

Role of Feminism in the Concept of Equality

Aarti Suhag

MA English from Jamia Millia Islamia University, Department of English, Delhi
(NET QUALIFIED)

Abstract:- Feminism inequality is a very vast and important topic that helps us to look deep into this world full of male-dominated and patriarchal societies. This study focuses on the role of improving women's bad conditions in a male-dominated society. It talks about the women's bad conditions and transforming the reality imposed on them. It took long years for women to achieve that equality in this world, but in some places, equality is still not achieved. Equality is something that is supported by most feminists especially by female critics whether it is the past ages of history or the present modern age, equality is something that every female critic had talked about in detail example Virginia Woolf in her "room of one's own", "Mary Wollstonecraft in A Vindication of Right for Women" Adrienne Rich the great liberal feminist talked about the social political and radical issues in a patriarchal society, etc. So, some feminists consider the right to increase for women to that origin that is less than men. The focus is on how equality can be achieved and provided to women and what they have to go through and struggle for.

I. INTRODUCTION

As we explore the concept of equality. I will lead you through several different perspectives. Our main aim is to understand the topic of equality in detail and also look at the various views of critics on the topic of equality which will help us to broaden our concept and explain to us how to explore life. I think that there was a time when we can see the imbalance of power that we need to recognize in terms of women's equality. True feminism is the equality of both sexes without being limited and restricted. And we have more boys and girls growing up today raised in more feminist households in which they share their works. Nowadays they both have the same education and job opportunities. But now also jobs are labeled for men and women. Not proper equality can be seen in job sectors; they both have certain segregation of work and jobs. But now I think the feminist moment in terms of equality takes on women's movement and women's perspective. But this is an important topic of feminist theory. What feminism means to me, I have spent my life believing that men and women have the same economic, social, and political approaches. But it is all about equality in different fields that respect the voice of women. True equality and true feminism are recognition of dynamic approaches. What does this mean? A feminist lens means that we are going to look at it differently, primarily concerning gender, but also ask and interrogate the concept and

say what are the multiple ways in which this concept has been applied in this world. With a couple of limitations, we are discussing concepts related to equality. Let us start with the understanding of some of these concepts, to begin the main concept which is equality. Something that challenges our understanding of the world. A concept is not given as a gift, but it is an insight for us to understand the world. So when I say feminist theories of equality, we are just beginning to explore the concept and try not to bring our pre-organized assumptions that we have already framed into our minds.

So, The main topic of equality is denaturalizing, what do I mean by denaturalization? It means that we think of concepts as things in the world. Equality is something that we understand as you and I are equal, humans are supposed to be equal to each other, and all humanity is considered to be equal. But when we sit with it and then begin to examine the reasons why that does not seem to play out in the actual world of consequences, then we will have to also make a conceptual adjustment about it, which is part of what we are trying to do today. Under feminist theories of equality, here are a couple of questions that arise. When we say equality the common understanding is of course we know what equal means to us that is "the same". However, in feminist theory, if we ask very specifically concerning men and women, equal to what? And this might seem a perfectly banal question. When we say men and women are equal, what do we mean? Do we mean men and women are equal in capacity, opportunities, strength, and inability? What do we mean by equal? What are the parameters based on which we understand such equality? This is specifically important about feminist theorization because the goal of feminism is to achieve equality for men and women and every other kind of identity that functions in this world. Different countries and their development have different contexts, and different challenges in the world reflecting the status of men and women in the labor market and their expected roles, based on the value of tradition and society within the family. At the same time, men traditionally performed the function of the breadwinner and occupied the highest position in society. But now the situation has changed and women are also paid with the same equality in the private sector, public sector, or industrial areas.

