Effect of Politics on Women's Quota: A Study upon Women's Reservation

Peter Joseph

Research Scholar, CCS Meerut, (U.P.)

----------♦----------

INTRODUCTION

It is surely noteworthy that the last decades so often referred to as the era of globalisation, have also witnessed a new interest in the politics of governance worldwide. Interestingly, governance discourse has displayed a particular concern with questions of gender equality, especially in the sphere of political representation. Countries as diverse as the United States, France, India and Japan have thus been subjected to the glare of negative attention, in the face of the low proportion of seats occupied by women within their respective governments.

Since the 1990s, debates and campaigns inside the women's development in India have unquestionably witnessed another focus on women in discretionary politics. Demands for reservations of seats, first at the level of neighborhood bodies (village councils and municipalities) and starting in 1996, through vain attempts to pass legislation for an one-third quota in state and national assemblies might be clear evidence of India's own investments in this dimension of sexual orientation fairness. Along these lines, the passing of the Women's Reservation Bill in the Rajya Sabha (the higher house of the Indian Parliament) on 9 March 2010 denoted a historic defining moment in the story of Indian popular government. Despite the fact that there is no sign yet that the Bill will be consumed in the Lok Sabha (the Lower House) the proposed legislation reserving one-third of all seats in the Lok Sabha and the State Assemblies could at long last empower Indian women to keep their "tryst with destiny". Despite animated association in the opportunity struggle, women were a miniscule presence in Parliament in the period overwhelmed by the Indian National Congress (henceforth Inc)—a pattern that continues to this day, with just fifty-nine women members in the Lok Sabha in the last national elections of 2009, an uncovered ten percent.

The trouble of this part, be that as it may, is to contend that a contemporary focus on the question of women, quotas and the politics of representation, might furnished an exceptionally fragmented if not distorted picture. More than numerous issues, reservations or quotas require a historical perspective, a revisiting of the early decades of the twentieth century, the time of autonomy in 1947 and the establishment of the Indian Republic in 1950. Just with an understanding of this history can the special charge joined to reservations as well as the contours of the contemporary talk about and stalling of the Women's Reservation Bill be legitimately assessed. Since the approval of the Constitution of India in 1950, India has been a multi-party Parliamentary majority rule government, accompanying an appointive system closely modelled on that of the British based on constituencies. An unified system of states and a Central government, with two houses of Parliament, elections are held at regular intervals (unless the government falls soon after that) in a first-past-the-post system. The main system of quotas institutionalised under the Constitution are for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. In spite of the fact that there have been discussions of exchange systems such as one based on relative representation, incorporating in the wake of the verbal confrontation spawned by the proposal for reservations for women, this has never been seriously consumed. The starting authority of the Inc accompanying autonomy has, since the 1980s, offered route to a variety of parties both at the Centre and in respective States. Women, as of recently stated, have never been a significant presence, if at the Centre or in the State legislatures.

HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK OF WOMEN'S MOTION UNDER THE BRITISH RULE

To substantiate my contention about the part of history, it is necessary to place the beginnings of the issue of quotas inside frontier modernity.1 In terms of the history of the women's development in India, the early decades of the twentieth century mark the recognized start of a fresh phase in women's organizing. "The instructive

experiments of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries", it is said, "prepared 'another lady' with interests that went past the household" (Forbes 1996: 64). The new demands of coming to be advanced, be that as it may, set off major uncertainties about the relationship between so-called "social" issues—until now characterized as pushing female instruction, raising the period of marriage, empowering "scientific" methods of tyke consideration, handiwork handling et cetera, and an as yet vague area of the "political", especially political action vis-a-vis the state.

Historians of the women's development have unchangingly underscored the discriminating, over-figuring out part of colonialism and the developing compel of nationalism for approaching women's politicisation in the twentieth century. Partha Chatterjees plan of the nationalist resolution of the women's question is seemingly the most powerful. Nationalism was equipped to successfully resolve the significant conflicts generated in the wake of social change throughout the ninetieth century by processing an "up to date lady" who was to be the encapsulation of the spiritual superiority of the country. From the turn of twentieth century, nationalists "refused to make the women's question an issue of political arrangement with the pioneer state"; in addition, they allowed women the vote without the need for a suffrage development. Instead of being openly rivalry with men, distinctions "between women on the planet outside the home" were significantly more significant: It was against conceptions of excessively "Westernized", "universal", and "low-class" women that the new standard was fashioned—the up to date lady whose instruction and liberation were fixed to the spiritual qualities of self-sacrifice, consideration, commitment, and religiosity, thus setting set up a revised patriarchy whose honesty rested precisely on being disavowed (Chatterjee 1993: 131-133 emphasis unique). Lamentably, Chatterjee's record stops with the turn of the twentieth century, and does not remark whatsoever on the intricate development of a women's development in the subsequent decades. Essentially, then, his arguments have the accompanying twin corollaries: On the one hand, women ceased to be significant in the following phase of nationalist struggle; then again, women's political rights were resolved in social terms, as spiritual bearers of Indian nationhood.

