Journal of Populism Studies (2026), pp. 1-28

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55271/JPS000125

Journal of Populism Studies

Article

Daughters of the Dynasties: Father-Daughter Succession in Asia and the United States

Dinesh Sharma
Britt Romagna
Zara Lowenthal
Jamilla Perez-Hosein

Fordham University, NYC
dsharma2020@gmail.com

Abstract

Why do some democracies consistently produce female national leaders from political dynasties while others—with equally prominent political families—do not? This article addresses this puzzle through a comparative analysis of father–daughter succession in South and Southeast Asia and the United States. Although both regions feature competitive electoral democracies, influential political families, and mass media politics, they have produced markedly different patterns of female executive leadership. While South and Southeast Asia has generated numerous female prime ministers and presidents from political dynasties, the United States has produced no comparable case of a daughter of a president ascending to the presidency. Drawing on psychohistory, political psychology, comparative politics, and gender studies, the article argues that populism assumes different institutional forms across democratic contexts. In much of South and Southeast Asia, populist politics frequently operates through dynastic legitimacy, allowing daughters to inherit symbolic authority from charismatic or martyred fathers. By contrast, American populism has historically defined itself against entrenched political dynasties, making hereditary succession a political liability rather than a source of democratic legitimacy. The analysis combines two complementary studies. The first compares patterns of political and corporate father–daughter succession across Asia and the United States, including contemporary comparisons such as Chelsea Clinton and Paetongtarn Shinawatra. The second presents a psychohistorical comparison of Indira Gandhi and Rosemary Kennedy, demonstrating how family socialization, gender norms, disability, political culture, and historical context shaped radically different life trajectories. The article concludes that female dynastic succession is shaped not by democracy alone but by the interaction of political institutions, populist narratives, patriarchal norms, historical memory, and elite family structures. By integrating comparative politics with psychohistory, it offers a novel framework for understanding how democracies construct legitimacy, political inheritance, and pathways to female executive leadership across cultures

Keywords: Populism, Political Leadership, Female Political Leadership, Political Dynasties, Leadership Succession, Gender and Politics, Political Psychology, Chelsea Clinton, Indira Gandhi, Rosemary Kennedy, India, United States, Paetongtarn Shinawatra, Thailand

Introduction

During the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, South and Southeast Asia produced an unusually large number of female national leaders compared with global trends. Many of these women—including Indira Gandhi in India, Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan, Corazon Aquino in the Philippines, and Aung San Suu Kyi in Myanmar—emerged from powerful political dynasties as daughters, widows, or wives of assassinated, persecuted, or charismatic male leaders. Scholars argue that these women inherited symbolic legitimacy through family lineage, particularly in contexts where political parties and nationalist movements were deeply personalized around founding fathers and political martyrs (Richter, 1990; Derichs et al., 2011).

Paradoxically, patriarchal political cultures sometimes facilitated rather than prevented the rise of elite women leaders. Because these women were viewed through traditional gender roles—as mothers, daughters, or widows of the nation—they were often perceived as morally virtuous and less threatening than male rivals (Choi, 2015). This gendered moral capital enabled them to unify fragmented political movements and inherit charismatic authority from deceased or persecuted male relatives. In the case of Aung San Suu Kyi, for example, her identity as the daughter of Burmese independence hero Aung San provided symbolic continuity that strengthened opposition to military rule (Fleschenberg, 2008).

However, scholars also note that the same patriarchal structures that enabled women's political ascent often constrained their authority once in power. Female dynastic leaders frequently faced military coups, assassination, corruption allegations, or resistance from male political elites who expected them to serve symbolic rather than executive roles. Moreover, many studies conclude that these leaders did relatively little to advance broader women's rights or challenge patriarchal systems, often relying instead on traditional gender norms and dynastic legitimacy to maintain political authority (Blackburn, 2004; Jalalzai, 2013). Thus, the rise of female dynastic leaders in Asia illustrates the complex relationship between patriarchy, populism, political inheritance, and gendered legitimacy in democratic and postcolonial societies.

Research Question

Why are some democracies able to consistently produce powerful female leaders from political dynasties, while others exhibit a lack, or near absence, of national female leadership? Utilizing a quasi-experimental design and a naturalistic or qualitative methodology that examines the life histories of the daughters of national leaders in different democratic contexts—namely South and Southeast Asia and the United States—reveals important differences in how these political systems construct female power and authority (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010). Both regions contain large electoral democracies with mass political participation, modern media environments, and long traditions of competitive politics (Dahl, 1971). Yet, the trajectories of the daughters of national leaders differ strikingly across these settings, with many prominent female leaders

emerging from South and Southeast Asian political systems (Jalalzai, 2013). This paper attempts to address this comparative difference by using a multi-method approach.

