

‘Understanding the concept of Honour Killing within the Social paradigm: Theoretical Perspectives’

Kanika Sharma

Senior Research Fellow, Centre for Human Rights & Duties, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

Abstract: -The present paper titled ‘Understanding the concept of Honour Killing within the Social paradigm: Theoretical Perspectives’ aims to outline the holistic concept and genesis of Honour Killing while analysing its theoretical perspective. The paper would deliberate upon the theoretical perspectives of social exclusion that leads to confrontation of conflict affecting right to life of the youth, particularly women which brings them directly in clash with the rigid and redundant norms of their families and social communities. This paper consequently presents a detailed analysis on the theories of patriarchy, cultural relativism, feminist and Marxist theories that logically trace the instance of Honour Killing as a phenomenon that plagues not just our Indian society but the International community and pragmatic suggestions of how to tackle the present dismemberment of our society.

Keywords:-Honour, Culture, Run-away Marriages, Natural Rights, Legal Positivism, Marxism, Feminist, Patriarchy, Cultural Relativism.

I. INTRODUCTION

Honour, the very word resounds courage, valour and regrettably in our Indian context also its antonym ‘shame’. Murders meted out to couples who have married against the wishes and commands of their parents and community has unfortunately become a repetitive social practice where the acts of the married couple calls upon the honour of the entire family who can only justify and avenge it by killing the couple in question. Theoretically speaking, honour killing is a social malady that our society confronts today. The terminology by itself declares these killings to be acts that validate murder in the name of honour. It is very largely construed and accepted by most patriarchal cultures as a righteous act of killing one’s own kith and kin to avenge the dishonour that had befalls upon the entire family/village/society. The act may be committed by family members or in certain distinct cultures the elders or the heads of the villages as a deterrent punishment in the form of extermination of the liable persons or some other form of equally appalling action to ensure that the ‘act’ in question is not repeated by the peers or consequent generations. The annihilation of the constitutional right to Freedom to marry of individuals is openly flouted and rather, an example of deterrence is set to discourage any future occurrences. The desecrated bodies of young couples might be the consequence of illegal diktats of the Khap in Haryana or the outlash by indignant ‘shamed’ parents/families in Punjab. The present paper titled ‘Contextualizing Human Rights within the conflicting social paradigm of Honour Killing and the Constitutional Freedom to Marry’ aims to outline the holistic concept and genesis of Honour Killing while analyzing its theoretical perspective. It would deliberate upon the theoretical perspectives of social exclusion that leads to confrontation of conflict affecting right to life of the youth which brings them directly clashing with the rigid and redundant norms of their families and social communities.

II. CONCEPT OF HONOUR

Honour Killing is becoming increasingly the most socially sanctioned repercussion and an all-encompassing deterrent to the rural urban youth, who dare to question the traditional social barriers and further dare to bring dishonour by exercising their ‘supposed right to marry’. Hence it becomes imperative to delve into the contours and concept of honour. UN Special Rapporteur Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy¹ defines the concept of Honour as especially powerful because it exists beyond reason and beyond analysis. But what masquerades as ‘honour’ is really men’s need to control women’s sexuality and their freedom. Crimes of honour potentially violate the right to life, liberty, bodily integrity, the prohibition against torture or cruel, inhuman, degrading treatment, the prohibition on slavery, the right to freedom from gender-based discrimination and sexual abuse or

¹Coomaraswamy, Radhika (2006), “Preface: Violence against women and crimes of honour” in Welchman, Lynn and Hossain, Sara (Eds.) *Honour: Crimes Paradigms and Violence against Women*, Zed Books Ltd., New York, pp. xi.

