

Concept of Arrange Marriage in Context of Feminism

Shelly

Ph.D. English [Pursuing], Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Sciences, HMR Institute of Technology and Management, Alipur New Delhi

The concept of marriage has been subject to a logical critique by feminists, who see it as a patriarchal tradition. In her book *The Second Sex*, the renowned French author and feminist activist Simone de Beauvoir goes into great detail about her concerns with the institution of marriage. She has drawn attention to the prejudice and inequity that a wife, who is viewed as the second and inferior sex to men, must deal with. What bothers me the most, however, is the idea of arranged weddings, without getting into the problematic aspects of marriage in general. Originally, marriage was a religious rite that sanctioned sexual relations and childbearing between two people—typically, a man and a woman. Most of the time, being married was a religious obligation that had to be fulfilled, rather than something that one wished to do. They served as a means of preserving "caste purity," maintaining caste endogamy, and securing inheritances. Even if it was thus way for many years, the meaning of marriage in most societies today has undergone a tremendous change. The story of marriage in modern times also takes into account the concepts of love, companionship, and respect in addition to having a religious obligation that made it essential to have children and have sex.

For a very long time, people of all cultures and religions participated in the practise of planned marriages. After centuries of this custom, people began to seek more freedom in selecting their spouses. Because of how widely accepted the concept was, arranged marriages are now only an archaic and pointless custom that has no place in a world that is becoming more and more modern. Arranged marriages continue to remain the only favoured method of marriage in some cultures, despite being the exception rather than the rule in most today. Many in India still view so-called "love marriages" with distrust and disgust, making arranged marriages both significant and quite common. We could wish to re-evaluate what it performs and what it truly entails even though the

Indian populace believes it to be the best strategy for a lasting marriage.

Arranged marriages are founded on the notion that your parents and other household elders are better qualified to select a spouse for you. When weddings were determined by the social and financial standing of the parties involved, this may have been effective. But, in the modern marriage, love and compatibility are seen as the foundation of a union. The idea that your parents know best doesn't make a lot of sense in light of this fundamental change in the very nature of marriage, and it doesn't actually work either. A marriage is a bond between two families, not a relationship between two persons, as is frequently stated above. Marriage now being viewed as a very personal issue rather than a social one has cast doubt on this idea.

WOMEN HAVE FEW OPTIONS

First, think about your options. Despite the fact that historically girls and women have had less influence over their marriage arrangements than boys and men, this trend seems to be changing worldwide, not just in India. In many of the societies examined above, neither men nor women are free to choose their own spouses, and the inequality that is seen is based on power imbalances between parents and children rather than between men and women. In actuality, just three of the 106 societies that use arranged marriages, according to Small (1993), give potential men more options than prospective brides. In 50% of the societies analysed, brides frequently possessed the authority to reject an intended union. She makes the argument that compulsion doesn't always entail a lack of choice in selecting potential candidates. However, as previously mentioned, once the marriage begins, arranged weddings need not develop significantly differently from Western ones. According to certain evolutionary theories (e.g., Hazan and Diamond 2000), the kind of everyday physical and psychological interaction that appears to be a part of

both forms of marriages is necessary for the development of attachment connections between two people. Third, Small challenges the notion that Western women are completely free to choose their mates since we want our families and friends to approve of and accept our new husbands.

In actuality, mothers may benefit from the daughters' loss of self-determination. The authority given to older women in some societies to arrange marriages for both their sons and daughters is not always insignificant because such alliances can play a significant role in determining wealth and property (Coles 1990). Dorné (1994) draws attention to the strategic interactions men and women have while working together to maintain existing imbalances between couples. Extended to a generational perspective, this may entail the preservation of systems of pre-arranged marriage; frequently, especially in patrilocal cultures, mothers-in-law acquire increased relative authority when their sons marry. They should pick daughters-in-law who will uphold their authority rather than undermine it. A mother could encounter issues if her daughter-in-law is overly adored by her son. The daughter-in-law may not be required to serve or care for her mother-in-law according to customary divisions of work enforced by the son. Also, the mother might be disregarded in favour of her daughter-in-law, which is acceptable in American culture but might not be in other cultures. Finally, in a nation like India, where, as my cousin remarked, "parental approval is still considered pretty essential and youngsters cannot just walk away from it," prioritising choice in the area of marriage partners may not be desired. In actuality, the concept of personal choice is a largely individualistic understanding of what it is to have equal self-determination.

THE CONCEPT OF WOMEN AS PROPERTY IS MAINTAINED THROUGH ARRANGED MARRIAGES

Another criticism of arranged weddings is that by treating women like property, they allow for widespread mistreatment of them (Haider 1995). It is evident from the study above that arranged marriages do not always regard women as property; however, this is sometimes the case. However, some contemporary methods of marriage planning are best described as treating both sons and daughters as

components of a single, larger unit—the family. Sons and daughters should consider the needs of the family as a whole when choosing their marriages because they are family members.

Another issue is that it's challenging to compare rates of domestic violence across cultural boundaries. While spouse violence occurs in love marriages in the United States and other Western nations as well, stories concerning battered women in arranged marriages may not be solely influenced by the method that marriages are arranged. Yet, planned marriages can sometimes make it easier for women to be mistreated or treated like property. This is because marriage customs sometimes mirror a cultural attitude of women as property. This might be especially true when cultural ideologies and religious systems support the notion that women are less important than men.

It is obvious that planned weddings can be carried out in ways that degrade, demoralise, and abuse women. And in order to avoid being forced into arranged marriages, women may resort to extreme measures, like suicide. It is difficult to say whether the best way to deal with these darker aspects of arranged-marriage practises is to aggressively oppose the custom of arranged marriages or to try to put protections against such actions within current institutions for arranging marriages. A practical option that is currently in place in many households is allowing women (and men) to veto weddings. A more democratic method of selecting spouses could also mean that spouses are held to a higher standard of care. This viewpoint does not suggest that either men or women are "property," but rather sees a union between two persons that has been collectively chosen and upheld.

CONCLUSION

The above article concludes that arranged marriages are something that bound the entire life of a woman and it also snatches all the rights and equalities of her that she deserves. It also suppresses her voice and she needs to think before speaking. Then what is the use of such marriages where a woman is losing her right to speak as well?

That's why women should have the liberty to choose whether she wants to get married or not. The choice should be her only and not the society. She is capable enough to take the decision what is right and what is wrong for her.