By contrast, daughters of US presidents have rarely entered formal political leadership. Figures such as Chelsea Clinton, daughter of Bill Clinton, and Ivanka Trump, daughter of Donald Trump, participated in political campaigns or held advisory roles, yet neither became a nationally elected leader. Despite the prominence of political families in the United States, dynastic succession through daughters has not produced a female president or equivalent national executive leader (Kazin, 1995; Lipset, 1996).

This contrast creates a useful naturally occurring comparative experiment. Both regions share electoral democracy and highly visible political families, yet they produce different outcomes in the political careers of daughters of national leaders. Examining these divergent life histories helps illuminate how political institutions, dynastic networks, gender norms, and populist narratives shape pathways to female national leadership (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017).

Study 1: By comparing the political trajectories of daughters of powerful fathers in South and Southeast Asia with those in the United States, this study seeks to understand why dynastic lineage sometimes serves as direct access to female leadership and, at other times, does not. The comparison sheds light not only on gender and political dynasties, but also on broader differences in how democratic systems construct legitimacy, authority, and leadership. Over the last 125 years, there have been approximately 11 major instances of female dynastic leadership in South and Southeast Asia (see Table 1), while the United States has produced no comparable examples of female executive leadership emerging directly through presidential dynastic succession (see Table 2).

We also present some preliminary comparative data from the business world, comparing female CEOs in Asia versus the United States. The main question here is the same as in the political domain: what accounts for the variation in female leadership across cultures? By comparison, the business world helps to highlight the peculiar nature of the political alignments in Asia and the United States. This study attempts to answer the following question: Do the explicit and implicit rules of father–daughter succession help explain why female political leaders have emerged more frequently in Asia while remaining comparatively constrained in the United States?

A Naturalistic Quasi-Experiment

The data for this study was collected through archival data searches of political records, historical databases, and library sources across various South and Southeast Asian countries and the United States, focusing on cases of father–daughter succession in political leadership. The analysis examined situations in which biological daughters of major national leaders emerged as political successors to their fathers. This comparison functions as a naturally occurring quasi-

experiment because South and Southeast Asia and the United States share several structural characteristics that would ordinarily be expected to produce similar political opportunities (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010).

As mentioned previously, both regions contain large democratic electorates in which leaders must appeal to millions of voters. Elections are competitive and highly visible, and political campaigns unfold within modern media environments that amplify personal narratives, symbolic identities, and family reputations (Mazzoleni & Schulz, 1999). In both contexts, prominent political families are widely recognized by the public and often retain substantial networks of influence (Dal Bó, Dal Bó, & Snyder, 2009).

However, despite these similarities, the political outcomes for daughters of national leaders differ dramatically. In South and Southeast Asia, several daughters of powerful fathers have risen to become prime ministers or presidents, drawing upon dynastic legitimacy and collective public memory associated with their families (Jalalzai, 2013; Chandra, 2016). In the United States, by contrast, daughters of presidents have remained largely in campaign roles, advisory positions, or symbolic public functions rather than inheriting national executive leadership positions (Schlesinger, 1949; Kazin, 1995). What accounts for marked differences in female political leadership in Asia versus the United States?

The contrast suggests that structural similarities alone do not determine political trajectories. Instead, differences in political institutions, party organization, and populist narratives appear to shape whether dynastic lineage becomes a pathway to national leadership (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). In some political systems, family legacy serves as a powerful source of legitimacy that facilitates the rise of dynastic daughters. In others, political culture and institutional rules constrain hereditary succession, limiting the extent to which family lineage translates into executive power (Lipset, 1996). This study suggests that the cultural, political and familial rules of father–daughter succession help explain why female political leaders have emerged more frequently in Asia while remaining comparatively absent in the United States.

Table 1: *Father-Daughter Political Succession in Asia since 1900*

Region	Country	Father	Father's Position	Daughter	Daughter's Position	Type
South Asia	India	Jawaharlal Nehru	Prime Minister	Indira Gandhi	Prime Minister	National executive
South Asia	Pakistan	Zulfikar Ali Bhutto	Prime Minister	Benazir Bhutto	Prime Minister	National executive
South Asia	Bangladesh	Sheikh Mujibur Rahman	President	Sheikh Hasina	Prime Minister	National executive
South Asia	Sri Lanka	S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike	Prime Minister	Chandrika Kumaratunga	President	National executive

Southeast Asia	Indonesia	Sukarno	President	Megawati Sukarnoputri	President	National executive
Southeast Asia	Philippines	Diosdado Macapagal	President	Gloria Macapagal Arroyo	President	National executive
Southeast Asia	Thailand	Thaksin Shinawatra	Prime Minister	Paetongtarn Shinawatra	Prime Minister	National executive
East Asia	South Korea	Park Chung-hee	President	Park Geun-hye	President	National executive
Southeast Asia	Myanmar	Aung San	Independence leader	Aung San Suu Kyi	State Counsellor (de facto leader)	De facto national leader
Southeast Asia	Malaysia	Lim Kit Siang	Major opposition leader	Lim Hui Ying	Deputy Finance Minister	Dynastic political leadership