exploitation, the right to privacy, the duty to modify discriminatory practices against women. ArunPal (2012)² in *Honour Killing: Culture, Dilemma and Ritual* says that the ideology of honour is one which directly results from patriarchal gender roles, wherein conformity to these roles is demanded and a source of status and acceptance within the community; and where deviance is censured. For males, 'honour' is gained through exerting dominance and control over females and younger males, and lost through weakness and failure to control; it can be restored through violent and coercive acts. For females, 'honour' is preserved through subordinancy, obedience, chastity, endurance and virginity, and it may be lost through any autonomous acts, particularly those relating to sexuality, and cannot be restored. 'Honour' in this sense is often a social quality; it revolves around the public perception of the individuals more than their actual behavior. Causing a scandal or gossip within the community is often the most significant aspect of an offense against 'honour'. Ultimately it is those with power within the family and the community (men and older women who have proved their internalization of the 'honour' code through the policing of younger women) who decide what acts are 'honourable' or 'dishonourable'.

Some actions which are strongly linked with honour based violence are:

- (i) Loss of virginity outside marriage
- (ii) Pre-marital pregnancy.
- (iii) Infidelity.
- (iv) Having unapproved relationships.
- (v) Refusing an arranged marriage.
- (vi) Asking for divorce.
- (vii) Asking for custody of children after children.
- (viii) Leaving the family or marital home without permission.
- (ix) Causing scandal or gossip in the community.
- (x) Falling victim to rape.

PremChowdhry (2006)³ in *Contentious Marriages, Eloping Couples: Gender, Caste and Patriarchy in Northern Indias* says that to overcome caste and customary rules some couples run away from the village and get married. Such cases are generally dealt within the close preserve of the family and/or its kinship network. Yet, some of them spill over voluntarily or involuntarily into the public sphere and assume a different form, as issues concerning the sexuality of women, almost entirely confined to the family, are thrown open for judgment. This public sphere is dominated by two diametrically opposing authorities, one informal and the other formal. The informal, is under the domination of the wider community (biradari) acting through the traditional panchayat with no legal standing; the formal is regulated by the state, based upon modern egalitarian laws.

These cases of Run-away Marriages are bracketed and categorized as 'Protection Matters' by law. They render a legally absolute and unhinged right to life and liberty to persons under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The pertinent thing to note is that Article 21 protects expansively the lives and liberty of the couple, the issue of determining whether a couple is legally married or not is judged by evaluating the certainties of majority age and consent of the boy and girl. In this respect, there is undoubtedly a legal discretion upon the court to adjudicate and decide the issue of marriage. However, there is a larger undiluted obligation cast upon the court to protect the paramount rights of life and liberty of persons. Honour Killing is a phenomenon that is clearly the final result and a conspicuous consequence of crumbling socially stated patriarchal norms and their constant tussle with modernity. Tradition is not necessarily detrimental but when tradition reeks of bias, discrimination and exploitation in the name of honour and leads to loss of lives of helpless and innocent minority segments of populations, it ought to be affirmatively uprooted. Redundant traditions which are ought to be imposed by self styled khap leaders or rigid and supposed 'righteous parents' are actually, outmoded customary law imposing unreasonable political orthodoxy. At the helm of all affairs, it's a vicious cycle which connects petrified eloping couples who have rebelled against the social caste/class stratified structure which has resulted in their unfortunate horrific Honour Killings.

III. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

In order to understand the socio-economic exclusion and legal status of the run-away couples and protection towards them, it is important to look into the theoretical framework which draws attention to the fundamental theories of Natural law and Legal Positivism.

²Pal, Arun (2012), *Honour Killing : Culture, Dilemma and Ritual*, Arise Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, pp. 49.

³Chowdhry, Prem (2004), "Private Lives, State Intervention: Cases of Runaway Marriage in Rural North India", *Modern Asian Studies*, February, pp. 55-84.

