcolonial society. Third World feminists' target is to challenge the notion that gender oppression is primary force of patriarchy. They try to see the portrayals of women of non-Western societies as passive, voiceless and portrayal of western women as modern, educated, empowered. Third World feminists have developed strategic skills that enable them to counter western stereotypes and they continue to develop feminist analyses of problems women face within their communities.

Home brings the issue of trauma of third world females. As the story opens, trauma can be felt. It is about the marriage of Sona. However, the family does not feel happy about the future as she is affected by the past wound: "Sona's marriage had not in fact led to a brilliant future for Rupa. No proposal had forced her to give up her education. She finished her B. A. after which her father arranged her marriage to the son of a retired colleague, based in Karol Bagh" (15). Because of the past experience they thought of education and its importance in one's life.

In the traditional society, marriage, children and family are crucial entities for women. They are not treated as real women unless they give birth to children. The ancient society considers women as the weak, irrational, contingent, and dependent and so on. Therefore, they become happy when they are married and conceived. On the other hand, if they cannot become pregnant, they regard themselves to be failure. There is competition among women for having children: "It turned out that Rupa too failed to conceive. Sona hid this fact as long as she could from her in-laws, she knew exactly the kind of comment it would elicit"(15). When Rupa is revealed to have failed producing children Sona becomes happy and optimistic because she is also

barren. She sympathizes herself that she is not alone to be infertile.

As the novel begins as a love story of Sona who marries in a cloth merchant's family and finds herself barren. After many years of prayer and fast, she is finally granted a baby girl, Nisha, and then a son in the coming years. Here, she feels as a successful woman being able to give children to the in-law house.

In traditional gender role, women are taken as the weaker and objective being analyzed through the eyes of patriarchal society. Women are defined and evaluated in terms of men. In this manner, Tyson puts:

Traditional gender roles cast men as rational, strong, protective, and decisive; they cast women as emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive. These gender roles have been used very successfully to justify inequities, which still occur today, such as excluding women from equal access to leadership and decision-making positions (in the family as well as in politics, academia, and the corporate world), paying men higher wages than women for doing the same job (if women are even able to obtain the job), and convincing women that they are not fit for careers in such areas as mathematics and engineering. (85)

Therefore, they are not independent in the society. They are dominated in the society economically, politically and socially.

However, with the movement of feminism they have become aware of their position in their society. They are getting education; they are participating in politics and are showing their capacity to perform as males. In the novel, Nisha is all of 25 when she decides to take her life into her own hands and begins her own small business. However, her astrological fallacies prevent any relationship from stabilizing

and she watches her friends and younger family members marry around her. In fact, people admire girls who are independent. Although there is rise of feminism, women are still victimized in the different societies. They cannot expose anything how they are suffering and abused by the males in their own house. In the novel, Nisha is then sexually abused by her cousin brother and while the family realizes who the culprit is, they do not oust him but simply ensure there is distance between them. Yet another probable situation ensuring the family pride is honored.

In the novel, almost all the female characters are dominated by the male characters. Women are considered to the contingent being. They are recognized by the male members: by father's name or children's name or husband's name. They remain silent even though they are suffering from the patriarchal society:

Sona's position forced her to bear these remarks in silence but her internal repartee was fierce and pointed: How can I be his mother? Or make up for anything? If it is in my fate not to have children, it is in his not to have parents. I have to accept that as much as he. (25-26).

Here, Sona is silent because she is conscious about her position in the family. She assimilates that she should not expose her internal fierce with others.

Likewise, it can be found gender discrimination everywhere in the novel. Women are psychologically oppressed by the patriarchal society. They like to only focus on the bodily attraction rather than the mental ability. They are happy when their body is attractive with good clothes, dressing, nail painting and so on. Nisha also thinks in this way: "Nisha slept between her uncle and aunt in the middle of a big double bed, the tips of her soft feet and hands shining with the nail polish her aunt had applied to amuse her" (66).

Moreover, there is gender difference in the third world society in terms of

marriage. Women have to leave their birth place and have to go to husband's house.

They should be servants in the new house serving every member in the family.

Therefore, they cry when they are led to husband's house. The story goes:

The bride continues to weep as she is escorted inside the bus by her mother and sister, both crying as much as she. Her aunts and cousins look covertly at her new relatives jammed on the seats –who who is what relation to their girl is remembered, noted, and filed away, to be brushed up later. (89)

In this way, in the weeping moment we find the gender discrimination that they are victimized in the patriarchal society.