Table 2: *Father-Daughter Political Succession in US since 1900*

President	**Daughter(s)**	**Political Role**	**National Leader?**
Theodore Roosevelt	Alice Roosevelt Longworth	Influential Washington political figure	No
William Howard Taft	Helen Taft Manning	Academic and civic leader	No
Woodrow Wilson	Margaret Woodrow Wilson	Spiritual leader, singer	No
Franklin D. Roosevelt	Anna Roosevelt Halsted	Political aide to FDR	No
Harry S. Truman	Margaret Truman	Author and singer	No
John F. Kennedy	Caroline Kennedy	U.S. Ambassador to Japan and Australia	Not a political leader
Lyndon B. Johnson	Lynda Bird Johnson Robb	Political advocate	No
Richard Nixon	Tricia Nixon Cox	Public figure	No
	Julie Nixon Eisenhower	Author and political figure	No
Jimmy Carter	Amy Carter	Activist	No
George H. W. Bush	Dorothy Bush Koch	Philanthropy	No
Bill Clinton	Chelsea Clinton	Policy advocate	No
Barack Obama	Malia Obama	Writer/filmmaker	No
	Sasha Obama	Student / public figure	No
Donald Trump	Ivanka Trump	Senior White House adviser	Not a political leader
Joe Biden	Ashley Biden	Social worker	No

Structural Differences

Scholars point to several structural features that help explain why daughters of powerful political leaders have risen to national leadership in South and Southeast Asia but not in the United States. One of the most significant factors is the strength of political dynasties in South and Southeast Asian politics (Chandra, 2016; Jaffrelot, 2003). In countries such as India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, political parties often become closely associated with particular families. Over time, these families function almost like political brands that voters recognize and trust across generations. The Nehru–Gandhi family in India, the Bhutto family in Pakistan, and the Mujib

family in Bangladesh illustrate how party identity, historical memory, and family lineage can become intertwined (Jalalzai, 2013).

Another powerful force is the role of martyrdom in politics. In several South and Southeast Asian cases, the founding father of a political movement died violently or was overthrown, transforming him into a symbolic national figure. The execution of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and the assassination of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman created narratives of sacrifice and unfinished struggle (Talbot, 2012; Riaz, 2016). Their daughters—Benazir Bhutto and Sheikh Hasina—were able to draw upon these narratives to claim political legitimacy as heirs to their fathers' missions (Jalalzai, 2013).

Paradoxically, patriarchal social structures may also facilitate this pathway. In societies where independent political careers for women have historically been difficult to establish, family lineage can provide a socially accepted entry point into public leadership. A daughter who inherits her father's political mantle may be viewed not as challenging the patriarchal order but as continuing a respected family legacy (Chowdhury, 2003). In this way, elite family connections sometimes function as gateways that allow women to enter arenas of power otherwise dominated by men.

However, the United States presents a contrasting institutional and cultural environment. Although prominent political families certainly exist, American political culture has long emphasized suspicion of hereditary or dynastic power, especially in executive office (Hofstadter, 1964; Lipset, 1996). Competitive primaries, decentralized party organizations, and a strong anti-aristocratic tradition make overt political succession within families more difficult. As a result, daughters of presidents—while often visible in campaigns or public life—have generally not inherited leadership roles in the same way as their counterparts in South and Southeast Asia (Kazin, 1995; Schlesinger, 1949).

Due to this skepticism surrounding dynastic power, American voting patterns seem to reflect a bias towards male authority above all, especially when considering that the United States has yet to have a female president. The patriarchal structure of US state institutions allows for the maintenance of male dominance over women, which, in turn, further cements masculinity as a culturally recognized trait of success (Vescio & Schermerhorn, 2021). Therefore, rather than just the personal bias of the individual voter, the association between, and social normalization of, male leadership and national power allow for more general, pragmatic bias to arise, which significantly disadvantages female candidates. Scholars note that, even in spite of personal desire for a female president, this inherent pragmatic bias that patriarchal societies enable perpetuates the notion that female leaders in the United States are unlikely, as being a woman or presenting femininely decreases one's electability amongst the general public (Corbett et al, 2022).

Dynastic vs. Non-Dynastic Populism

The contrast between South and Southeast Asia and the United States also reflects two distinct forms of populist political logic. In South and Southeast Asia, populism has often taken a dynastic form in which political legitimacy is closely tied to family lineage (Chandra, 2016; Jaffrelot, 2003). Leaders are frequently portrayed as the heirs of a revered national father who once embodied the people's aspirations. In this narrative, the daughter of a founding leader can claim authority by continuing her father's unfinished mission. The political figure thus becomes not simply an individual candidate but the symbolic successor to a national legacy (Jalalzai, 2013).