Rex Martin⁴ (2013) writes about *Natural Rights* being the ancestors of basic Human Rights. In this regard, the right to choose a life partner is one such fundamental human right that can be traced right from the Natural rights era. Natural Rights theory identifies natural rights in a state of nature which are characterized by the absence of government. According to its main proponent John Locke, people in the state of nature were free, equal, and independent. He conceived natural rights as the right to life, liberty, health, and the fruits of one's labour and as having obligations attached, which normatively directed the conduct of other individuals to respect these rights even in the state of nature. Similarly, the right to marry and to lead a life of dignity, free from fear and threat is imperative to the very essence of liberty. This imposes an obligation upon every individual to exercise their rights while mutually respecting the inviolable rights of others. The natural rights tradition established the importance of two main kinds of rights: rights to certain liberties of conduct and rights to the prohibition of particular injuries at the hands of others. Natural rights are regarded as liberties held independently of society. They are held by human beings simply in virtue of their being human; they are rights of individual persons as such. Human rights (as laid out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948) are rights of persons in society, specifically in organized societies. Human rights represent important interests of such persons (in personal autonomy and in participation in the institutions and practices of self-governance, as well as interests in security, dignity, health, and well-being). These interests are treated as human rights because these interests are vulnerable to specific threats which are characteristic of life in society, in particular, in modern societies. Understanding this theory in the light of certain practices of Honour Killing that is leading to social exclusion of youth today is in direct contrast to the main premise of the Natural theory.

The *Legal Positivist theory* followed the Natural Rights theory and postulates John Austin's theory of 'Positive law'. In this respect, the right to marry by choice is not just a right that exists in vacuum. The concept of 'positive law' renders the right to marry due legal recognition by law. Jane Duran⁵ (2005) writes about the Positivists propagating that the majority of the society must be in the habit of obeying the sovereign entity. The sovereign is identified as both the source of a command and its enforcer. Correspondingly, with regard to run-away marriages, the due recognition of the marriage as a legal fact, entitles the couples contracting such run-away marriages adequate protection and rights under law. However, the social mandate unassumingly and innately followed leads to the rampant marginalisation practice of honour killing against the youth in rural and urban india where they are not permitted to exercise their right to choice of partner.

Analyzing the issue of run-away marriages traditional theories of Patriarchy and the Marxist theory of Historical Materialism accompanied by Cultural Relativism come into the picture. These theories in human rights discourse become particularly increasingly relevant as they explain the socio-economic and cultural determinants of human behavior and conditions. Some of them are discussed below:

Marxist theory of Historical Materialism – According to the fundamental premise by Karl Marx, the society is always in a state of tussle where the proletariat (have-nots) and bourgeoisie (haves) are against each other. The weaker segment, the have nots are always confronting violent opposition by the haves. This principle can be applied to the couples exercising their right to marry who face opposition threats on account of lower socio-economic status of either of the spouses. The theory of Historical Materialism has also cast a great impact from a *Feminist* thinking. According to Tahira S. Khan⁶ (2006), "Every school of feminist thinking, whether liberal, Marxist, socialist or radical has attempted to explain and theorize the phenomenon of women's oppression in the light of historical records about the creation of patriarchy and the patriarchal socio-economic institutions of human society. Apart from these prominent approaches of feminism, we find many other theories of sub-groups of theories and concepts. Generally, all the academic and theoretical explanations that have attempted to examine issues related to women in various disciplines of social sciences can be divided into 2 categories – Idealist and Materialist. Idealist school is the basic genesis of the liberal feminist school and propose the idea that the suppressed status of women in society is natural and embedded in the society's basic fabric. According to this school, conditions for women can be rectified by demanding protection and equal rights from the state. The idealist approach ignores the material and economic forces of oppression that operate against women. As per the Material Theory, the oppression of women is a social, historical and alterable phenomenon. They propagate the view that family relations are shaped by material forces such as private property ownership. "Within the materialist school, there are two theories providing logic contributing to the oppression and violence against women at two levels (a) personal (family) and (b) structural (state and society). The time and place of the honour/shame code was structured around female sexuality is of importance and

⁴ Martin, Rex (2013), "Human Rights and the Social Recognition Thesis", *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 44, No.1, pp. 1-21.

⁵ Duran, Jane (2005), "Realism, Positivism and Reference", *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 401-407.