The question I wish to pursue here is if such assumptions might be sustained, or if indeed "women" proceeded to be basic precisely when the ground of social nationalism moved toward the political claims of citizenship.

Presently it is in reality possible to find unmistakable women who drew from (while also transforming) the intense ingredients of social nationalism to end up very uncommon embodiments of open politics, and who established this new lady on numerous stages—provincial, national and international. Sarojini Naidu was apparently a standout amongst the most famous of them. As of recently in 1918 she persuaded her Inc group of onlookers that giving women the vote might in no way, shape or form meddle with the "destinies" of men and women, which were "separate" ones, yet united by nationalism. Nor, in the decade that emulated, would it be able to be denied that it was the British who refused to concede women the right to vote and stand for elections on the same terms as men, in spite of the fact that this request delighted in the support of most of the women's organisations of the time, the Home Rule League, the Muslim League, and the Inc, incorporating an at first opposed Gandhi. By 1930, major women's organisations were also pondering the question of reservations of seats in political bodies separated from women's voting rights. In her quite publicised Presidential Address to the All India Women's Conference (in the future Aiwc) in Bombay of the same year, Sarojini Naidu made it unequivocally clear that women did not need special medicine [i.e. any type of assignment or reservation], for this might sum to an admission of women's "second rate quality". This was the reason she was no feminist. Women's task was nothing less than the "spiritual change of the planet" (Aiwc 1930: 21). Thus, even nationalism in her view restricted the scope of women's transformative potential. On an alternate occasion she evoked "the indivisibility of womanhood— frontiers, wars, races, numerous things make for division—however womanhood combines. The monarch and the peasant are one, and the time has come when each lady should know her own particular godliness" (Reddy 1964: 124). Social distinction and political rights seem to stream seamlessly into each other, and with this vital consequence: whereas social nationalism rested on claims of distinction, women's politics drew upon the universal dialect of solidarity and indivisibility.

Be that as it may if a figure like Sarojini Naidu could transform the knowledge of frontier subjection into a sentimental extend of female spiritualism and humanism, in one and the same breath dismissing feminism in the name of women's worldwide solidarity, this can't be said for numerous others who got animated in setting up women's organisations and advertising women's issues. For some of these women who were drawn towards agendas of social change under the changing and politically turbulent decades of the twentieth century, the question of political rights, engagement with the pioneer state, the interest for the franchise and the contentious issue of reserved seats were not so easily "resolved". It may be worth reviewing that the first interest for women's entitlement to vote (presented to Montague in 1917) appears to have been something of an unplanned by-item: The introductory nomination by Margaret Cousins, (an Irish feminist and secretary of the Women's Indian

Association (from this point forward Wia) in Madras), with the sponsorship of D.k. Karve and the Senate of Poona's Indian Women's University, was for compulsory free essential instruction for both girls and boys. It was just when she was educated that the terms of the Montague-Chelmsford enquiry were strictly "political", intended to launch a constitutional process of self-government, that she claims to have connected the interest for instruction to the need for Indian women's franchise (Reddy (ed) 1956; Pearson 1989: 201-202). Sarojini Naidu headed a separate designation requesting that women be incorporated on the same terms as men in any political settlement for India.

In one of the first extensive studies of the Indian women's development, Jana Everett attempted to record for such differences amongst women in their connection to politics and reservations by alluding to the "inspire" and "equivalent rights" factions around women's organisations (Everett 1979). Since then, various studies have analysed this enormously mind boggling period in the history of the women's development, especially from the perspective of the blended fortunes of diverse women's delegations soon after the British government, and the responses of British colonialists furthermore feminists.2 In a later intercession, occasioned precisely by the present restoration of interest in the subject of reservations, Geraldine Forbes has alluded to distinctive phases on this issue between 1918 and 1935 in terms of women's relationships to politics and voting rights. It was just after 1930 (after the Lahore Declaration and the Nehru Report promising women "equivalent rights") that the thought of universal franchise shaped the applicable scenery for shifting stances towards the issue of reservations (Forbes 2002). Unmistakably there were profound differences and conflicts even inside women's organisations such as the Aiwc, established in 1926, which turned into the most compelling national women's organisation in the following decade. In a prior study, Forbes has brought up how one by one, women who had previously supported designation and reserved seats [such as Muthulakshmi Reddy] added their voices to the interest for "equity and no privileges" and "a reasonable field and no favour". The official stance of the three major women's organisations in 1932 against any "privileges" notwithstanding, "there was an extraordinary arrangement of support for special electorates and designated seats", especially from commonplace assemblies and neighborhood bodies (Forbes 1996: 107-108).