The novel occupies most of the spaces with the traumatic experience, created by the male characters, throughout the book. The characters do not feel adjusted in their life in a way and another. They internally assimilate that women should be submissive as they have learned from their childhood in the traditional society:

The bridal couple spent all their time in their unit, their desire to be alone shamelessly palpable. Home from the shop, Raju could barely be greeted, let alone fussed over, before he disappeared into the maw of his bedroom, shutting the door softly but oh so firmly behind him. After a while Pooja emerged to make tea. Only two solitary betraying mugs on a tray, ringed with little bowls of dry fruit, spicy mixture, and biscuits. (257)

It means, women have internalized that they are weaker than the male counterparts.

What characters behave in the novel, it is due to their past experience of male domination over women.

The male members think that whatever occurs in the family women are there

to work inside the house. Men only do outside business and they think that they are breadwinner of the family. Thus, they think women should take all the responsibilities to all household tasks, for instance:

Nisha had helped her mother by hating Pooja, but now her mother and acquired an interest in the girl from which she was excluded. After the baby's birth, she supposed there would be another battle of possession, claim, and counter-claim, though even that state would not last- neither the hate nor the love was permanent. (277)

It shows their culture that how daughters are responsible to help their mothers to do household tasks not the sons in the family. They hate other people who represent another culture and they love their own.

Nisha has feeling of inferiority for several times. But she does not show it because it is the matter of society, ethics, relation and friendship. Indian culture takes great matter having a child or childless, or son or daughter. They still believe in the traditional society. They talk about such familial matters. Thus, Alexander's views can be matched here:

Nisha was fascinated by the baby, but since it was Pooja's, she was a reticent with her affection. O weekends she watched from a distance as her mother oiled in the sun in the veranda, while Pooja sat near by. Up and down Sona gently massaged the little baby's laughter. On such occasion Nisha stretched out her hand to stroke the fine, soft, black hair. (279)

In this way, the culture plays a very important role in one's life. Though people are individual and free to think about themselves, nobody can go beyond the culture.

Nisha understands her mother better than others because both of them are

female characters. It implies that female can understand other female rather than male because they have similar body structure and experience incurred by the patriarchal society. In this regard, the text says:

Homebound, Nisha felt more part of her mother's life. When Rupa came, Nisha joined them on the bed as they lay down after lunch, food heavy in their stomachs, dark curtains drawn across the windows. Rupa put her arms around Nisha, lying in the middle half-doing, half-listening to the plaintive whispers that floated about her. (264)

Nisha's feeling is not only singular, but familial and social; it gives effect on the whole community.

Nisha plays greater role to have the ample examples of male domination. She feels alienated, disorderly, scared and so on when one is separating from the home or original culture. Nisha is being married and she is in bridal make-up but frequently she is thinking not to go to another's house: "In a few hours she would be married. She wished she could see beyond the ceremony, but she couldn't. his family was just him and just mother"(309)

Therefore, *Home*, is about Nisha, who grows up with changing times, taboos and cliches in a North Indian middle class family. There is oppression and sexual abuse in the joint family. Nisha experiences these things during her childhood when her family imposes rules on her and her family members. Nisha assimilates the problems of castes and social status. Later in her life, familial experience comes in the mind and determines her behavior that has been taken as trauma which creates boundary in the mind so that none can go beyond the painful situation. Jenny Edkins, another major critic of trauma also stresses on the past memory that comes in the mind of people when they experience some catastrophe. In case of winning they

celebrate and commemorate renewing the nation with new strength. Private grief is nationalized and the authorities take the responsibilities to perform the task. However, the combatants have the deep wound in their mind they cannot forget the nightmares and the devastating situation.

In the novel, it is found some experience of women in their own ways. Manju Kapur brings all the characters from Indian origin. Therefore, whatever activities we seen in the text they represent Indian gender bias and feminism and it is the part of third world feminism. They are not free from the marginalized situation they experienced in the past. Partition has troubled them all the time. They have the sense of aloofness when they are alone. Although they do not realize all the time that they are suffering from trauma of past, as they do, it can be realized. As the narrator says:

They sat in the crowded waiting room, during the free consultation period, pressed close to each other. It was hot, and Nisha was perspiring. Above them, a fan suspended from the high ceiling on its long pole moved slowly. It was once a big room, and a partition made of white-painted plywood stretched halfway up. A sagging, rickety door served as the entrance to the doctor's section, scraping against the floor as patients went in and out. (234)

It means the family members come closer to each other because they want to feel mutual protection. Their sitting together makes them feel sense of affinity. They fear that they cannot live meaningfully when they are separated. It was not the actual war, they experienced but it was the pain they felt when they got tortured in partition. Therefore, trauma haunts the characters all the time, whether they realize or not.