⁶ Khan, S. Tahira (2006), *Beyond Honour: A Historical Materialist Explanation of Honour Related Violence*, Oxford University Press, Karachi.

further the reason of its endorsement by the social system. The crux of the historical materialism theory is that all social and intellectual relations can be explained by analyzing the material conditions and systems of a particular society, and the most basic material is the economic structure. Material changes in the world have changed the roles and status of women. For instance, surplus value gave birth to private property, which is accumulated in the hands of men due to division of labour, according to gender. Private property raised concerns among men about the inheritance rules for their children and the result were efforts to assure paternity. Concern with paternity led to the development of the institution of monogamous marriage. And once monogamy arrived, to safeguard private property the male started policing and regulating the wife's fertility. History has shown the close links that exist between economics and religion, moral and sexual values that predominate in a given society.

There are a number of classical feminist theories of the *Patriarchy* that can be linked to women Sylvia Walby⁷, for example, presents four different theories in her book *Theorizing Patriarchy* (1990). "According to her patriarchy is a system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women." Walby identifies four different general feminist theories related to patriarchy. These are Marxist feminism, Liberalism, the Dual-systems theory and Radical Feminism. Marxism Feminism means that men's domination over women is because of the domination of capital over labour. Economic exploitation and class-relations are the central features of social structure. These central features determine the nature of gender relations. The family is a consequence of the need for capital from women's domestic labor in the home, producing the next generation of workers. The second theory is Liberalism. Liberalists believe that the patriarchy exists because of the denial of equal rights to women in education and employment. These factors are pivotal for the subordination of women. They believe that society as a whole has sexist attitudes towards women, which act to sustain the situation. The way to solve the problem is to work for equality between the genders. The third approach is the Dual-systems theory. This perspective is a mix of Marxist and radical feminist theory. It believes there are two systems of power relations and both are important for explaining how the gender roles are structured in society. Thus, the inequality between genders can be analyzed as an effect of a capitalistic and patriarchal structure or by the capitalist-patriarchal society. The radical feminism claims that "...men as a group dominate women as a group and are the main beneficiaries of the subordination of women. They do not believe it is a product of capitalism. Instead they see sexuality as a major reason for male domination over women. Through the sexuality the men force their view of femininity on to women. The main source for the patriarchy is the reproduction and the sexuality. Schneider⁸ (1971) also endeavours an understanding of honour in terms of power in the society and suggests that honor, in the context of social relations, can be understood as "the ideology of the power holding group which struggles to define, enlarge and protect its patrimony in a competitive arena"

The theoretical framework of prestige, honour and assertion of traditional patriarchy is fundamentally what leads to fear and apprehension in couples contracting choice marriages which eventually leads to the increased spate of run-away marriages. "The ideology of honour is one which directly results from patriarchal gender roles, wherein conformity to these roles is demanded and a source of status and acceptance within the community; and where deviance is censured. For males, 'honour' is gained through exerting dominance and control over females and younger males, and lost through weakness and failure to control; it can be restored through violent and coercive acts. For females, 'honour' is preserved through subordinancy, obedience, chastity, endurance and virginity, and it may be lost through any autonomous acts, particularly those relating to sexuality, and cannot be restored. Ultimately it is those with power within the family and the community (men and older women who have proved their internalization of the 'honour' code through the policing of younger women) who decide what acts are 'honourable' or 'dishonourable'⁹. The Patriarchal school of thought, according to M.L Anderson¹⁰, (2000) writes "patriarchal societies give men power and authority over women and this can be found at the individual, group or institutional level. To prevent dishonoring from occurring, the honor ideology is enforced by systematic control of women's social and especially sexual behavior. As should be evident, this places females in a very dangerous position in traditional societies." According to Kandiyoti¹¹, (1987) interestingly, women in traditional patriarchal societies don't have a direct claim to honour even though the

⁷Walby Sylvia (1990), "*Theorizing Patriarchy*", Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 3-8.

⁸Schneider, J, (1971), "Of vigilance and virgins: Honor, shame and access to resources in Mediterranean societies" *Ethnology* Vol. 10, pp. 2.

⁹<http://indialawyers.wordpress.com/2010/07/03/honour-killings-and-the-need-for-new-legislation/> accessed on 20th December, 2013 at 9:00 AM.