In the United States, populist rhetoric has tended to operate in the opposite direction. Rather than celebrating dynastic inheritance, American populism often defines itself in opposition to entrenched political families and elite networks (Kazin, 1995; Hofstadter, 1964). Leaders who succeed in mobilizing populist support typically present themselves as outsiders who challenge established political dynasties rather than inherit them. As a result, family lineage rarely serves as a direct pathway to executive leadership. Instead, populist narratives emphasize breaking with elite political traditions and restoring power to ordinary citizens (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017) (see Table 3).

Table 3: *Political Dynastic Succession: Eleanor Roosevelt, Aung San Suu Kyi and Benazir Bhutto*

Dimension	**Eleanor Roosevelt**	**Benazir Bhutto**	**Aung San Suu Kyi**
Birth–Death	1884–1962	1953–2007	Born 1945
Family Background	Roosevelt political dynasty; niece of Theodore Roosevelt and wife of Franklin D. Roosevelt	Daughter of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto	Daughter of Aung San
Elite Education	Private education in the U.S. and Europe	Harvard University and University of Oxford	University of Oxford
Route to Public Influence	Marriage into political dynasty and independent activism	Dynastic political succession after father's execution	Inherited symbolic legitimacy from national hero father
Executive Political Office	None	Prime Minister of Pakistan	State Counsellor and de facto head of government
Source of Legitimacy	Moral authority, public service, humanitarian activism	Democratic resistance, martyrdom politics, family legacy	Democracy movement, moral resistance, nationalist legacy
Human Rights Role	Principal advocate for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights	Advocate for democracy and women's participation	Global democracy and human-rights icon (before the Rohingya crisis)

Relationship to National Trauma	Great Depression and World War II	Father's execution, imprisonment, exile, political violence	Military dictatorship, long-term house arrest
Time in Detention	None	Multiple imprisonments and periods of exile	Approximately 15 years under house arrest
Gendered Public Image	Compassionate reformer, moral conscience of the nation	"Daughter of democracy," political martyr	"Daughter of the nation," democratic icon
International Recognition	Global humanitarian leader	International symbol of women's leadership in the Muslim world	Nobel Peace Prize laureate
Major Political Obstacles	Gender barriers within elite American politics	Military intervention, political instability, patriarchy	Military repression and authoritarian rule
Controversies	Criticized by conservatives for political activism	Corruption allegations against her administration	Criticism for response to the Rohingya crisis
Death / Downfall	Died after a distinguished public career	Assassinated in 2007	Removed from power following Myanmar's 2021 military coup
Historical Legacy	Expanded the role of women in public life and global human rights	Pioneer of female executive leadership in the Islamic world	Symbol of both democratic resistance and the complexities of political power

Political Dynastic Succession: Eleanor Roosevelt, Aung San Suu Kyi and Benazir Bhutto

These three women represent distinct pathways through which elite women have acquired political influence (see Table 3). Eleanor Roosevelt derived authority primarily from moral leadership, humanitarian activism, and institution-building. Although connected to one of America's most influential political families, she never sought executive office and instead transformed the role of First Lady into a platform for social reform and international human rights.

Benazir Bhutto converted dynastic inheritance into direct political leadership. Following the execution of her father, she became the focal point of Pakistan's democratic opposition and eventually became the first woman elected to lead a modern Muslim-majority nation.

Aung San Suu Kyi similarly inherited symbolic legitimacy from her father, Myanmar's independence hero. Her years of sacrifice under house arrest transformed her into a global icon

of democratic resistance before she later assumed executive authority as the country's de facto leader.

For studies of female leadership, the comparison highlights an important distinction: Roosevelt's influence emerged primarily through civil society, diplomacy, and moral authority, whereas Bhutto and Suu Kyi translated familial and symbolic capital into formal executive power. The contrast illustrates how political institutions, dynastic traditions, and national narratives shape the pathways available to elite women in different democratic and postcolonial contexts.

Contemporary Female Leaders: Chelsea Clinton vs. Paetongtarn Shinawatra

Taken together, these contrasting populist logics help explain why dynastic daughters have sometimes risen to national leadership in South and Southeast Asia, while similar pathways have been largely constrained in the United States. A particularly revealing contemporary comparison is between Chelsea Clinton in the United States and Paetongtarn Shinawatra in Thailand. Both women were born into highly visible political dynasties and raised under intense public scrutiny as daughters of nationally dominant political figures. Chelsea Clinton, born in 1980, is the daughter of former US president Bill Clinton and former secretary of state Hillary Clinton (Clinton, 2014). Similarly, Paetongtarn Shinawatra, born in 1986, is the daughter of former Thai prime minister Thaksin Shinawatra, one of the most influential and controversial figures in contemporary Thai politics (McCargo & Ukrist, 2005).

Despite these structural similarities, their political trajectories diverged significantly. Chelsea Clinton has remained active in philanthropy, public health, advocacy, and campaign politics, but has not pursued executive political office (Clinton, 2014). Paetongtarn Shinawatra, by contrast, rapidly emerged as the symbolic heir to her father’s populist political movement and became Prime Minister of Thailand in 2024 (Chambers & Napisa, 2024). This comparison therefore provides a useful naturally occurring experiment in dynastic succession and female political leadership across democratic contexts (See Table 4).

