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The Feminist Leadership Development Course, 2016 started as a step undertaken by Jagori in association with various leader groups, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and youth-led groups, this workshop is framed for a long term period of 2 years and is further spread across 5 settings. The Phase 1 of the FLDC was conducted in the month of December in the year 2016 where in the participants representing different organisations and groups came in flowing from across the different states of India. A recap workshop was held in February 2017 for those participants who could not attend the December workshop but were keen to join for the next phase. The participants from both these workshops were part of the Phase 2 as well which was conducted over a period of five days from the 8th of May, to the 12th of May, 2017. The leadership training programme was conducted in Hindi language.

The main objectives of this phase were to carry forward the ideas that were developed in the Phase 1, some of these ideas were on masculinity, feminism, gender, ‘women empowerment’, equality, and effective communication, all this to build a more democratic and inclusive, and a feminist practice of leadership. The idea behind these training programs is multi-layered from networking, i.e. building stronger networks within and of feminist and/or women’s organisations; developing effective organisations with feminist ethics both within their own setups as well as their on-field works; the idea that gendered power relations can exist even within empowerment groups and (what would be dealt with in further details in the report below) between the researcher and the researched, opens up the possibility of using feminist philosophy to develop forms of leadership that are critically feminist in their methods. This is a program that works draws its principles from the fact that feminism is an effective tool, and an important lens to analyse the everyday, make changes into the everyday politics of domestic, public, private, and official.

This however does not mean that the organisation, or the facilitators believe that there is only one kind of feminism because this would then end up being an idealism that feminist theories themselves have been wary of, however, there is a sense of understanding that equality and equity, acknowledgement of difference and ‘intersectionality’ should be basic to any feminist philosophy and or methodology.

**Training Team**

The training team for this Phase was formed by Madhu Bala (Senior
Manager of Programmes, Jagori); Haritha Sharma (Consultant, ex-Director of HID Forum, Bangalore); and DeepaVenkatachalam (Director, SAMA).

Participants
There were total of 33 participants. The participants came from different parts of the country, and belonged to different organisations.

Day 1: 8.05.2017

The first day of the FLDC, Phase 2 started with a welcome note by Madhu Bala, which was followed by a day that included the general introductions, icebreaking activities, recapturing of the Phase 1 which was followed by a few group activities, and a movie screening. The objectives of the training were also established including:

• Developing a sense of understanding on feminism, and feminist philosophy.

• Development of leadership skills, and discussion leadership qualities.

• Building a more defined understanding of the role of a social changer/change leader.

• Defining the further steps for the future schedules of the FLDC.

• Looking at ‘health’ from a feminist perspective.

The participants were divided into four groups, to divide the responsibilities, and bring out the discussion on leadership skills, and build a discourse around leadership. Each day each team would have different responsibilities. The groups were named the following:

1. Reporting Group
2. MazaMasti Group
3. Pratikriya Group
4. NaarivadiChashma Group

All of these four groups were made keeping in mind the ways of reporting that an effective leadership must focus on, and to keep reflecting upon the agenda of the training program.

Image 1. The final four groups
This is a reflective exercise, while the categories of the groups in terms of their work agenda remained the same, the members of each group changed each day so that all the participants got a chance to be in each role.

Thereafter, the participants were asked to think over the Phase 1 of FLDC and come up with any three learnings or questions that were raised in the first phase. The common understandings that came from this exercise were:

1. Discussions on patriarchy helped in formulating a clearer understanding of the structures of patriarchy.

2. How one must organise a training program to effectively manage the content as well as the time, and the clarity of objectives.

3. New tools of training, methods to accelerate discussions in a group, and a sense of confidence.

These were the major learnings that emerged from the Phase 1, and on this note the discussion on sex-gender system, and the idea of naturalness of ‘sex’ was opened up. The session focused on the question Is ‘sex’ a natural category?, through this the the sex a natural and predetermined category was deconstructed and ideas on patriarchy, rights of people identifying as Trans* were brought forth for discussion.

The participants were later on shown a Hindi movie titled Begum Jaan. Through the movie a discussion on Leadership was opened up, by discussing the drawbacks of the movie a larger strategizing methods could be brought for discussion. This was an engaging way of brainstorming around, first leadership, second opening up a discussion on the movie’s content, and the lacks in the kind of leadership that has been portrayed in the movie, helping in setting down the areas of feminist leadership that need to be discussed in the training, and gauge the participants’ awareness and existing knowledge.

The discussion that followed was focused largely on the multiple ways of resistance, the strategies that may or may not work for some issues, and the different strategies that may be employed to resist, and the qualities of a good leadership.

- Confidence
- Equality,
- Unity,
- Empathy,
- Team work,
- Decision making abilities,
- Presence of mind,
• Motivation,
• Ethical issues

All of these emerged as important and almost necessary leadership qualities for the participants at large. Using this discussion, the participants were thereon encouraged to also suggest the loopholes or the things that the kind of leadership that is represented in the movie. Some of the points were:

• Dependency
• No or lack of discussion of the strategies
• A rigour was needed to understand the problem/lack of information or knowledge
• Leader’s egocentrism and inability to be reflexive

Lastly, the strategies of resistance, and leadership were discussed. The day included another activity which tried to extrapolate the groups’ learnings from the previous phase, in this the participants were asked to choose amongst three options, one those who identify as feminists, second those who believed that what they (feminists and feminisms) proclaim to do, they are failing at it; and third group was confused with this identity i.e. they were not sure if they associate with feminism or naarivadas such or not, and a general thesis came about that the contradictions in their personal lives created this confusion for them. These contradictions provide important dimension to discussions on feminism, and an understanding of individuals in general, i.e. to say they bring out the contradictions that are often associated with any kind of identity location.

Day 2: 9.05.2017

Started with a discussion on the sitting arrangement of the group, several observations came in, including, new batch and old batch are sitting clustered. This was just a way of making the participants more familiar with each other, and to make the space more inclusive for the new participants who may or may not have been familiar with each other. To facilitate this suggestions from the group were sought and some of them were:

1. Change of the rooms in which the participants are staying, mixing the groups.
2. A conscious and conscience decision to sit with new people, and interact and network.

Once this was done the four groups were asked to make their presentations, following are the discussions:
**Reporting Group**

The group discussed the Day 1 of the Phase 2, and went over the day to reflect upon the agenda that was set for the workshop helping in covering the questions that were raised the previous day, and the objectives, the questions that may be discussed, including health. The presentation was detailed and included the questions that were raised on the previous day, and thereafter, the discussion was opened up to get responses from other participants to give feedback on the reporting.

- Better coordination between the groups was needed.
- The group went into too many details, it became lengthy/some felt that it was needed as it refreshed the day.

The resource person (Haritha Sharma) used this opportunity to talk about the main aspects of any kind of reporting, including:

- What?
- How?
- Learnings?