Therefore, what is the norm that equality seeks to achieve? Therefore, we consider what are called models of equality in the world and these models are important because they teach us how to think of equality differently, depending on the situation, context, and consequence. We also have to take into account the

question of equality in public and equality in private. Now, why these two are important very often, a lot of struggles for equality have tried to achieve such terms in one or the other, and often it is considered difficult to achieve in both because the questions for each realm are different. Feminist theory encourages you to ask all of these questions: What does it take to achieve equality in public? What does it take to achieve equality in private? And how is it that these two are not bridged so that they begin to mean the same? Public equality means educational equality, social, political, economic, and legal equality for both sexes, and on the other hand, private equality means equality in the private life in our house, society, and family. The root of discrimination based on equality started first from the family and society where the child is being born and brought up.

Do we form equality based on how men and women are different? That is what we mean by differences or do we form models of equality based on their ostensible sameness —men and women are human, we are all participants in the human race, and therefore, each of us should be allowed the same kinds of rights in the world. We begin by considering a particular form of equality that came up in the 1960s and 1970s but has its provenance much earlier in liberal feminism in the late 19th century. This we call the feminism of uncritical equality. Why do we call it uncritical? Uncritical equality means that the term equality is not interrogated, it is assumed that everybody knows what it means and therefore the fight for feminism is very important. Now such uncritical equality as a concept comes about mainly in the US and the global north in the 1960s and 1970s, but also much earlier on, in the late 19th century, and early 20th century, with the fight for voting rights for women. Such a feminism of uncritical equality focuses on what many have considered to be a masculine model of humanity and culture, meaning equality is considered to be enough if guaranteed through votes, access to education, and sometimes access to employment, in other words, public rights, seemingly anything that anybody has access to, in public space. So, it is considered gender-neutral, because you do not want to refuse such rights. Of course, it is important that women have the right to vote, and that they have the right to education, and the right to own property so that they can own the property of their ancestors if they don't have brothers. Such a model of equality is also present in forms of thought known as liberal feminism, socialist, and Marxist models of feminism. It means that in many ways we are trying to trace the history of a concept, concepts are not properties of people, times, or of location.

Now let, us examine, what we mean by liberal feminism. Liberal feminism started in the 19th century (started by Mary Wollstonecraft) seeking its roots for the equality of women which focuses more on women's suffrage and women's education, it also means that the state should ensure fundamental freedom for individuals and therefore commonsensical women should also enjoy the same. So it derives from liberalism itself in thinking about the state as guaranteeing rights to all citizens. Since women are citizens,

they should enjoy those same rights. Therefore, it is a left-hand side that equals the right-hand side kind of logic and that is the platform on which feminism makes its case to the world.

In socialist and Marxist models of feminism, again these derived from socialism and Marxism, that think about the human as a primarily productive entity or guarantees, if women are also part of that polity, their rights should also emerge from their capacities as a producer, a worker, or as the owner of the property or as bearing the same kind of class consciousness and consequences as men. The liberal legacy comes from the assumption that men and women have equal natures and the only differences arise from socialization and treatment. As we know that men and women will have similar lives in the world. Now, you might begin to understand what I mean by the equality model of sameness, which is that men and women are the same, of course, they are just socialized differently, behave differently, to live in the world differently. And therefore, if we cancel those out, then each of their lives will begin to look the same and this is how feminism can achieve its goals. There are various critics associated with the idea of liberalism like Mary Wollstonecraft, Virginia Woolf, John Stuart mill, etc.

If women are included in that polity, their rights should also result from their roles as producers, workers, property owners, or people who share the same level of class consciousness and consequences as men, according to socialist and Marxist models of feminism, which were also derived from socialism and Marxism. The liberal heritage is based on the idea that men and women are fundamentally the same and that socialization and treatment are the only sources of difference. Men and women will live similar lives in the world, as is well known. Now that you have a better understanding of what I mean when I say that men and women are equal in every way.