WOMEN'S EQUALITY IN THE ERA OF INDEPENDENCE

Communalism, Minorities and Majorities : The host of issues hurled in the name of the Communal Award require considerably more examination than either women's organisations seem to have been equipped for around then or that feminist historians have given since. In the space of this part, it is just possible to say some of the more imperative aspects, starting with the exact construction of the idea of "communalism" itself. Right into the twentieth century, liberal nationalists envisioned what's to come India as being made up of discrete religious communities, Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian et cetera (whatever the problems appended to such a vision, and parallel efforts to divide boundaries between "social" and "political" domains). They even freely espoused the part of separate electorates. Nonetheless, from the 1920s, and not just because of the series of Hindu-Muslim riots in numerous parts of the country throughout that decade, the importance of "communalism" changed breathtakingly and came to be conceptualised in zero-sum terms, in a connection of opposition to a much narrower meaning of nationalism. Nationalism now asserted to stand above and outside the primordial pulls of religious group or caste (Pandey 1990: 235), steadfastness to country needed to surpass that of any sectarian attachments (whose open political spot in this way must be diminished), until, at long last, any reference to communities, was synonymous with religious neighborhood, as well as with all that was pernicious in the British arrangement of "gap and guideline". Understandings such as these were unmistakably prevailing in organisations like the AIWC.

Leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru juggled between the "untenability", in his view, of a communal system of political representation, and claims that the INC must make it the business of the state to give favoured treatment to minority and backward communities. This was in 1930. Even though the Constituent Assembly as late as 28 August 1947 (after Indian independence and the creation of Pakistan) sought to ratify the special rights of minorities, which explicitly included reservations of seats in the Central and Provincial Legislatures, a principle of representation in the Cabinet, and a due share in the services, by the time the question was re-opened in 1949 after the horrors of the Partition violence had subsided, it did not take much to dismantle and drop them altogether. The distress and ambiguity of the moment was such that it was even possible to radically undermine the political relevance of notions such as minorities and majorities in a secular independent state making a break with the colonial past. However, it was not as though these terms were abandoned. Nehru, for example, continued to use them, along with the asymmetry of political power that the majority/minority dyad implied, when he declared that any demand for safeguards by minorities betrayed a lack of trust in the majority, while also advising the majority not to ride roughshod over the minorities. Already in 1947, when the *Objectives Resolution* of the Constituent Assembly

had resolved to provide adequate safeguards for "minorities, backward and tribal areas, depressed and other backward classes", the term "minority" was dropped, and "class" was said to be sufficiently inclusive. As a result of the efforts of B.R. Ambedkar, the phrase which finally found its way into Article 16 (4) of the Constitution of India was "any backward class of citizens". Ambedkar himself appears to have used "community", "caste" and "class" in the course of his deliberations more or less interchangeably {Ambedkar 1979; CAD 1946-50). But overall, the tenor of these debates was such that the rights of minorities had to be encapsulated as primarily cultural and religious, not political.

The Constitutional Resolution of the Women's Question : In comparison to the trajectories of the political rights of minorities, retrograde classes and the "untouchables", the bearing taken by women's rights from the 1930s to 1950, was significantly distinctive. We have recently seen how the Communal Award not just at heart influenced women's organisations' understanding of caste and communalism, however stiffened the resolve of numerous to clutch "equivalent rights" at any cost. In the years hinting at and taking after the Government of India Act of 1935, women's organisations were successively deceived. The first to do so were the British, who refused to furnish any statement of crucial rights or non-discrimination on the basis of sex for holding open office in the 1935 Act Some modifications were made in regards to qualifications for voting in distinctive provinces, (wifehood remaining essential), which extended male and female electorates to forty-three percent and nine percent respectively. Forty-one reserved seats for women were allotted around diverse communities. In the following elections of 1937, what added up to fifty-six women candidates entered the legislatures, out of which just ten originated from general seats and five were nominations. Women's organisations subsequently felt specifically deceived by the Inc: If it was Gandhi who had been the most vociferous supporter against reserved seats for women, the Inc now had no place for any women candidates other than those who were staunch party workers in any case. At last, for all their efforts to broaden the amount of women voters, "there was no necessary culmination between the politicisation of women and the genuine progression of their cause" (Nair 1996: 140).