¹⁰Anderson, M.L (2000), "*Thinking About Women: Sociological Perspectives in Sex and Gender*", Allyn and Bacon, Boston, pp. 291.

¹¹Kandiyoti, D.A (1987), "Emancipated but unliberated?" *Reflections on the Turkish case Feminist Studies* Vol.13, pp. 317-338.

family honour is largely dependent on their behavior. Their actions as individuals, particularly through actual or perceived sexual misconduct, can only bring dishonor to others. However, it is not only sexual misconduct, but any misbehavior on the part of female members that can bring shame and dishonor to the male members or a whole community, lineage or family.

Quite a few scholars have linked the idea of 'honour' to social status and regulation of social relations. The conception of honour used to rationalize abuse and killing of women is founded on the idea that one person's honour depends on the behavior of others; behavior that must be controlled. Thus, an essential component of one's self-esteem and community status becomes dependent on the behaviour of others¹². In studying the concept of honour, it is revealed that it is a complex notion that is tied to both a man's self-worth and social-worth. A man's honour is his claim to pride which may be reflected in such factors as his family of origin, wealth, and generosity. However, a man's honour is tied most closely to the reputations and sexual conduct of women in his family, particularly his mother, sisters, wife, and daughters. Any breach or suspected breach of sexual codes by these women is viewed as a potent assault on the man's honor, the family's honour, and/or the communal fund of honour associated with a clan, tribe, or other lineage groups. Such an assault results in "shame. To be rid of shame and restore honour, the woman offender must be punished. Family responses to sexual or alleged sexual misconduct vary from ignoring or minimizing the situation to killing the woman. Decisions may depend on the social and political standing of the family in the community¹³. According to Turner¹⁴ (1995), for a man, loss of control of women's behavior results in shame. Thus, if it appears that males or families cannot control their females, especially in the area of sexuality, their honour is threatened and the result is shame.

Theory of Cultural Relativism - The corollary of honour and its ramifications on the society can be explained well with the theory of cultural relativism which surfaced in the early 20th century. Susanne Moller Okin¹⁵ in 'Is Multiculturalism bad for Women?'(1999) claims that the patriarchy is a worldwide phenomenon that decreases the women's possibilities to make choices in life: Many of the world's traditions and cultures, which certainly encompass most of the people of Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and Asia are quite distinctly patriarchal. They too have elaborate patterns of socialization, rituals, matrimonial customs, and other cultural practices (including systems of property ownership and control of resources) aimed at bringing women's sexuality and reproductive capabilities under men's control. In this respect by identifying certain regions globally belonging to distinctive and traditional patriarchy, she excludes certain others from the patriarchal scheme and assumes that Western liberal regimes are simply and plainly less patriarchal than other regimes. Baker et al.¹⁶ (1999) indicate that the concept of honor goes through a transformation in its application to the West. Nevertheless, it can still be understood as an ideology held by those who seek patriarchal power in a competitive arena by dictating and controlling women's behavior. Here, Baker et al. (1999) argue, the competitive arena is the female's demand for equality. As females acquire more rights and freedoms males' power and control is challenged. This is consistent with what Bates and Rassam¹⁷ (1983) reported happening in developing Middle Eastern countries. They predicted that the increasing exposure to Western culture challenges males' and families' control of females and hence, their honor, could lead to increased violence against women.

The Constitution of India under Article 21 entails the right to life and personal liberty of all individuals and no person shall be deprived of the same except according to procedure established by law. This expansive fundamental right secures legal protection and maintains status quo towards all individuals entering into marital alliances against the wishes of their parents/ families/ communities. Within the social paradigm, there are two distinct sets of structures that witnesses aggression and protest between these two sides: assertion of freedom amongst the youth on one side and violent oppression by the so called saviours of the society and defenders of family honour on the other side. The schizophrenic nature of our Indian society clearly reflects that the law might be progressing faster than the society mindsets. The Legislature and the Courts consistently enforce fundamental right to the freedom of the individual to marry and have a family but the conspicuous khaps at the grass-root level assertively deny the youth the same. The logic in the two states of Punjab and Haryana maybe

¹²<http://www.critcrim.org/redfeather/journal-pomocrim/vol-8-shaming/araji.html> accessed on 5th April 2014 at 11:45 PM.