A good report as suggested by him, comprises of answers to these three questions, and does the work of disseminating adequate information to both those who were part of the particular session and those who were not present there.

The next group discussed the methods of conduction that were used in the previous day to deliberate the issues and questions as discussed previously.

**PratikriyaGroup:**

Those who are hesitant in putting forward their point of view, were given space to come up and speak if they have anything to say. Efforts to create a feminist environment for participation. The organisation of the workshop was well thought out, with enough time and space to introspect over the methodologies that were employed.

A reflection on one of the activities from the Day 1 followed in the presentation of the group. This activity was called the microlab, and as the presenting group noticed, this activity of moving around in circle (microlab) allowed to let one think of oneself, as well as others, it gave the participants to retrospectively think about team work, and the need to be less self-centred in any form of group and or team work.

Using the reflections from the presenting group, the Resource Person (RP) discussed the steps in the form of feedback on the groups’ presentation to formulate guidelines on creating a “Training Plan”. It is important for the
trainer to think of these steps of flow of a training day.

1. Guiding questions like the composition of the participating group, the ways of participation, who was talking more; they can help in navigating a training day and making the space more comprehensive of the different viewpoints, and opinions.

2. Methodologies (Prakriya): what to do when, how to make a methodology the most effective. Taking the microlab activity as an example, RP elaborated on how ‘touch’ and ‘vision’ are more powerful than only naming oneself as in a general round of introduction, and hence this microlab method can be done before a formal name introduction. What follows below are some pointers that were floated around in the group to talk about tools for team building/community work.

» When can one use a method or tool like microlab? When ice breaking amongst different groups.

» An open discussion with one question, a quick discussion is one way of building a team, and creating a sense of familiarity amongst the participants.

» Planning these questions also has a methodology, that is to say that these cannot be just any random questions, they too need to be thought of beforehand, along with the number of questions you would ask. For instance, too many questions would tire down the group. At most you can have 5 questions, but to maintain the energy you would have to involve the groups in different activities.

» The first question can draw from the external factors, for instance, “how was the coming to the venue? Or, how did you feel when you entered the venue or the training room?” this is a kind of a follow up/disclosure of the affective experience to build trust. It is a movement approach in the sense that there is a movement from the external world of the participants, to their personal or what may be called the internal world, their phenomenological experience.

» Third section of a training plan consists the feedback/observation/analysis on the methodologies that you may employ or have employed previously.

Naarivadi Chashma Group

The naarivadi chashma group or the feminist lens group, is to analyse each day of the training phase from a feminist perspective and formulate three questions based on their
analysis. This day’s analysing group however focused more on the kind of observations that they made. Following are their observations:

- Introduction/experience sharing led to thinking that the larger perspective of the different groups complied with the general understanding of feminism as women centric, and women empowering.

- The phase 1 of the FLDC discussion brought into light how different organisations are working with particular understandings of gender, masculinity, and patriarchy. Things like, is sex natural? How one is conditioned, and those conditionings were brought into question, questions of men’s place in feminism, and how feminism does not talk only about women, but about equality, including men, women, and trans gender. The idea of a “male feminist” was also brought up, this was in tandem with the kind of discussions that took place in the Phase 1 (December, 2016) of the FLDC, since feminism is a way of thinking, it is a philosophy, anyone can be a feminist, taking from this challenges to feminism were opened up for discussion.

- The next one was an observation on gender in the everyday, i.e. how every day is gendered, and what one may consider a normal, everyday affair is also saturated with gendered hierarchies and power relations hence, feminism requires constant questioning, thinking, and efforts to understand.

- Importance of the terms being used for instance, ‘sahyog’, and ‘sahayta’.

- Touch, comradeship, a lot of aspects of a feminist ethos were put to use in the micro lab.

When you report, you end with an analysis based on which you had to raise three questions. For a trainer the four groups, the four parts, play an important role. Any training has these four components, and hence can support us in formulating the sessions.

**Participant Question (PQ):** does feminism say that one does not for instance, put on lipstick, sindoor?

**Responses:** One must think why do we want to put it? Do we see where it comes from? Is it not gendered? There needs to be self-reflexivity, and a critical analysis of our own desires, we need to keep in mind that are also made with and through traditions. But, what if it is personal choice and my wish? (PQ)

**Responses:** Our desires are also constructed with traditions, they also come from those spaces and
punishments for not following a tradition, are not always physical, they are also experiential and mental or to put it in another way, these punishments are not always visible. The feeling of guilt also becomes a mode of self-regulation, and surveilling the self; it can be a choice when we reach a place of equality, these traditions in personal choice too must be historicised. Shringaar, beautification, religion are not working in isolations, the ideals of beauty and beautification are not removed from the structural modes of surveillance and claiming bodies, and individuals. They have gendered as well as violent histories that need to be kept in mind, and the politics of all these need to be kept in mind before we claim them as personal choices necessarily.

Another important example that came from all this discussion was how one’s surname is important in forming one’s identity, examples came from the women participants’ own experiences, and Madhu took the discussion forward to bring about how surnames are not politically insignificant things, but carry the weight of identity and different kinds of politics.

Post Tea Session
What is feminism (naarivaad)?

Madhu Bala took the participants through a history of Feminism/ women’s movements and built on this history to further the discussion, around questions like what feminism is, or what is it to be a feminist. As noted in the discussions, a person can be a feminist even if that person has a consciousness of the patriarchal inequalities, and attempts to make a change, whether that attempt is successful or not, cannot affect one’s feminist identity, what matters is that one learns from the failures, and if one has to fail, then fails better.

There is no one definition of feminism, any individual who would stand up for any form of discrimination and or injustice, can be a kind of a feminist, whether they identify as one or not is a different matter altogether. Drawing from the book ‘Naarivad ye akhirhaikya?’ (KamlaBhasin, Nighat Saeed Khan), Madhu engaged with the different historical positions of feminism. In the context of India, post partition and post-colonial period i.e. 1947, we see different forms of feminism emerge. The beginning saw one of the most popular forms of feminism that is the udaarvaadinarivaad – Liberal Feminism. It gives importance to the human, the person (vyaktivishesh), it was a human centric approach and used the category of ‘human’ to make its political claims. Under this form of feminism came the voting rights for women, or the universal enfranchisement.
But voting too can be influenced, the critique for such an approach came from the fact that one cannot see voting right as a right in isolation it must be located in the context of the material lives of the women who have to practice this right. That is to say that voting pattern, or the ‘choice’ that a woman may make might also be influenced by the male members of a family, or by other community members. However, this is not a critique of the demand per se, but only an attempt to draw attention to the limits of the demand and the politics of liberal feminism. These critiques often came from other forms of feminism, including that when we’re talking about women’s rights we need to understand that gender, and patriarchal ideology were the target. Because of patriarchal pressure, the voting of women can be influenced, moulded, and forced. Woman’s body, its movements all these should be the focus; a woman must have rights over her body. This was what came to be considered (radical feminism/ ugravaadinaarivaad). It was from radical feminists that came the famous slogan Personal is political (“Vyaktigaat hi rajnaitikhai”). This slogan brought together the personal and the larger social structures together, and problematized the public/private divide.