THE LEGACY AFTER INDEPENDENCE

This, then, was the "resolution" of the question of women's representation at the conception of the new India. Prior voices in favour of reserved seats had been marginalised in favour of the dialect of formal uniformity. Not just this, as I have been contending, the universal dialect of "no special rights" verbalized by women was every now and again voiced in checked contrast to others, such as Scheduled Castes and Tribes, who did appropriate special quotas in the new government.

It is momentous to see how this historical legacy proceeded to structure the understanding of the first spokespersons of the post- freedom women's development as well. As Lotika Sarkar and Vina Mazumdar recognized in 1974 in their Note of dissent over the issue of political reservations for women (in the setting of the readiness of the Towards Equality Report on the Status of Women in India for the United Nations), being "firm believers in equivalent rights for women" went as an inseparable unit with criticising the system of reservations for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, "as a legacy of the provincial period institutionalising backwardness of certain sections of our populace". It was just their explorations into the by and large denied status of women after freedom, incorporating women's surprisingly low representation inside the legislatures, that compelled them to realise that applying the guideline of fairness in a connection that is unequal just intensifies inequalities. Nonetheless, they were unable to persuade different members of the Committee of this new stance. They even went ahead to bring up that, while lately the representative base of male legislators had been developing and transforming its class composition, "on account of [the small number of] women... the story is truly diverse... the foundation of the women legislators is considerably narrower and represents for the most part the overwhelming strata of our society" (Sarkar and Mazumdar 2008: 13). In addition to this criticism, these women representatives fail to offer a sense of the ground realities and any close links with women's issues. It is interesting to note in this connection that the main sort of reservations that discovered favour by the Committee overall were reservations at the level of nearby government—basically the village councils or panchayats.

What changed in the mediating decades such that, hot on the heels of the seventy-third and seventy-fourth Constitutional Amendments in promptly 1993 that carried one-third reservations for women in neighborhood provincial and urban bodies, a similar interest was raised at the state and national levels by 1996? As per Nivedita Menon, while there has without a doubt been a shift in the trajectory of the women's development, such that women have risen as a significant constrain in Indian politics, this alone can't represent the level of support that the new call for reserving one-third of all seats in Parliament and the state legislatures for women gained. The feminist stance in favour of such reservations has tied in with an altogether different improvement an upper caste unease if not opposition to the rise of retrograde caste parties in the last decades, who have visibly changed the composition of parliament and the way of discretionary politics (Menon 2008).

The women's movement could not have been more different from the rise of the OBCs as a political force. The new phase of political awakening beginning in the 1970s took the form of the emergence of fresh issues, whether articulated within existing social movements or in an "autonomous" form, both through the interventions of smaller groups and within mass-based forms of organising. Apart from the ever widening reach of the issues themselves—against violence and discrimination in fields, workplaces and public spaces, in the family and household —it is necessary to pay attention to the language and frameworks deployed, as social issues were sought to be transformed into political ones. Modernity and development were subjected to critique, and the terminology of patriarchy found widespread acceptance, more so, indeed, than the language of feminism, which some found problematic, with its association with western and liberal ideologies. Through a combination of liberal and socialist worldviews, the "new woman" of this moment could be described as the otherwise unmarked activist/academic whose specific identity seemed to matter little in her role of representing the multiple forms of victimisation of the vast majority of India's women across classes and groups. By the 1990s the women's movement was encountering a range of newer challenges—secular challenges in the rise of Hindu right wing politics and fears among Muslim minorities; caste cleavages including new organisations representing Dalit women; and a new economic order proclaiming a break from state led development under globalisation and a liberalised role for markets. These have been well documented. Less well understood are changes in the nature of the movement itself, as it quietly professionalized itself in different ways.

CONCLUSION

Dissimilar to in the preindependence period, thusly, when leaders of the women's development contrasted the stance of an united womanhood against the claims of caste and minority groups by opposing reservations all in all, today we are seeing another stance strongly in favour of reservations for women. However this is continuously joined by a stamped opposition to opening up this classification through sub-quotas. As per one especially pessimistic observer, Anand Teltumbde, the disappointment of quotas for the Scheduled Castes and Tribes to generate a viable dalit or adivasi voice in our Parliament has not been sufficiently noted in the first spot. Set up of Ambedkar's desire for separate electorates, the existing system has just yielded candidates under the control of their respective parties. He believes that much the same will happen with a quota for women—that in the present time of coalition politics, huge parties will seek to field women in considerable number in a feudal mode so as to hold more excellent hold on the chose populace. This is the reason smaller parties of the Dalit and retrograde castes fear that such reservations will dissolve their base.