¹³ <https://indialawyers.wordpress.com/category/honour-kilings/> accessed on 20 December 2013 at 9:00 AM.

¹⁴ Turner, F. (1995). "Shame, beauty, and the tragic view of history" *American Behavioral Scientist* Vol.38, pp.1060-1075.

¹⁵ Okin, Moller Susan (1999), *"Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?"* Princeton University Press, New Jersey, pp. 14.

¹⁶ Baker, N.V., Gregware, P.R. & Cassidy, M.A. (1999)." Family Killing Fields" *Violence Against Women* Vol. 5, pp. 164-184.

¹⁷ Bates, D.G. & Rassam A. (1983), *"Peoples and Cultures of the Middle East"*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, pp 213-219.

different but it is questionable all the same. The act of Honour Killing has been traversing on an increasingly steep curve in India. The phenomenon is rampant in a few north Indian states like Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. This however by no means signifies that the rest of the India is free from this social evil.

IV. CONCLUSION

It has been 67 years since India's independence and we are a country with eminent achievements like the ISRO scientists (Indian Space Research Organization) historically entering the Mars orbit and the World Health Organization (WHO) declaring India polio-free in 2014. However, it also has been 67 long years since the same independence and we are still plagued with our basic human rights to choose and to select a partner and more imperatively to live with unconditional human dignity. The unfortunate incidences of Honour Killings have not decreased and nor is there a downward trend of run-away marriages. There is an imperative need to redefine the social construct within which the society operates. The modernity that revolves around technology and youth doesn't identify with the old shackles of conventional diktats and self styled norms. Honour Killing may be yet another outcome of this continuous tussle between the obsolete mandates of the rigid society and the progressive propelling youth. The debate about honour and culture fixation has finally brought to light certain horrid facts and alarming statistics.

The positive trend that our Indian government is propelling towards is that it is finally taking stock of the situation. Research in academia and laws in the parliament are moving side by side complementing each other and providing answers to these vicious social dilemmas. There has been a lot of speculation and discussion about introducing a separate law to prevent Honour Killings, and rendering legal and logistic protection to run-away couples. Recently, the government of India¹⁸ has initiated the process of drafting this law against honour killings by treating crimes in the name of honour as a separate category of offences. The move comes after 22 states, including Punjab, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Chandigarh supported the recommendations of the Law Commission of India to treat honour crimes as a standalone offence. The Law Commission had in its 242nd report on "Prevention of Interference with the Freedom of Matrimonial Alliances in the Name of Honour and Tradition" recommended a strict law against honour crimes being perpetuated by community panchayats working under different names in different parts of the country. But in retrospect, the rhetorical question that needs to be reflected is that, is there a requirement for a law to categorically penalize and reiterate what has already been declared as punitive? The Indian Penal Code, 1860 is the most comprehensive penal legislation which covers under its umbrella all criminal acts of murder, attempt to murder, assault, wrongful confinement and criminal conspiracy. Our Indian Constitution and its plethora of legislations comprise one of the finest and most impeccable expositions in theory. However, in practice, its implementation has its profound flaws. Honour killing is the most ruthless and calculated form of murder committed in the shallow pretext of avenging honour and reputation. But it's nevertheless murder. Instead of adding yet another new piece of legislation to the existing bulwark efforts should be pioneered towards effectively implementing the existing ones.

It is imperative to realize that a transformation in the basic mindset and philosophies of people needs to be altered to realistically bring about a pragmatic change. Along with increasing the efficiency of the police officials, state functionaries and other law enforcement agencies like the State Human Rights Commission, there is an urgent need to alongside sensitize them as well.