Radical feminism was also critiqued on the basis that we (feminists) had to dismantle patriarchy that is a structure and an ideology. By including only ‘women’ in feminism, the system of patriarchy cannot be dismantled. Are women the only group that is oppressed in patriarchy? No. men too. By talking only about women patriarchy also becomes only women’s responsibility, for instance, in trainings or meetings we see only women. Is it only their responsibility to subvert patriarchy? Men then remain in their positions of privilege and hence there came a realisation that men are needed too. Moving on from this Socialist/Marxist Feminism was discussed using the term ‘kisaani’ (from ‘kisaan’ or farmer).

Socialist feminism (samaajwad-inaarivaad), raised questions around wages, labour, domestic labour, questions around informal labour, women in fields/agriculture, working hours, and social security, private/public divide. However, they were critiqued for their utopic idealism and one of the major critiques that came forward was that just because men go in the kitchen does not mean they are sensitive, this was a comment on the utopia of collective, communal kitchens, houses. Is it enough for men to enter the kitchen? Does it really narrow down the disparities in the division of labour? From here then came multiple
streams of feminism, but it is not to say that all these kinds of feminisms developed in neat stages, or that the development of one led to the end of another, rather all of them were and still are working simultaneously.

Another important intervention made by Madhu Bala was by talking about “Black Feminism” this stream of feminism was an outcome of the consciousness of racism within feminist circles themselves. It was a critique of the hegemonic white feminism whose centre of contention was the upper class, white woman. Using this, Madhu raised a pertinent question which is “have we not learnt to analyse in detail?” this came from trying to understand the usage of the colour black, trainer raised an important question on a common protest practice of using the colour black as the symbol.

Concluding the discussion/lecture the trainer talked about the 1995 Beijing conference that made woman as the centre of discussion. We need to always ask, who is the most disadvantaged? In gender roles or patriarchy, women become the most disadvantaged, hence in this way one must remember that it is the unequal power relations that are the target, for feminism matriarchy is not the desire, it does not want to replace male head figure with a female head figure, but the idea is to question the hierarchical relations themselves, using the example of existence of patriarchal power structures in the LGBT community as well, the trainer reflected on this point.

One of the questions that came from one of the participants was “Why feminism? Why is it called naarivaad if it is also talking about men? Some of the responses that came forward were “Iskoshareermeinnahirakhein. Eknaarilayi ye vichaar”, the idea was to challenge the biological determinism of the question itself, that is instead of imagining this woman as just the biological woman, one must consider the idea of woman as well. Second, the philosophy of feminism was brought and developed by women, it demands that women be kept in the centre of for instance, knowledge formation. An example given by the trainer was how the Gandhian thought is so named because of the fact that it was developed by Gandhi himself, similarly ‘Marx’ian philosophy, and hence ‘Naari’vad/ ‘fem’inism. Women understood that in the patriarchal world women are being disadvantaged continuously, and since this ‘vaad’ or this doctrine or thought was brought by women, by naarihence naarivaad. This feminism also understood that men will be comrades, but this will be led by women. Some of the writers and thinkers that were suggested were Simone de Beauvoir, and Rosa Luxemburg.
The politics of naming is important here, drawing from the discussions that happened in the Phase 1, and the first day of Phase 2, the idea of being a 'humanist' emerged as an identity instead of feminist, but this was critiqued on the basis of the fact that this name, this term, does not talk about one’s philosophy, and their politics or political positioning. It hides the structural disparities that one wants to work against, and digresses from the any form of strategical information. You cannot 'empower' women by talking only about women, you will need to talk about men because ultimately they have to go back there, there are multiple areas of discrimination, and women do not exist in isolation, they are constantly placed in interaction with men, one cannot build a discourse without talking about the oppressor, which again is not a monolithic category.

The focus of this session was on feminism, the philosophy of feminism, the learnings we can take from histories of feminism to develop feminist leaders, and qualities of leadership. In this way the session opened the questions around feminism itself, and how the many shades of feminism came from feminists’ self-reflexivity, and an exercise of critiquing the hegemonic power structures both outside feminism as well as within feminist circles. So then, is there a complete feminist? There is not a scale of feminism, if it is a philosophy then it is a way of thinking, and living; the idea is to put the 'woman' in the centre. Using feminist principles Haritha talked about some of the most important quality of a trainer, like:

- **Her or his body language:** If the trainer is too dominating, intimidating in their body language, and adopts the ways of a hegemonic masculinity the the participants, the women participants, can get intimidated, and may not be able to participate in the discussions as much as they would want to or should.

- The second suggestion was around **awareness**, a feminist leader/trainer must be aware of the contemporary situations, so that you can critique the questions that are being raised, the policies being built and can strategise a training that is politically in sync with the materiality of different lives, for example, the maternity leaves debates.

- Third, a feminist leader must be a **good listener**. You must let the person complete their question, must listen, women historically have been unheard, hence a feminist leader must listen.

- Fourthly, **openness**. If a person
does not agree with my point of view, I must respect it, and not take it as a challenge but rather engage with it. Not to try to set yourself in a rigid mould.

• Fifth, **recognising your limits.** Saying ‘I don’t know’. Knowing what you can do, and what you cannot do is very important.

**Things to avoid as a feminist leader:**

• Feminist leader must not force their point of view on others. You can have a dialogue, but you cannot force others.

• Biases, it is important to be aware of one’s own biases and stereotypes to not give into early and easily made judgments.

• Must not misuse his or her position and force someone amongst the participants to speak up, repeatedly. This can make the person feel attacked or intimidated.

• Dismissal of others’ experiences.

**Activity**

Haritha conducted an activity with the participants in which they were asked to think about any **personal experience related to leadership**, or in which they held the position of a leader, or anything that they thought of as a position of leadership, thereafter they were asked to split into groups of four and were given four guiding questions based on which they had to prepare presentations. The questions were:

• What were the leadership qualities that you think you used?

• People who supported your leadership or the supporting factors?

• What were the problems that you faced?

• What change came about with your leadership?

**Post Lunch 2:30**

This activity was very fruitful in opening up and understanding the participants’ own understandings of leadership, and what they think makes a leader. This was a precursor into entering
the discussion on personal leadership and personal power. The following are the observations that came from the presentations of the four groups based on the subthemes or the guiding questions given by Haritha:

**Leadership qualities**
- Clarity of thought and thinking through the problem.
- Determination
- Ability to analyse situations
- Diligent.
- Good listener.
- Solution focused thinking
- Presence of mind.
- Ability to make decisions.
- Pedagogical methodologies should keep in mind the diversities.
- Vision for the future.
- Facing the challenges and attaining the goals.