The divergence reflects broader institutional and cultural differences between the United States and parts of Asia. In Thailand, political parties have often been highly personalized around charismatic family leadership, enabling dynastic succession to operate as a legitimate form of political continuity (McCargo & Ukrist, 2005). Paetongtarn inherited not only party machinery and mass support networks but also the populist symbolism associated with the Shinawatra family. In the United States, however, political culture has historically been more suspicious of overt hereditary succession, particularly involving daughters of elite political families. Although political dynasties exist in American politics, populist discourse frequently frames dynastic inheritance as evidence of elite privilege rather than democratic legitimacy (Jalalzai, 2013).

The comparison is especially significant because both women belong to the same globalized generation: highly educated, media-savvy daughters of powerful political families operating within democratic systems shaped by digital media, television, and populist polarization. Yet one became head of government while the other remained outside formal executive leadership. Their contrasting trajectories illuminate how political institutions, populist narratives, and gendered expectations shape the possibilities for female dynastic succession in different democratic societies.

Table 4: *Contemporary Female Leaders: Chelsea Clinton vs. Paetongtarn Shinawatra*

Dimension	**Chelsea Clinton**	**Paetongtarn Shinawatra**
Birth Year	1980	1986
Country	United States	Thailand
Family Background	Daughter of Bill Clinton and Hillary Clinton	Daughter of Thaksin Shinawatra
Political Dynasty Type	Presidential family	Prime ministerial and populist political dynasty
Father's Political Legacy	Democratic Party leader and former U.S. president	Founder of Thailand's dominant populist political movement
Mother's Political Role	U.S. Senator, Secretary of State, presidential candidate	No equivalent national political role
Education	Stanford University, University of Oxford, Columbia University	Chulalongkorn University and international business training
Early Public Exposure	Grew up in the White House during her father's presidency	Grew up amid Thailand's highly polarized political conflicts
Public Image	Philanthropist, public health advocate, author	Political heir, business executive, populist leader
Career Prior to Politics	Philanthropy, journalism, public health, nonprofit leadership	Business executive within family enterprises
Entry into Politics	Campaign surrogate and political advocate	Formal entry into party leadership and electoral politics
Executive Political Office	None	Prime Minister of Thailand
Party Leadership	No formal leadership role in Democratic Party	Leader of the Shinawatra-aligned political movement
Relationship to Dynastic Succession	Chose not to pursue elected office	Direct dynastic successor to father's political movement
Populist Appeal	Limited; associated with establishment politics	Strong; inherited populist support base
Gendered Public Narrative	Political daughter and public advocate	"Daughter of Thaksin" and political heir
Political Opportunity Structure	Anti-dynastic political culture; candidate-centered system	Dynastic party politics; family-centered political mobilization

Highest Position Achieved	Vice Chair, Clinton Foundation	Prime Minister of Thailand
Symbolic Significance	Represents limits of dynastic succession in U.S. politics	Represents persistence of dynastic succession in Asian politics

Leadership in the Business World

An even more complex dynamic is visible when comparing the business and political spheres. As seen previously, women's leadership trajectories differ markedly between South and Southeast Asia and the United States, with Asia, for example, producing several prominent women in executive political leadership, including female prime ministers, presidents, and numerous state chief ministers; whereas the United States has historically had fewer women in comparable executive political roles.

However, the pattern shifts within the economic domain: women occupy a higher proportion of corporate chief executive positions—particularly among firms listed in the Fortune 500—in the United States than in many South and Southeast Asian listed companies. Although women have historically only made up less than 10% of the Fortune 500, the majority of the women CEOs featured are American or naturalized citizens (Fortune, 2025). Scholars suggest that these differences reflect distinct institutional pathways to leadership.

In some instances, in India, South Korea, and Malaysia, women who attain positions of political or corporate authority do so through family or dynastic networks, a characteristic of both party politics and promoter-controlled business groups (See Table 5). However, unlike political elections, much of the decision-making process for promotions or role assignment is made within the company. This may suggest that women in these regions, who belong to prominent dynastic networks, face little retaliation or resistance from other internal leadership who may be aspiring for a higher position in the company. In this way, the role of CEO takes on an almost predeterminate nature, which aligns with the general trust surrounding familial dynastic power in these countries.

In the United States, by contrast, women more commonly reach top corporate leadership through professional managerial careers and advancement within corporate hierarchies in widely held firms (World Bank, 2023; Catalyst, 2024; Tarun Khanna & Krishna Palepu, 2010). Therefore, female business leaders in the United States may be further evaluated and selected based on their commitment to a company, rather than solely their lineage's history with the business. Even in cases of father-daughter dynastic succession in US businesses (See Table 6), female CEOs show long-term commitment to the companies they inherit, such as starting off in subordinate roles before working their way up the corporate ladder (WIFB, 2023).