As a result, the presumption that equal treatment leads to equal results also follows. Women have equal rights to own property, to vote, to work, and all of the above in many nations throughout the world, yet despite these efforts, persistent forms of marginalization and distinction still exist. Often, concepts have to be asked if they are enough, whether they are all-encompassing and the answer is mostly no. But you need to have a sense of what their particular boundaries and constraints are, to develop other kinds of concepts that will help these problems. That women and men are equal? I had asked you to keep in mind this idea of the universal human subject because, in political philosophy and theory, this is a question that is important when we discuss equality. What does this universal human subject feel like, look like, seem like, and bear properties of? And often the answer tends to be, a white upper-class man. Therefore, ask the question, is the universal human subject closer to what we understand of men or closer to what we understand of women? To continue, the liberal legacy comes from seventh and eighteenth-century political and philosophical liberal theory, which contested the divine right of monarchs to rule and argued that men of the propertied class should have equal citizenship rights. Now, this, of course, is very much

within the context of the enlightenment or modernity, where in divine rights are questioned, to developments like the Industrial Revolution, you suddenly have a world where the divine right of Kings is not a given way, where God does not dictate the world, where the natural capacities of humans are considered to be slightly more exalted in the world.

Therefore rights are meant to be determined based on equality that all men and women are born equal in the world, and therefore should have access to everything. Now, liberalism was very much about a revolutionary fervor against feudalism or the divine right of kings. However, liberal feminism borrowed and expanded upon this very notion to argue that if all men are equal, then therefore so are women. We are also humans in the world and therefore should have equal citizenship rights. This is where is important because the rights that feminism argues for remain within the realm of public rights, which is where liberal feminism finds itself to be most effective. Equal rights feminism or formal equality has therefore been very, very successful primarily through legislative means. Now, this is what we call a set of formal rights and formality does not have the same meaning, formal rights mean on paper, and things on paper make sense, something on paper is important and they are not necessarily trivial, therefore, one should not dismiss the liberal legacy as saying it only brought about public rights, no, on the contrary, it brought about public rights. But then you begin to examine the limits of this and then say, well, why is it that women still suffer? Why is it that minorities still suffer? Why is it that we still think about the world as existing and operating primarily through inequality? And this is where you interrogate the question of limits in the liberal legacy. What does the liberal legacy guarantee? Fundamentally equality, equality of opportunity, equality of condition of life, equality of outcome.

My choice, which is a very interesting example of what is called choice feminism and choice feminism is very much within the liberal legacy, that given in the paper paper of liberal feminism by(virgina woolf) women are guaranteed rights of all kinds within such an edifice, it is a woman's choice to do whatever she wants. My body, my mind, my choice, to wear the clothes I like even as my spirit roams naked, my choice to be a size S or a size XL, XXL, they do not have a size for my spirit and never will. Now, for example, you have a set of very striking-looking women making an important case in a very assertive fashion for my choice, saying that I have a right to live in this world and act as I please. Why is it that this is both interesting, and empowering, but also problematic? The assumptions that undergird something like this are that all other things being equal, women can act as they want, and there are no consequences and if there are consequences, then the state will attend to the illegal of these consequences, and women can rest. If you have ever lived as a woman anywhere in the world, you are both aware of your rights and conscious that they are not always guaranteed and that one must exercise caution. This play also addresses the issue that not all women have the same options, that you are limited by your ethnicity, caste, class, and

a variety of other factors just as much as you are by your gender. When assessing the limitations of the liberal legacy, one must keep these kinds of restrictions in mind.

We turn then to the second model of sameness— inequality, which is the socialist and Marxist model of feminism, which focuses on material inequality. And similarly expands upon socialism and Marxism as forms of thought, where women argue for rights to economic as well as political equality and bring attention to class as well as gender consciousness, which is, I am a gendered being but also belong to a certain class and when all the classes are liberated in many ways, as Marxism argues for, along with it will come gender liberation. So a lot of importance is given to this idea that class trumps gender in many ways, and this is contested, but Marxist feminism argues that economic conditions are very important for being able to understand bids for equality and this has been ignored in liberal feminism. also think about each of these models as having a dialogue with each other, rather than completely critiquing it and dismissing it. To create a more complex understanding of what it takes to secure equality for both genders, let's combine our thinking about liberal and Marxist ideas. Both of these models raise questions and concerns about the home environment, specifically why it is so difficult to create the same conditions for equality there, how frequently the conventional division of labor is maintained, and why exceptions are more likely to occur than not.