**Supportive elements:**
- Decision was well thought, and hence acceptance from the family.
- Logical and clear thinking.
- Organisational support.
- Friends.

**Challenges:**
- Family, and the social settings that one lives in.
- Fear of loss of reputation. Women shared how they have often been asked in their family to do a job that does not require you to move out too much, go to different places.
- Constant challenge to one’s motivation and confidence.
- Inability to come to a decision.
- Economic stresses.

**Changes:**
- Their efforts led to changes in people’s thinking i.e. they tried to think about and accept variant ways of thinking and behaving.
- They thought about the traditions.
- Self-respect, and confidence.
- Independence that came with overcoming the above challenges
- Intergenerational relations were also affected.

These exchanges were followed by a discussion the commonalities that the participants found in each other’s experiences. One of the major points that emerged was that there was a will to make a change in all of the participants, and the motivation to decide for oneself to bring a change.
Haritha drew from this observation to build on the discussion on **personal leadership**, the ability to take one’s own decisions and to lead oneself. The imagination of a leader for the participants was of a social leader, and using this the resource person elaborated upon three kinds of leaderships:

» Social leadership

» Organisational leadership

» Personal leadership/self - level leadership

As mentioned above the session was oriented towards making the participants to think about taking charge of themselves first, and their personal leadership skills so as to talk about managing their own lives, and changing their own lives and then expanding to other kinds of leaderships.

How do you use it as a concept? One needs to be aware of one’s own challenging elements? i.e. what are our thoughts that pose as challenge? The present can only be changed with changes in self, (“vyaktigat star par netritva”) that is leadership at an individual level. From this activity and the discussions that followed it was collectively concluded that the personal powers and the supportive elements come from different sources, our challenges can also be from within ourselves. In a way theory and practice gap came up in the discussion; one’s thinking, feelings, and your skills all affect the leadership that one would show.

**Activity 2**

Groups were formed on the basis of **order of birth** and the session was focused on discussion on the self, with emphasis on one’s own power, and leadership skills and hence defining leadership through the self was an important discussion. The groups were divided into three major categories, first born; middle child; and the last born, subsequently the each group was asked to discuss amongst itself the following three questions:

- How has your order of birth supported you or privileged you?
- How has it posed as a challenge?
- What is the influence of your birth order on your personal power?

Each group presented their observations. How age hierarchies operate in the way decisions of the youngest, self-doubt. This exercise helped in understanding how personal experiences with our family can influence the personal power that we practice, or develop sense of. Family emerged as the first organisational unit that influences how one would
make decisions, and would process it. It is a psychosocial approach to understanding leadership, and patriarchal influences in understanding leadership skills, it may be said that the material resources that one has are influential, which in turn may be influenced by the familial organisations all affect the leadership skills one may show or attain. Both of these activities were behaviour oriented, and focused on the past experiences and behavioural patterns that participants may have shown in their personal lives.

POST TEA SESSION- 4:30
Personal Power Survey (VyaktigatTaakat)

To further the discussion on personal power, use of a self-assessment activity on the kinds of power one has. Seven kinds of personal powers were enumerated, and a scoring of 1-10 in terms of skills one was asked to be made. The third criteria was based on the frequency of use. This activity, and the process of understanding this activity, initiated conversations around power, and locations. After discussing the dominant powers, the group came to the conclusion that subject expertise, self-determination, communication skills, and social connections power came as the powers most frequently used, whereas status position was one of the weaker powers with respect to social development.

Usage of power came out as a point of conversation, where and how of usage of power were important factors in the discussion. The position of power is understood as a position that one takes over and the responsibilities that come with that position, and the ways in which those responsibilities may be fulfilled with the kind of position one holds. The third column brought out the ways in which powers are divided by the frequency of their usage, which led to a discussion around the ideas of position power, and the power of connections. The discussion was held in the light of the NGO/social development sector, which was used to develop personal leadership skills, and how these skills or powers may be used to develop effective leadership skills training.
Towards the end of the day 2, the discussion was taken ahead to talk about the broad stages of team formation. This was important to identify the stage in which your group is, this would influence your leadership style, and mould it to suit the needs of a situation. The terms ‘group’ and ‘team’ were opened up so that leadership styles could be brought forth for discussion and, and the development of these styles. The four stages are:

1. Forming: in this stage the leader’s role is to give a direction to the group, in this stage the collective is more of a group than a team. A group is a more general idea of a collective, there is a sense of multidirections in the collective, and the steps towards building a team include bringing these multiple directions to an agree upon common goal and direction. This is where the leader’s role is vital in giving a sense of direction to the group.

2. Storming: this is the stage that may be ridden with conflicts within the group, and the leader here is required to give a safe space to every individual of the group to present their points.

3. Norming: here the leader is required to be a coach and start creating certain norms and rules for the developing team. She would be required to be affirmative and yet flexible enough to establish certain ground rules, and ethical principles for the team.

4. Performing: this is the final stage, and here the team is expected to be ready to perform, and display the skills and knowledges it has built in the previous stages.

The day ended with an extempore that initiated conversations on multiple topics from a feminist perspective. Each participant was asked to pick up a chit that would have a word on it, and was asked to speak on it from a feminist perspective for a minut. This game works to first to discuss how gendered relations exist not only in certain specific areas but at multiple locations. Second, participants were encouraged
to think about specific terms from a feminist perspective, it could be that the term given to each may further their engagement with feminist ideas. Each participant was also asked to hold on to their respective chits, and informed that each one of them would be required to write essays on their respective terms on the last day of the Phase 2.

![Image 5 One of the participants during the extempore.](image)

**DAY 3- 10.05.2017**

Discussion on reporting, the session was opened up for discussion on reporting. With the feedbacks the reporting process was opened up, especially different ways of reporting. The group tried to brainstorm around how reporting can be done in varied ways. How leadership process in the reporting team itself became a point of discussion, our aim influences our way of reporting, presenting, and discussing. With this, a discussion on feminism itself was opened up, recapturing the essentials of feminist leadership that were brought about by a discussion on history of feminism, and the activities that were held on day 2. The kinds of leaderships that were discussed yesterday, brought back the focus on personal leadership and power; the importance of working on self, and self-reflexivity/introspection are important. Self-evaluation came as an important take away from the day 2.

‘Group’ and ‘team’ were discussed so that leadership styles could be opened up, and the development of these styles. Reflections on the chit game encouraged the participants to further the ideas on self-reflection, and how the activity encouraged them to analyse their level of knowledge and analysis. The resource person asked the group what were the new tools that were introduced to the group, responses included the lottery/chit system, visualisation, self-assessment tools like scoring.