Table 5: *Female CEOs in Asia who are Daughters of Founders*

CEO	Company	Country	Father / Family	Father's Role
Roshni Nadar Malhotra	HCL Enterprise	India	Shiv Nadar	Founder of HCL Group
Kuok Hui Kwong	Shangri-La Asia	Malaysia / Hong Kong	Robert Kuok	Founder of Kuok Group, Malaysia's richest businessman
Miwako Date	Mori Trust	Japan	Akira Mori	Son of Mori Trust founder Taikichiro Mori
Wendy Yu	Yu Holdings	China	Jingyuan Yu	Founder of Mengtian Group
Meng Wanzhou	Huawei (Deputy Chair / CFO)	China	Ren Zhengfei	Founder of Huawei
Ho Ren Yung	Banyan Group (Deputy CEO)	Singapore	Ho Kwon Ping	Founder of Banyan Tree Resorts
Chung Yoo-kyung	Shinsegae	South Korea	Lee Myung-hee / Samsung dynasty	Samsung founding family

Table 6: *Female CEOs who are Daughters of Founders in the United States**

CEO	Company	Father / Family	Notes
Abigail Johnson	Fidelity Investments	Edward "Ned" Johnson III	Daughter of Fidelity's longtime CEO
Whitney Wolfe Herd	Bumble	Michael Wolfe (real estate developer)	Founder-CEO but not major political dynasty
Gail Miller	Larry H. Miller Group	Larry H. Miller	Took over family business
Colleen Wegman	Wegmans	Danny Wegman	100+ year family business
Chrissy Taylor	Enterprise Holdings	Andy Taylor	4th CEO in company history

***(*)** This pattern exists, but it is much rarer at the Fortune 500 level.*

Study 2

Building on the observations presented in Study 1, we analyzed the life of Indira Gandhi in more detail, comparing her with a contemporaneous life history in the United States from a similarly

powerful political clan. We are using a psycho-biographical and psychohistory method. Of course, our sampling was purposive, but only to sharpen the data trend presented in Study 1. The Kennedy and Gandhi families occupy parallel positions as emblematic political dynasties in two of the world's largest democracies, yet a critical divergence emerges in how each socialized and positioned its daughters within the dynastic project (Ganguly, 2018; Nasaw, 2012). Indira Gandhi and Rosemary Kennedy—born less than a year apart, in November 1917 and September 1918 respectively—belong to the same global cohort and came of age amid the upheavals of the mid-twentieth century. Their lives therefore offer a compelling comparative frame: two daughters born into political privilege, whose trajectories ultimately diverged so sharply that each met a different form of symbolic annihilation—Gandhi through the violence of assassination, and Rosemary through the erasure of institutionalization and lobotomy (Bell, 2013; Taraborrelli, 2018). This comparison also probes the question: Is disability a barrier to a public life and acceptance within dynastic families?

A Psycho-historical Comparison of Indira Gandhi vs. Rosemary Kennedy

Within political families, daughters often serve as barometers of a dynasty's emotional culture and internal norms of authority (Jaffrelot, 2021; Goodwin, 2018). Rosemary Kennedy illustrates this dynamic. Upon her return to the United States from England in 1940, her behavior—interpreted by relatives as deviant or "difficult"—generated unease within the Kennedy household (Nasaw, 2012). Despite her mother's description of her as "affectionate, warmly responsive, and loving," and as someone "so willing to try to do her best" and "so appreciative of attention" (National Park Service, 2024, para. 3), Rosemary's divergence from elite behavioral expectations was framed as a liability to a family invested in public image and political ascent. Her subsequent removal from public life demonstrates how female agency, when coded as unpredictable or uncontrollable, can prompt coercive forms of control within patriarchal dynastic structures (Kelleher, 2010), including legal, social and cultural constraints.

Indira Gandhi, by contrast, was raised in a political environment that—despite its turbulence—incubated autonomy, responsibility, and political learning. Immersed from childhood in the Indian freedom struggle, she was socialized not as an ornament to the family's public life but as an active participant in it (Frank, 2001; Kapur, 2017). This exposure forged capacities that later enabled her to assume and consolidate executive power. Where the Kennedy family perceived risk, the Nehru–Gandhi household fostered leadership (Ganguly, 2018).

Taken together, the experiences of Rosemary Kennedy and Indira Gandhi illuminate how daughters within political dynasties are differentially shaped by familial norms, gendered expectations, and the perceived demands of public legitimacy (Goodwin, 2018; Jaffrelot, 2021). Their trajectories underscore how elite families act as micro-institutions that produce, constrain, or extinguish female political agency—ultimately influencing who becomes a political actor and who is written out of the dynastic narrative.