So, think of this question of the working woman. Why is it that we never ask anybody if he is a working man? How is that not a subject position in the world? There are two aspects to this question, which is men are expected to work and therefore there is no working man, there is only a man, and women who work are also expected to take care of the home. So, questions to them are always about how you manage your home and work. This is a class-specific question, lower class women have been working since time immemorial, and they are considered to be not similar kinds of subjects as middle or upper-class women who are considered to be class privileged enough to not have to work if they do not need to, but in many ways classed as it may be the question of the working woman across classes means that women have to take care of the home as well as work and therefore they are doubling the amount of labor but being paid the same amount as a man. The result of this has been an ongoing sort of campaign for childcare, maternity, paternity leave, and flexible working hours, in formal work. Therefore, it is difficult that I brought up the realm of home versus the realm of the public remains an enduring concern for the feminist theorization of equality.

Let us turn then to another form of equality or a model of equality that is different from the models based on sameness. These are the models based on difference, which is the understanding that men and women are different, let us just get with that fact. Earlier, it was uncritical equality, now it is the uncritical reversal, which is the opposite of that, where a higher value is given to the female side of the male or female binary.

Not only is such a theory suggesting that men and women are different, but it also goes on to argue that women should be placed higher on this hierarchy. This is often seen under the rubric of cultural feminism, where there is a cultural understanding of women as exalted beings. A lot of this can be seen in the Materialist stance of the 1970s and 1980s, where the primary value for women was based on motherhood.

In cultural feminism, women's ways are not only considered to be different than men's but also respected and revered. Where motherhood is considered to be the primary differentiating function. Women can give birth, men cannot and therefore women should have a higher value in humanity. There is a belief to these stances, there is this understanding, and what we mean by belief is "that there is a certain quality of women that is essential to the very act of being a woman, to the very state of being a woman, and that cannot be changed no matter what".

Since it cannot be changed, it is therefore essential to our understanding of women in the world. We also come up with a slightly important struggle and fight, which is between biological determinism and social constructionism. What do these terms mean? What do we mean by biological determinism? Biology is the determining factor, biology is composed of hard differences that cannot be overcome. Therefore, a man is a man, therefore woman is a woman, and therefore within women reside differentiating biological characteristics such as motherhood. The social constructionist view argues that men and women are some kinds of biological matter in the world, but they become men and women through social processes. It is social processes that guarantee certain kinds of respect for motherhood and confine women to those spaces. What we are arguing for is not to say, one is better than the other, but again to look at the limits of each of these, and also, which of these is more capable of being able to handle patriarchy as we know it, is our concern, how to solve the fight? So, the issue with cultural feminism is that it does not do away with patriarchy. Just because women are respected does not mean that they are liberated. The feminine is defined in opposition to the masculine, there is no way to have a more imaginative understanding of gender. And essentialism for motherhood means that you can only have a particular type of woman in the world, one who is both capable and willing to birth children. It does not have enough space for a large set of bodies that might have constraints concerning motherhood, reproduction, about having children and therefore it creates only one model of being a woman, which is capable of conforming to a very specific definition of the feminine. This might oppose the liberal model, this might oppose it in a way that says that equality cannot just be about the masculine, it has to do also with the feminine, but again, there are no more multiple feminine.

II. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have looked at equality as sameness as well as difference, taking into account multiple models of each. We have examined liberal, Marxist, and cultural feminist models of these, and we have looked at issues with each model, as well as its strengths. As a result, it is important to have a thorough awareness of the world, its critics, and equality as a whole. Everyone wants equality, especially women, but it is only achieved in a few locations, not in rural areas where people are far from their rights due to a lack of resources for education and other necessities.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Virginia Woolf 1929 A Room of One's Own
- [2]. Mary wollstonecraft 1792 A Vindication of Right for women
- [3]. Simon Beauvoir 2010 The Second Sex