*The narivaadichashma* group raised two important questions, one, do we have to give the rights to women? Second, what is the role of the participants, the groups in the way that we would go and develop them? Do we go out there and save them? Or do we work with them? Do we keep them and understand them as mere victims? Or think of them as agents? All these questions led the trainer to bring into focus the socialisation and conditioning processes that lead
one to unconsciously employ certain terms. ‘Empowerment’ (sashaktikaran) is one term that came up in the discussions, along with the power relation between the NGO worker, and the target group/communities.

The second question that was asked by the group was on why the participants have not developed a feminist consciousness even after continuous discussion, and years of working with feminism, and or women. As noticed by the presenting group itself, the chit game proved to be fruitful in opening up several kinds of discussions on feminism, for instance, feminist methodology.

Third question by the group about the methodology of the birth order activity, raise important existential and experiential questions based on gender differences. They questioned why the groups could not be divided into six groups instead of three based on both birth order and gender. This was an important observation, and did show an appropriate utilisation of both the training information, and the idea of feminist lens.

**TEA BREAK: 11-11:30**

Energiser: song.

The session started with another activity agree/disagree. The participants were asked to stand up on their spots, and certain specific statements were spoken out. Several arguments came about on the varied qualities of a leader, with the activity a lot of issues came in the forefront:

- **Is a leader born and not made?**
  There was an intense debate on this between both the groups, the points of disagreement ranged from one group suggesting that a leader can be developed and a person’s leadership skills can be sharpened, and hence a person can be taught to become a leader, a leader can be made. On the other hand, the other group suggested that there are inborn abilities that any leader has, and it is only these abilities that can be worked upon or strengthened.

- **A leader never gets tired**
  Difference between getting tired and stopping. What sort of understanding of a ‘leader’ is coming up? The ideas were result oriented, and an imagination of a singular personality as a leader. Movements are being imagined as a responsibility of one person, hence a break is being read as a stop.

- **A strong leader always takes right decisions.**
  The whole group disagreed with the statement, and a space for making wrong decisions was concluded. Right and wrong is contextual.
• **Leader’s anger always strives towards success.** – consensus

• **Leader always controls his/her emotions.** Emotions were also looked at in the personal life, how certain emotions are also sacrificed in the leadership. The action oriented approach also came up, how a leader has to control their emotions to not take wrong actions, and not make uninformed decisions. What sort of an image of a leader is being painted? What is the imagination of a leader? Self-reflection figured in here as well, bringing back the feminist perspective, i.e. can one keep affect out of understanding experiential material? The time, the term always, became a point of contention, in the way that the leader cannot be in control always.

• **Leadership is with the leader, not with the collective.** The collective forms the basis for the leadership as well. The group work is required for the leader to come to a decision, or to represent. What is leadership then? These qualities were discussed through funding, representation, and decision making.

• **There is no difference between an organisation’s and a movement’s leadership.** There is difference in methodology, and the methods. The debates went on to discuss the difference between organisational struggles and movements. Ideas around movements started coming up. The counterargument came that the debate is focussing on the techniques but the question is on leadership quality.

• **A leader is always a good speaker:** who is a leader comes back with this question. Isn’t leadership to be located in time and space? What is a good leadership? Questions of language, speech came up.

![Image 6 Agree/Disagree Activity](image6.jpg)

![Image 7 Agree/Disagree Activity being conducted](image7.jpg)

Opinions and the layers of opinions can change, there are multiple levels of thinking and processing. There are different kinds of leaderships, and styles, and each of them have different skills. Hence, the kind of training they...
got developed their leadership. Trainers, leaders are made, are developed, and are constantly learning. Leadership is a process, and the figure of leader needs to be embodied, that is, must be read in terms of the limits of the physicality of a leader. Masculine figure of leadership then must be questioned, what are the pressures on a leader, pleasures of a leader. Example of IromSharmila, the trainer drew examples from the contemporary times to illustrate their points.

By picking up the discussion on case work/ethnography, the trainer illustrated how leadership can also be tiring, and not accepting this is a masculine bias. Budgeting for instance is an area of leadership, establishing norms that are equal. Leadership and communicative skills, are not necessarily correlated, a good leader is not necessarily a good orator; a leader is engaging, and these engagements can be in any form. Relationship are strengthened by listening, rather than talking, speaking; if a leader does not listen, there would be gaps in communication, does not necessarily have to be a good orator, a good public speaker, for instance, Soni Suri. The area of specialisation, and the expertise all play a role in the places of communication.

**POST LUNCH SESSION: 2:30**

Making group work (Blankke and Moutton). Based on the following two parameters four kinds of work situations and leadership styles were presented by Haritha

- Focus on work
- Focus on relationship

Based on these two, four types of leadership styles emerge:

- Less focus on both work and relationships: ineffective leadership
- Too much focus on work, and less on relationships: becomes a boss. This leadership style is very effective in the forming stage of the group, however as the team strengthens, people lower in the hierarchies start feeling dominated.
- Too much focus on relationships, and less on work: the leadership feels like a club membership. There is lesser output, however there are strong interrelationships.
- There is a balanced focus on both work and relationships: here then you have a team leader. Playing with the group and according to the needs. Co-working does not mean that you work like a ‘boss’ i.e. as a dominating pressurising force.
How are we leading our team? We need to listen to the team, if there is critique, a leader must also look into the kind of relational aspects that exist. Why or when does one need to be a boss? Mostly in the beginning of the group formation, and second in the situations of emergency as there is lesser time/insufficient time for a group discussion. There needs to be a balance, and movement between different kinds of leadership. The leader needs to be flexible with her styles, and must take the feedback seriously and have a presence of mind. Inputs from the participants also highlighted similar things, most of them quoted examples from their personal experiences. A discussion around other factors that contribute into making of a leadership styles was kicked in, for instance, how age, class, urban, rural positions also affect the leadership style, and the dynamics of a workplace. In an organisation for instance, age hierarchies may take over positional hierarchies; the power of negotiation gets influenced too.

**ACTIVITY**

**Win as much as you can**

The activity included group work with participants split into four groups (A, B, C, and D) with one observer in each group. The activity went on for about twenty minutes. There were intermittent group discussions amongst the representatives from each group. The groups had to discuss and decide between choosing X and Y. Different assessment combinations were put up and the combinations and permutations of these were used to score each group. The activity included 10 rounds, at the end of which, the resource person asked the groups to go through how they made decisions. Each group also consisted of an observer.

The groups were then asked their feedback on the activity, to know their decision making process. While one group thought that everyone could choose one option, the other group (A) were strategizing by keeping in mind their maximum benefits, the third group was working from the point of view of keeping everyone’s benefit in mind, i.e. wanted to and expected a larger team work from the participating groups. The first group showed tendencies to maximise their own profits. This group work was reflective of the social settings and or fields one may enter.