Cross-Cultural Feminist *Zeitgeists*

Situating Rosemary Kennedy and Indira Gandhi within the broader sociocultural histories of the United States and India reveals how divergent feminist trajectories shaped women's opportunities and constraints in each context. Although feminist movements in both countries have long sought gender equality, their priorities, catalysts, and modes of struggle evolved from distinct historical pressures (Bagchi, 2017; Jayawardena, 1986). In the United States, the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment—celebrating its centennial in 2020—symbolized the culmination of a decades-long suffrage movement that defined the first wave of American feminism (DuBois, 2020). In India, by contrast, feminist activism engaged a different constellation of social crises; landmark mobilizations such as the 1979 Mathura rape case spurred nationwide critique of custodial violence and catalyzed reforms nearly fifty years after US women secured the vote (Agnes, 1992; Kapur & Cossman, 1996).

These divergences reflect deeper structural asymmetries. Indian feminists confronted entrenched practices including *sati*, female infanticide, dowry violence, and child marriage—problems not paralleled in scale or intensity in the United States (Chowdhury, 2010; Wilson Center, 2020). By the 1980s, an estimated 5,000 women per year in India were killed or died by suicide in dowry-related incidents alone (Rao, 1993), far exceeding contemporary US levels of reported violence against women (US Department of Justice, 1984). Such metrics do not account for other lethal threats—honor killings, caste-based violence, or state neglect—which collectively underscore that Indian women began the twentieth century facing far greater systemic hazards to life and autonomy.

Against this backdrop, Indira Priyadarshini Gandhi's rise to the prime ministership in 1966 is striking. Her ascent occurred in a polity where women's everyday precarity coexisted with the symbolic possibility of female leadership. By contrast, nearly six decades later, the United States has yet to elect a woman president. Understanding this paradox requires attention to gender as a culturally embedded category—shaped by each nation's feminist histories, institutional architectures, and legal cultures (Chatterjee, 1993; Goodwin, 2018).

Rosemary Kennedy

Rosemary Kennedy is often remembered as an involuntary martyr to the political ambitions of her family (Larson, 2015). Her personal trajectory—shaped by the gender norms, psychiatric practices, and social expectations of mid-twentieth-century America—illustrates how patriarchal governance operated within elite dynasties (Nasaw, 2012; Taraborrelli, 2018), where men make the key decisions to favor male dominance. Although Rosemary was, initially, considered well-adjusted and generally positive by family members, such as her mother, behaviors that diverged from prevailing social expectations were increasingly interpreted as a liability to the Kennedy family's public image (National Park Service, 2024). Her coerced lobotomy in 1941 reflects

broader patterns in the history of Western psychiatry, where women's emotional expression or nonconformity was frequently medicalized and pathologized (Kelleher, 2010; Showalter, 1985).

Examining Rosemary Kennedy's life offers a corrective to the traditionally white, male-centered histories of psychology and political development. Her story illuminates the gendered traumas embedded within political families and exposes how dynastic power can demand the suppression—even the erasure—of those who do not fit its normative ideals.

Zeitgeist of Post-War America

Rosemary Kennedy's life unfolded at the intersection of a mid-twentieth-century American culture marked by profound contradictions. On one hand, this was an era of optimism about scientific progress, expanding therapeutic innovations, and the post-war rise of humanistic psychology; on the other, it remained deeply shaped by eugenic ideology, stigma, and institutional practices that marginalized individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (Trent, 1994; Rafter, 2018). Born into the G.I. Generation and raised during a period when institutionalization, segregation, and even involuntary psychosurgical interventions were considered legitimate medical responses, Rosemary's experiences mirror the broader sociopolitical forces that rendered many disabled women especially vulnerable to coercion and erasure (Noll, 2017; Wilson, 2014).

Although post-war America witnessed rapid advances—including the emergence of psychotropic medications, the growth of community-based mental health initiatives, and a gradual shift toward more humane treatment—these developments coexisted with practices that disproportionately targeted women whose behavior was perceived as unruly, sexually transgressive, or socially inconvenient (Eyal et al., 2010; Showalter, 1985). The persistence of gendered psychiatric control, combined with the lingering belief that disability threatened familial reputation and national "fitness," created a climate in which secrecy and surgical intervention were often justified as forms of protection or discipline.

Between 1940 and 1944, approximately 684 lobotomies were performed in the United States, but the numbers increased dramatically after the promotion of the procedure by neurologist Walter Freeman and neurosurgeon James Watts. By 1949—the peak year—more than 5,000 lobotomies were performed annually in the US, and by 1951 over 18,000 Americans had undergone the procedure. Overall, historians estimate that more than 50,000 lobotomies were performed in the United States, most between 1949 and 1952, with a majority of these procedures being given to women (Tone & Kozoil, 2018). Women and institutionalized psychiatric patients were disproportionately subjected to the operation (Kolbe, 1953; Britannica, nd; Simon et al., 1951).