Home brings such issues that are related to feminism. The characters, especially main including Nisha, are not sure of the future life because of the past

bitter experience. Nisha even does not feel happy when she is married. She is not confident with her future. It is because of the past memory. The text goes in this way: "Arvind did tell his mother and she responded by silence and withdrawal. Still Nisha went, but without the support that would have made her comfortable and secure. She saw every inch of the way to Karol Bagh covered with fragments of her broken future" (323). Nisha is newly married but she is not happy because she feels uncertainty about the future. Therefore, trauma haunts the people in every manner whether they realize or not.

Coping with Gender Bias

Kapur tries to release the characters from the traumatic situation and gender discrimination through the characters. Nisha, the central character, is all of 25 when she decides to take her life into her own hands and begins her own small business. It is because of the patriarchal society which has dominated her all the time. The patriarchs think that women cannot decide about their life without them. Nisha, thus, takes the life in her own hand and shows the society that women also can do many things. However, this step is not tolerant to other characters like Sona because they are appropriated by the males. When Nisha decides to do new business, Sona is not satisfied: "Sona was not pleased at this new development in Nisha's life. 'She is going to get married, why waste time and money in all this?' A business was not like teaching, resignable when the bridegroom reached the door" (289). Here, conflicting ideas are manifested: old and modern. Sona believes in the traditional gender discrimination that women should not do business, Whereas Nisha believes in the new concept that women can go beyond patriarchal society and establish their new life.

Nisha is determined with her goal. She does not give attention on what other people comment about her steps, "Nisha didn't care what people said or

thought"(289). Therefore, she has become able to resist the traditional gender discrimination and shows others that she is capable to do herself. She calculates the money she has to spend for the rent and other expenses. She is confirmed that she can perform, despite the fact that she is brought up in the patriarchal family. Her father decides to buy the suits from her on condition that if they are not sold, he will give her back. It indicates that father is not confident in his daughter but she is bold.

It is not the easy task for Nisha to do business. She faces lots of difficulties in course of selling suits in the shop. She gives charge to her mother and Sona to take the responsibility but they make fault because they are not used to managing the business: "The first time Nisha left her mother in charge, she came back to find her bursting with accomplishment. She had shown them. Masterji had actually lain down after lunch, was Nisha paying him to rest? Masterji showed his displeasure by not coming for two whole days" (293). It means Nisha's mother does not know how to manage the shop and the importance of regularity. It is because of the inability to do business as women are dominated by the patriarchal society. They are suffering from gender trauma.

Then Nisha becomes furious with her and says: "Mummy, what have you done? Wailed Nisha. Even if he sleeps he never cuts less than five suits a day. I promised Gyan's twenty by day after, if he doesn't come, my reputation will be spoilt. Do you know how competitive the market is"(293). It is the result of the challenge Nisha takes against the patriarchal society. This indicates conflict between traditional and modern society. Patriarchal society follows the traditional system oppressing women while most of the women have accepted the system. Nisha and some of the modern women do not like the traditional society. They do not like the joint family and want to escape from their house.

In conclusion, trauma is the physical wound in the scientific term. It is also the psychological term, which affects a person's whole life. Trauma does not have its independent effect but it starts from the history permeating throughout the life. The affected person may be unaware of the situation; it explodes at any time indirectly. Nisha, the principal character, also suffers from the traumatic situation or psychological wound that bothers her whole life.

4. Conclusion: Conflict between Traditional and Modern Systems

This thesis studies the gender and trauma theories especially created from the time of partition that are related to the culture and personal experience as well with reference to the novel *Home*. The researcher has reached conclusion that the life of people becomes complicated when they have to settle in new place and system from that of earlier. Indian women are oppressed by the male characters as the normative and at the same time they are dominated by the Indian people particularly. Moreover, women are discriminated in the traditional Indian society. Women have to play as determined by the gender role artificially rather than naturally.

Home tells the story of people especially women who have been victimized by the patriarchal society. Women lose their chastity, identity, freedom and so on in the hands of male characters. However, it does not run for long time because the modern era has made them conscious about their position in the society. They now are ready to go against the patriarchal values and assumptions. The novel talks about the family of Banwari Lal who comes to India after partition and with the help of his wife's jewellery, starts out a sari business in Karol Bagh, Delhi. He succeeds gradually as he is forced to marry his daughter, Sunita, to a man of dubious credentials. Even as the family gets richer, Sunita is abused and then, perhaps, murdered by her husband - leaving behind a son, Vicky, to be brought up by the Banwari Lals. Thus, it shows the domination and discrimination of women in patriarchal society. When the family comes to new place, they are feeling alienated on the one hand, and the women suffer in the patriarchal society on the other.