Practical Steps -

- There is a dire need of active awareness campaigns especially in the remote rural areas so as to make individuals realize their Right of Choice in respect of choosing their spouse. It is the most basic of all Fundamental Human Rights and categorically guaranteed under Article 21 by the Constitution. This connotes further that it has a direct implication on the Right to Life and Liberty itself.
- Legal Associates and Social Counsellors should be deputed at every District Protection Centre/ Run-away couple home. It is important to provide a joint psychological counselling session to the families of the married couples, as well as the run-away couple. It is imperative to note that marriage is a relationship that eventually is a bond between two families. As such it becomes increasingly vital for the Government to facilitate a forum where there is interaction between all family members. This should be done with an aim to remove the deadlock so that the alliance can be accepted and consequently the antagonism is congenially resolved between all family members.

There is undoubtedly a dire need for Human Rights to move forward and put an end to this abhorrent practice. Patriarchy has reigned for centuries in India and has resulted in the regression of status of women, annihilation of freedom and destruction of dignity. To quote *'The vilest crimes are committed in the name of*

¹⁸*The Tribune*. 2014. (December 12). "22 States, U.T's support Bill to prevent Honour Killings". Chandigarh, India. pp.1 & 11.

defending honour of the family or women and we should hang our heads in shame when such incidents take place in India in the 21st century.' – P. Chidambaram (Former Home Minister's statement in the Rajya Sabha on Honour Crimes.)

REFERENCES

- [1] The Red Feather Journal of Postmodern Criminology, An International Journal', available at <http://www.critcrim.org/redfeather/journal-pomocrim/vol-8-shaming/araji.html> accessed on 5th April, 2014 at 11:45 PM.
- [2] Anderson, M.L. (2000). *Thinking About Women: Sociological Perspectives in Sex and Gender*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- [3] Baker, N.V., Gregware, P.R. & Cassidy, M.A. (1999). "Family Killing Fields"
- [4] Bates, D.G. & Rassam A. (1983). *Peoples and Cultures of the Middle East*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- [5] Chowdhry, Prem (2004). "Private Lives, State Intervention: Cases of Runaway Marriage in Rural North India." *Modern Asian Studies*, February, pp. 55-84.
- [6] Duran, Jane (2005), "Realism, Positivism and Reference", *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 401-407.
- [7] in *Mediterranean societies*", *Ethnology*, Vol. 10, pp. 2
- [8] Kandiyoti, D.A (1987). "Emancipated but unliberated?" *Reflections on the Turkish case Feminist Studies*, Vol.13, pp. 317-338.
- [9] Khan, S. Tahira. (2006). *Beyond Honour: A Historical Materialist Explanation of Honour Related Violence*. Oxford University Press, Karachi.
- [10] Law Resource India: 'Honour killings and the need for new legislation', available at <http://indialawyers.wordpress.com/2010/07/03/honour-killings-and-the-need-for-new-legislation/> accessed on 27th January, 2014 at 10:30 AM.
- [11] Law resource India: 'National legal research desk on violence against women and children', available at <https://indialawyers.wordpress.com/category/honour-kilings/> accessed on 20th December, 2013 at 9:00 AM.
- [12] Martin, Rex (2013), "Human Rights and the Social Recognition Thesis", *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 44, No.1, pp. 1-21.
- [13] Okin, Moller Susan. (1999). *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- [14] Pal, Arun (2012). *Honour Killing : Culture, Dilemma and Ritual*. Arise Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.
- [15] Schneider, J, (1971). "Of vigilance and virgins: Honor, shame and access to resources
- [16] The Tribune. 2014. (December 12). "22 States, U.T's support Bill to prevent Honour Killings". Chandigarh, India.
- [17] Turner, F. (1995). "Shame, beauty, and the tragic view of history" *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol.38, pp.1060-1075.
- [18] *Violence Against Women* Vol. 5, pp. 164-184.
- [19] Walby, Sylvia. (1990). *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- [20] Welchman, Lynn and Hossain, Sara. eds. (2006). *Honour: Crimes, Paradigms and Violence against women*. Zed Books Ltd., New York.