**Observers**

**Group B:** what sort of leadership was established, in terms of communication there were certain misunderstandings, and clarity of thoughts was slightly missing.
Group A: initially the decisions were made at the last moment, a longer discussion on the change of leaderships, especially when the representatives were asked to come forward. There may have been gender dynamics, in terms of which representatives were coming forward. The group was strong on calculations, and strategies.

Group C: lack of equal participation, certain members were completely reclusive, the male member proved to be forthcoming, and more confident in taking decisions compared to the female members. The group was divided amongst hyperactive, active and inactive members.

Group D: there were similar observations, and one could see group hierarchies being established. The quiet ones remained quiet.

The groups were largely focused on winning, result oriented, instead of the process of decision making being more democratic. The discussion moved to how the group activity may be related to the real life experiences of the participants. One observation that came was that smaller groups can be more effective; second there was a conversation around equality, the mode of thinking that could allow a collective to emerge. Intersectionality as a concept was introduced in the session to bring it back to feminist agendas. Bringing back the discussion to the kinds of powers as discussed previously were used in this activity, which helped in practical application of the knowledge that was formulated.

Base structure-superstructure discussion

If the base is faulty, that is to say if the base or the value system is formed on a discriminatory ideology, then the structure would be faulty.

- Aim/goal: this aim has to be collective.

- Commitment: For a leader there has to be a commitment, the value must be clear the medium can be any. It could be an NGO setup or on an everyday basis/or life.

- Ethics: The leadership has to maintain personal ethics that would enrich the values system of that leadership. Honesty to the value system is an important quality for an effective and honest leadership.

These would develop skills, and encourage new learnings as the learning process would not be hindered. Along with these self-reflexivity, critique must be taken in the way that would better their work, helping in growing your skills. Another important skill is networking, this expands a leader’s outreach, and develops the methods we would employ; this would also
make us acknowledge and make space for difference, and diversity. This is also something that one must learn, and practice in the everyday life. Continuous self-reflection is important along with this an analysis of your own affects, and emotions, that is to say, to be aware of one’s own feelings and psyche. It is also important to moderate one’s behaviour. In this way the triangle of leadership skills was developed that first reflected on the relational values, as well as, the base structure development. There was a focus on the inclusion of men in feminist leadership, and feminist movements, to diversify the responsibilities of feminist activism. This is where the training camp is also headed, and ultimately the leader has to be sorted, and more aware. The key function of leadership is to build leadership, a leader has to strengthen other leaderships.

DAY 4: 11.05.2017

DeepaVenkatachalam, Director, SAMA
The session would focus on women’s body, health, violence, and their rights.

REPORTING TEAM
• Recapturing of the previous day, and a go through over the reporting methods suggested by the trainers.
• The birth order discussion was followed through, which reflects upon the kind of questions that stayed with the group.
• Questions around feminism, and ways of feminism were also brought up, as well as the team hinted towards the kind of discussion on leadership that followed the previous day. For instance, the ability to communicate thoughts.
• The team captured the discussions around leadership qualities, that were brought up through agree/disagree activity.
• There was a good coordination between the presenters. While the presentation was detailed, it did help in recapturing the kind of points of contentions that had come up on Day 3. This also reflects on the Reporting Team’s own learnings, and take aways.
• They represented what the understandings were through the game, this could be reflective of the group’s larger understandings, and the methodologies that are working for them. Activities, and games are largely team based, and the terms that were opened up
• However, the team was slightly unclear in reporting Day 3 from the perspective of a newcomer or an outsider.
**NaarivadiChashma Group**

- Why are women not visible on the positions of leadership? They drew examples from the Day 3’s activities (win as much as you can). The idea of ‘risk’ is associated with female leadership; second there is a bias with men being able to do calculative work better. Women too then hesitate to voice their opinions.

- How in society a woman’s work/job becomes her identity or more importantly her sexual identity? For instance, Anarkali of Ara the protagonist is into performing arts, how is she considered into ‘prostitution’/sex work? The discussion around consent could be brought up, as well as discussion on power relations between men and women; men and women in the same position. The role of the unconscious conditioning and its role in articulating power dynamics in a team; it is not a battle of sexes, but a fight against patriarchy.

**Deepa’s Session**

What is health? How do we understand health from a feminist perspective? And how do we associate feminist leadership from this perspective? Deepa gave the example of ASHA workers, and mentioned commercial surrogacy. Motherhood in the market, what forms does it take?

How do we read it? What sort of parallels are drawn between sex work, and commercial gestational surrogacy?

**Activity**

The groups were divided into 5 groups, for an activity. The groups were supplied by newspapers and were asked to highlight the headlines/news pieces that in their understanding talk about health.
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*Image 9 Newspaper with a marked article for the Activity*
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*Image 10 A group of Participants in discussion for the newspaper activity*
Determinants of Health

Presentation no. 1 (Group 5)
Newspaper: DainikJagran

The group presented the headlines

• Sexual abuse: affects physical as well as mental health
• Natural disasters
• Health and education facilities
• Sex related advertisements
• Beauty
• Energy drinks and caffeine
• Child sexual abuse/harassment
• Sexual diseases/medicines
• Illegal unregulated medical practitioners

Presentation no. 2 (Group 2)
Newspaper: Punjab Kesari

• Availability of medicines, and regulation of over the counter medicines.
• Alcoholism
• Environmental questions/global warming
• Sexual violence
• Health budgeting and in relation to GDP
• Suicides/mental health
• Illegal unregulated medical practitioners viz. a. viz. brain drain
• Health camps

Presentation no. 3 (Group 3)
Newspaper: Navbharat Times

• Hygiene, hygienic environment. Pollution.
• Side effects of certain medicines
• Economic restrains in accessing medicines
• Birth control pills and their affects
• Mental health and triple talaq
• Abortion rights
• CSA
• Lubricants and women’s bodies
• How advertisements also use health as a selling point
• Junk food/fast food (fast economy?)

Presentation no. 4 (Group 4)
Newspaper: Hindustan Times

• Technology and science
• Male sexuality and sex treatments
• Environmental deterioration and the policies around it. Rising levels of ozone.
• Workers’ health and their rights
• Medical education/state sponsored education
• Gas leakages and long term impacts of these incidences.
• Packaging of food products
• Technology and mobile towers
• Tiredness and lethargy in everyday
• Abortion rights/rights over one’s own body/rights of the future child figure
• Availability of resources
• Alternate fuels
• Poverty and health.
• Relationship between class and health.