The novelist intends to establish the harmonious society despite the conflict prevalent because of the combination of the people having different views. The patriarchal always attempts to dominate the women. There is the smell of gender

discrimination inside and outside the family. Patriarchs do not like to consult women in their decision. As a result, women have become aware of the patriarchal domination as also helped by the feminist movement. It leads them to think that they do not feel compelled to follow the traditional people.

Moreover, the novel shows the changing society. The society follows all the rules made by the ruling people. Now women have been acquiring education, they intend to destroy the traditional society and establish new one. In the same manner, in the novel, there is conflict between two types of people: traditional and modern. Banwari Lal represents the traditional society and they want to continue the traditional business and the manners while other characters like his daughters-in-laws represent the new systems.

Therefore, Manju Kapur wants to show the plight of Indian women who have become the victim of the patriarchal values. She wants to subvert the traditional society and establish the new one where there is equality between men and women. The novel, *Home* is about the portrayal of the characters who want to escape from the traditional society and want to live modern life on their own.

Most of the female characters in the novel *Home* have been suffering from the traditional patriarchal society in several ways. They are struggling with their life to resist against patriarchy. They regard home to be the best place to get rid of the problem. In the title "Home", we can see discrimination lurked because it is the displacement from the fragmented mind to sympathize psychologically. Because of gender bias, women are thinking themselves weaker in all respects in comparison to men. Their psychological periphery does not allow them to go beyond the perimeter they are provided by the patriarchal society. They feel that they are puppets of patriarchal world. They realize and assimilate that they are created for serving and

making happy to male characters.

Consequently, there is no such fixed rule for the boys what they should do bound by the rules. However, for the women they should do according to the rules imposed by the patriarchal society. They feel frustrated, disappointed, betrayal and so on. They realize that they have to follow the patriarchal norms and values after their marriage as they go to their in-law's house. Nisha, one of the protagonists of the novel has to follow the tradition as experienced in her childhood. After her marriage, she is compelled to submit herself as a descent wife and daughter-in-law in the new house. Nisha has the feeling of domination in the patriarchal society.

Therefore, the novel depicts the male and female characters going through the various difficult adversities of life. They suffer in their own ways. Although male characters dominate women, the formers suffer in their own ways. They have to struggle in new place, which is completely new place for them. Partition has made their life traumatic. They are not able to remove the bitter past experience in the present time. Although they are attracted by modernism, traditional concepts do not allow them to adopt modernism. Women are suffering from the patriarchal society. There is dual psychological problem for them, one from the traditional concepts and another from the patriarchal society. Therefore, the modern women, daughter-in-laws of Banwari Lal family go beyond the familial values.

Works Cited

- Carby, Helen. "White Women Listen! Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood." *Black Feminism*. New York: Routledge, 2002. 234-45.
- de Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H.M. Parshley. New York: Vintage, 1952.
- Dennett, Daniel. "What's Killing Men." *Herald Sun*. Ed. Chris Heyward. Melbourne: Routledge, 2005. 21-29.
- Eagly, Alice. *Black Men and Masculinity*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2004.
- Fine, Cordelia. *Delusions of Gender: How Our Minds, Society and Neurosexism Create Difference*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2010.
- Fraser, Nancy and Linda Nicholson. "Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism." *Feminism/Postmodernism*. Ed. Linda Nicholson. New York: Routledge, 1990. 50-71.
- Frye, Marilyn. *The Politics of Reality*. London: The Crossing Press, 1983.
- Hooks, bell. *We Real Cool: Black Men and Masculinity*. London: Taylor & Francis 2004.
- Home. Blurb. New Delhi: Random House India, 2007.
- Kapur, Manju. *Home*. New Delhi: Random House India, 2007.
- Katrak, Ketu. *Theorizing a Politics of the Female Body*. London: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Menon, Ritu and KamlaBhasin. *Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's Partition*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes." *Feminism without Border*. New Delhi: Duke University Press, 2003. 1-7.
- - -. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Feminist Review* 30 (1988): 65-66.
- Narayan, Uma. *Dislocating Cultures*. New York: Routledge. 1997.
- Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex."

Towards an Anthropology of Women. Ed. Rayna Rapp Reiter. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975. 157-210.

Spelman, Elizabeth. *The Inessential Woman*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. Noida: Routledge, 2006.

Young, Iris. "Humanism, Gynocentrism and Feminist Politics." *Throwing Like a Girl*. New Delhi: Indiana University Press, 1990.73-91.