I, for one, am prepared to be less pessimistic about the last conclusion of a reservations strategy for women. Be that as it may we must ask ourselves what precisely would be historic about carrying a basic mass of women into discretionary politics. Famous expectations about women acquiring a "cleaner" government untouched by male force and pelf—or about women's interests being better represented by women—might well remain unfulfilled. Anyway in the last analysis, provided that we backpedal to the definitive vision of leaders like B.r. Ambedkar, what is at stake is nothing less than force sharing and interest whatsoever levels of the appointive process. History will without a doubt be made when diverse women, shaped by various experiences of discrimination and exclusion, will get equivalent partners in the task of building India's political future.

REFERENCES

- AMBEDKAR, Babasaheb (1979), *Writings and Speeches,* Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra.
- ANSARI, Iqbal A. (1999), "Minorities and the Politics of Constitution Making in India", in Gurpreet Mahajan and D. L. Sheth (eds), *Minority Identities and the Nation- State,* New Dehli: Oxford University Press, 113-135.
- BOSE, Prasenjit (2010), "Women's Reservation in Legislatures: A Defence", *Economic and Political Weekly,* 45: 14: 10-12.
- CHATTERJEE, Partha (1993), *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- EVERETT, Jana M. (1979), *Women and Social Change in India,* New York: St. Martin's Press.
- FORBES, Geraldine (1979), "Votes for Women: the Demand for Women's Franchise in India, 1917-1937", in Vina Mazumdar (ed), *Symbols of Power: Studies on the Political Status of Women in India (Women in a Changing Society I),* Bombay: Allied Publishers, 3-23.
- FORBES, Geraldine (2002), "Women of Character, Grit and Courage: The Reservation Debate in Historical Perspective", in Lotika Sarkar, Kumud Sharma and Leela Kasturi (eds), *Between Tradition, Counter Tradition and Heresy: Contributions in Honour of Vina Mazumdar,* New Delhi: Rainbow Publications, 221-239.

- GANDHI, Nandita, and SHAH, Nandita (2008), "The Quota Question: Women and Electoral Seats", reprinted in Meena Dhanda (ed), *Reservations for Women,* New Delhi: Women Unlimited, 61-80.

- JOHN, Mary E. (2000), "Alternate Modernities? Reservations and the Women's Movement in Twentieth Century India", *Economic and Political Weekly,* 35: 4344: 3822-3829.

- KISHWAR, Madhu (2008), "Women and Politics: Beyond Quotas", reprinted in Meena Dhanda (ed), *Reservations for Women,* New Delhi: Women Unlimited, 299-326.

- MENON, Nivedita (2008), "Elusive 'Woman': Feminism and the Women's Reservation Bill", reprinted in Meena Dhanda (ed), *Reservations for Women,* New Delhi: Women Unlimited, 158-186.

- MOON, Meenakshi, and PAWAR, Urmilla (1989), "Women in the Early Untouchable Liberation movement", *South Asia Bulletin,* 9: 2: 68-71.

- NAIR, Janaki (1996), *Women and Law in Colonial India: A Social History,* New Delhi: Kali for Women.

- NANIVADAKAR, Medha (2008), "Dual Member Constituencies: Resolving Deadlock on Women's Reservation", reprinted in Meena Dhanda (ed), *Reservations for Women,* New Delhi: Women Unlimited, 355-370.

- OMVEDT, Gail (1994), *Dalits and the Democratic Revolution: Dr. Ambedkar and the Dalit Movement in Colonial India,* New Delhi and London: Sage.

- PEARSON, Gail (1989), "Reserved Seats—Women and the Vote in Bombay", in J. Krishnamurthy (ed), *Women in Colonial India: Essays on Survival, Work and the State,* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 199-217.

- REDDY, Muthulakshmi (ed) (1956), *Mrs. Margaret Cousins and her Work in India: with a Brief Sketch of her Colleagues and Comrades,* Madras: Women's Indian Association.

- SINHA, Mrinalini (1999), "Suffragism and Internationalism: The Enfranchisement of British and Indian Women under an Imperial State", *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 36: 4: 461484.