Presentation no. 5 (Group 1)
Newspaper: Rajasthan Patrika

• What sort of policies is the government developing?
• Placement of news information on women’s health.
• Mother’s day and women’s health were linked to division of labour inside the house.
• Child marriage and health
• Suicides and mental health. Suicide helplines.
• HIV AIDS and abortion rights. Difference between garbhapat and garbh-samapan (Deepa)
• Farmers’ loans, and food security.
• Human trafficking and health. Mental, physical and sexual health.
• Maternity, and commoditisation of breast milk.

How does health become a critical lens for reading the everyday? Health or being healthy has multiple layers of perspectives and reasons, there are psychosocial, sociological, cultural reasons that affect ones health. All the above points are in a way related to the social systems, and relations that
one occupies. What draws the line between healthy and unhealthy? Food security became a point of contention, there was discussion around what do participants understand from food security, or khaadyasuraksha, and the role of market and economic forces in establishing forms of food security and food security policies. Right to Food that calculates this in terms of calories, which brought to the fore a discussion on malnutrition bringing back the sociological reasoning around health.

Statistics are often used to move forward market logic, and privatise the health sector, for instance fortified biscuits that were distributed to the Anganwadi workers. One of the participants opened up the public and NGO facilities that are occupying the politics of health, for instance vaccines, preventive vaccines, this draws away the attention from the lack of resources. The corporate sector’s benefits, and their reach into the district level through State as well as illegal channels. One of the participants included another factor of hormones, and which was extended to talk about HRT (Hormone Replacement Therapies).

**Privatisation/corporatisation and health**

There are issues of resources, and power distribution, and grabbing of resources of the marginalised. Technology and scientific advancements are beneficial but to or for whom? Who can access those technologies? Who are marginalised and who are discriminated against to be able to develop this technology? For instance, why are there no technological advancements for better sanitation facilities or cleaning systems?

**Education/Knowledge distribution systems**

Education on health, is there enough knowledge on the health facilities medicines that are being supplied? Sexuality education, sex education, and health discussions around the development of gendered relations in our social settings. Our knowledge systems, and the discourses that are developing from them are also patriarchal, and hence we must go back to the gender politics of the contraceptives and birth controls. What sort of language are we using in the health field? Pedagogical methods are important here, they must be rethought and must be problematized.

The post-colonial nation has been obsessed with the idea of population control and puts the impetus of social change on this spectre of population control. There is an underlying assumption that with the management of the population other sociological and
cultural issues would be resolved, as is evident from the fact that from the first 5 year plan (1951) to the recent times, the budget has also been around family welfare.

Violence
Can be inside or outside the house, both marital and parental houses can be implicated in forms of sexual violence. Often in majority of cases we see the coming together of the State powers, State actionaries and health facilities. For instance, Deepa used the example of the recent Bombay High Court judgment on BilkisBano’s case from the period of Gujarat riots (2002) the doctors who hid their evidence, and the police personnels who did not file a proper chargesheet. Health and violence must be looked into details, why is it that sexual violence is still not read as a public health concern, why is there such a lack of vision? To answer or to start thinking about these questions one needs to look at ‘health’ not only from a medical perspective but needs to contextualise it, and understand that it is not a neutral category rid of any social or cultural meanings. How can one understand these forms of violence in this light? What kinds of Governmental guidelines are in place with respect to sexual violence, domestic violence, or gender based violence?

Caste
The intersectionality of caste and other identities one may occupy must be kept in mind. They come together to affect one’s health, and any work that does not take into account this intersection is limited. From this one can draw the questions around public health systems and facilities, since these intersections often influence the places one can access.

Rights and Resources
Right to Life which is a fundamental right, the right to health is associated with this fundamental right. However, in India, right to health is not a formal entitlement for the citizens. Water is an important resource, sand smuggling (river sand for construction) leading to water problems in the areas. There are market and State forces are working simultaneously to create larger differences, and the Government schemes somehow either underestimate or do not recognise these relationships. All of these questions also come down to body, and sexuality, and by body there are specific manners in which female bodies get implicated in these intersections. The dynamics of labour, and the kind of labour pool that is employed is also thought of from the point of view of the corporates, for instance, restricting labours’ movements. Since most of these labourers in such factories are
women, it is a relationship to female bodies, and their health, as well as their sexuality.

**Media and market**
The kind of information that is circulated is co-dependent on the information that the media uses, and propagates. How we receive this information and the way this information gets circulated, and these institutions come together. Donation, red market, and the distribution of the physical body and the ideas of Brain dead, and heart dead were all brought into fore. In all of this, the State comes in the centre, but at the same time there are also multiple international organisations and policies that affect ‘health’.

**Post lunch session**
PQ: Do same sex relationships contribute to spread of STDs?

The resource person discussed with the participants that same sex relationships as such do not influence the spread of an STD, it has got to do with the kind of relationship that any sexual partners share.

Another question that came from one of the participants was on euthanasia and palliative care, through the example of ArunaShaunbag who was provided palliative care by the nurses of the same hospital. Whose life is less valuable? Is there a possibility that mercy killing or euthanasia would be used to further discriminate against the already discriminated? We would have to look into the ways in which the person has come in for medical assistance, how did the treatment go, what spaces could she access? The kinds of treatments she could have, and if the life of such an individual was valued enough.

**Health Facilities/Initiatives**
- CEDAW, the international initiative to bring up women’s question.
- TRIPS all the nations had to give a patent to a particular medicine, using which the companies could overcharge the users.
- Government and Private Hospitals.

**Activity:**
The participants were divided into four groups, for case study activity. Each group was given a case to study, and each group had to keep in mind the perspective of health facilities, and initiatives, and analyse the cases. Along with this resource person also asked them to keep in mind the intersections of different categories that the protagonists’ in the cases occupied. They were also instructed that they may extend the case study to include the factors that they think might play role in different facilities. The groups were given 20 minutes to discuss, and create a report each.
Presentations

Why do we want to use “garbhsamapan” instead of garbhpaat? Garbhsamaapan, MTP (Medical Termination of Pregnancy) Act, 1971, 2002. It was initiated with an idea of population control, there was an urge that in this way population could also be controlled. This Act does not give a right to the woman, it only enlists the conditions in which a woman can go for an abortion, for instance, breaking of contraceptive, failure of contraceptive/birth control measures; So that it be done under medical supervision; second, in case of pregnancy caused by sexual violence. Third, if there are any mental issues with the mother, and fourth that the child to be may have develop certain specific developmental disabilities. The Act also divides the pregnancy into three trimesters, the first one being of 12 months, where only one doctor needs to be consulted; between 13-20 weeks, two doctors need to be consulted. The hospitals that provide these services need to be appropriately registered to carry on this treatment.

Coming back to the case study, the first issue that came up was the doctor’s attitude; secondly, the issue of lack of information around the Act was substantive; third, there is no recognition of marital rape in the Act, as well as sexual violence. Does the woman have any rights on her body? Or more importantly, when is a woman able to practice rights, or her agency? The Act in itself restricts this autonomy formally, by not making abortion a right, but only provisional, this is also an extension to the critique of the laws on violence on women. PCPNDT Act, and abortion are related, how abortion and sex selection are related, this highlights how different laws are impacting the abortion rights, and consequently women’s rights over their bodies. Hence, information, a thorough knowledge about these rights, and Acts is extremely important, this can be one of tackling the institutional attitudes as well as those of the actors of these institutions.

Image 12 Presentation of Case Study by Group 1
Today’s day started with an essay writing session, wherein the participants were asked to write a minimum of 5 page essay on the chits that they had picked on the final activity (extempore) of Day 2. This was to let the participants reflect upon their learnings, as well as to see their practical application of the learnings on diverse issues, or categories of analysis.

Once the participants were done writing, the trainer asked them to bargain with each other to exchange the essays amongst themselves. Thereafter, they are needed to edit the essay they have received with their inputs within 10 days from Day 5. This activity encourages participants to first engage in conversations over different topics, second, to write collaboratively which forms an essential part of working together; third this also enables a longer conversation amongst the participants even after the training is over; fourth this puts the participants’ analytical skills to use as well as would encourage the participants to practice their writing skills. An important instruction was given to write the essays from a political perspective and were suggested to include issues from the contemporary times. Another important objective of this exercise is to develop more resources in Hindi language, to make such works widely accessible. These are important parts of building effective feminist leadership which was the crux of the 5 day training program.

Report writing group

- Energiser included a song.
- The team recalled the previous day’s activities, questions, and discussions, like how feminism is not about battle of sexes, but a fight against patriarchy.
- After summing up the group presentations, and the various questions that were raised around studying ‘health’, including the relationships between caste, class, and health.
- ArunaShaunbag’s case was also brought in again, to discuss mercy killing and or euthanasia.
- CEDAW and TRIPS and their roles were summarised.
- Case Study Activity:
- Test tube babies, and the process
of developing test tube babies, as well as commercial surrogacy were discussed.

- The woman is also being (re)imagined only through motherhood in the kind of policies that the State comes out with. For instance, the protective plan limits by age, fertility and sexuality both the definitions of woman, and female health.

- Madhu Bala asked for a general feedback from the participants on the session on ‘health’, which brought about how the group was continuously engaged in the session, and proved to be highly informative for them.

- Medical tourism, and the privatisation of the health sector was an important take away from the Day 4 session.

- Women’s labour in the health sector, and caste based division of labour in the health sector, for instance, the morgue work.

- Forced sterilisation.

These were the points that the group presented.

Naarivaadichashma group

- Why is there no provision for the miscarriages that occur during a commercial gestational surrogacy?

Madhu Bala talked about how the various labour movements are demanding that the contracts that are being made should include social security concerns. The CGS concerns are far behind in these movements and demands, and one of the reasons could be a lack of a formal union, and also almost a misrecognition of this as not a labour. Another part of the contract is the issue of transparency, the surrogating woman should be made part of each and every step. The other feminist thought does not take a moral stand but an ethical one from the perspective of labour issues and raise concerns around formalizing this as a labour/or source of livelihood.

Another question raised by the presenting group was:

- Why are women made to bear the onus of population control?

Masculinity; control over women’s body as well as through this their sexuality. How can use of permanent or long term contraceptives control women’s sexuality? Pleasure during a sexual relationship; the womb becomes the focus due to its assumed ability to reproduce, which is ultimately considered a property, and proprietary can be exercised on the woman. This is a denial of clitoris, overemphasis of the womb, and all of this gets validated by the rhetoric of love.
Post lunch session

The session was divided into debriefing, planning for the next phase, and the third one closure.

Debriefing

A day to day basis debriefing started, the participants themselves summed up the training sessions of each day. The participants had a good, clear understanding of each day’s itinerary, and had a clarity of the tools used, the questions raised, and the things they could take away back to their respective works/organisations. The diagrams, tools that included group works, the self-assessment tools as well as the future oriented questions all aided the learning process of the participants. The participants in this way revisited each day of the training, the conceptual questions that came from them, the leadership and social change processes, the ways in which feminism/feminist lens could be used to think about varied things.

Deepa’s session proved to be extremely helpful in consolidating the participants’ interest in the training, and expanding the horizons of the sources of information for instance, legal, sociological, case studies, government policies, advancement of technologies, market strategies, and funding and budgeting.

Discussion on the Phase-III workshop planned for 19-24th September 2017

The participants were consulted on the dates of the phase, and a breakdown of the phase was given. The first two day of the phase would involve presentations by the participants on the various hurdles they came across in the first two phases, and second, the issues or areas the trainings could not cover with respect to their specialisation. The presentations are to be divided into 4 parts that are activities, challenges, changes at the personal level and organisational level, and the learnings. Next day would be on visible and invisible labour. The last day would talk about women’s safety and safety, which would also include body mapping, communicative strategies conducted by different resource people.

- Microlab (ice breaking, introductory)
- Training overbrief
- Division into 4 groups.
- Three questions from the previous phase of the training
- Film screening- Begum Jaan
- Discussion on the movie
- Lecture on Feminism
- Discussion on–Is ‘sex’ a natural category?
- Day 2: reporting
Closure

A general roundup of the training strategies, and suggestions, that the participants would go back and conduct with their respective organisations and groups.

Assignment questions:

1. Facilitate two trainings on gender/feminism, health, and leadership and submit reports.

2. Impact of contraceptives on the women’s health.

3. Charter of Demands on ‘health’.

Open feedback:

- Jagori has helped in networking, and connecting to different people from different organisations.

- Learnt a lot from the training sessions, as well as the resources like the books provided, helped in furthering the knowledge. The family members also sometimes read the material which further expands the circumference of the knowledge and helps in giving information to them.

- Has helped in writing more informed reports, pieces, and has expanded their outreach.

- Leadership training helped in identifying the lacks in our working.

- The kind of intensity and rigour that is provided in the trainings; this is a mixed sex group which opened up to different field experiences.

- Madhu opened up discussions very appropriately and the information summarised by her came to the participants very effectively and easily. The trainer proved to be very inspiring, especially in shaping the feminist thought process.

- The venue was highly appreciated.

- The methods employed and the content provided on leadership was presented in newer ways.

With this the Phase 2 of the FLDC came to an end, the participants and the training team all showed great enthusiasm and will to learn, and the discussions were formulated with much theoretical rigour by the trainers, and presented to the participants in simplified ways to create a larger understanding. The illustrative examples as given by the trainers, as well as the participants themselves all helped in consolidating the applicability of everything that the participants were told. In the end everyone who was part of the Phase 2 left the training venue with a stronger network of feminist associations and bonds, as well as some great new learning/training techniques.