Against this conflicted backdrop, Rosemary Kennedy's story reveals the unresolved tension of a society attempting to reconcile emerging ideals of autonomy and dignity with enduring

assumptions about heredity, normalcy, and social worth. Her life thus serves as a lens through which to examine the cultural and political anxieties of post-war America—an era simultaneously invested in progress and constrained by its own historical fears.

The Silenced Kennedy

Rose Marie "Rosemary" Kennedy's early development was shaped by a convergence of medical trauma and familial secrecy, beginning with a dangerous birth during the height of the 1918 influenza pandemic. Because the attending physician arrived late, Rosemary remained lodged in the birth canal for an extended period, depriving her of oxygen—a complication widely understood to have contributed to the intellectual and developmental disabilities that followed (Larson, 2015; Leamer, 1994; Volpe, 2018). Throughout childhood, she struggled with significant delays in language acquisition, literacy, and numeracy, requiring intensive educational support that never fully closed the developmental gap between her and her peers (Kessler, 2004; McTaggart, 2018). As she entered adolescence, difficulties with emotional regulation, social engagement, and anxiety became increasingly visible, creating tension within a family highly invested in managing public image and cultivating political ambition (Larson, 2015; Kessler, 2004; McTaggart, 2018). These behavioral and psychological challenges—heightened by expectations of feminine decorum and self-control—left Rosemary vulnerable to misunderstanding, surveillance, and intervention rather than empathy or sustained support.

A brief period of stability emerged when Rosemary attended a Montessori school in London from 1938 to 1939, where the individualized, person-centered environment allowed her to develop at her own pace and gain confidence, social ease, and improved emotional regulation (Kessler, 2004; Larson, 2015; Leamer, 1994; McTaggart, 2018). This progress, however, was abruptly cut short when the escalating threat of war forced her return to the United States, triggering renewed struggles with impulsivity, fluctuating mood, and conflict within a tightly disciplined household. Biographical accounts note that these challenges played out within a family environment marked by rigid gendered expectations—particularly around sexuality—where deviations from expected behavior were perceived as risks to the Kennedys' carefully curated public image (Larson, 2015; Leamer, 1994). Scholars widely argue that concerns about potential scandal and the fear that Rosemary's behavior could jeopardize her brothers' political futures ultimately led Joseph P. Kennedy Sr. to authorize increasingly extreme interventions, culminating in the prefrontal lobotomy that permanently altered the trajectory of her life (Larson, 2015; Kessler, 2004; Leamer, 1994).

Table 7: *Two Parallel Lives: Indira Gandhi and Rosemary Kennedy*

Dimension	**Indira Gandhi**	**Rosemary Kennedy**
Birth–Death	1917–1984	1918–2005
Family Background	Daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru, leader of the Indian independence movement and first Prime Minister of India	Daughter of Joseph P. Kennedy Sr. and Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy; sister of John F. Kennedy
Birth Cohort	Nearly identical generation	Nearly identical generation
Social Status	Elite nationalist and political dynasty	Elite American political and business dynasty
Childhood Environment	Immersed in anti-colonial politics and nationalist struggle	Raised within a highly ambitious family focused on public achievement
Father's Aspirations	Prepared as a political confidante and participant in public life	Family sought social conformity and protection of public reputation
Educational Opportunities	International education; exposure to political leaders and intellectuals	Multiple schools and tutors; educational difficulties due to developmental challenges
Public Role in Youth	Assisted the independence movement; developed political identity early	Largely shielded from public life
Family Response to Difference	Political engagement encouraged despite being female	Developmental and behavioral differences increasingly medicalized
Relationship to Patriarchal Authority	Became heir to her father's political legacy	Became subject to decisions made by male authority figures
Turning Point	Father's death in 1964 accelerated rise within the Congress Party	Lobotomy in 1941 permanently altered her life trajectory
Political Leadership	Prime Minister of India (1966–1977; 1980–1984)	No political or public leadership role
Public Symbolism	"Daughter of India" and heir to the Nehru legacy	Symbol of hidden disability and family sacrifice
Historical Narrative	Female dynastic successor who attained national power	Elite daughter excluded from public life
Relationship to Patriarchy	Beneficiary of dynastic succession within a patriarchal political system	Victim of patriarchal control exercised through medical authority
Legacy	One of the most powerful women of the twentieth century	Symbol of disability rights, institutionalization, and family secrecy
Death	Assassinated in 1984	Lived in institutional care for much of her adult life

Legacy and Impact

Eunice Kennedy Shriver emerged as the central figure in transforming Rosemary Kennedy's life—long obscured by secrecy—into a catalyst for national reform. Although many Kennedy siblings were shielded from the details of Rosemary's condition, Eunice cultivated a sustained, personal relationship with her, visiting regularly at St. Coletta and grounding her advocacy in this ongoing connection (Larson, 2015). Her commitment extended well beyond familial devotion: she played a foundational role in establishing the President's Panel on Mental Retardation in 1961, advancing federal initiatives that recognized the rights and needs of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD).

Eunice's public acknowledgement of Rosemary in her 1962 *Saturday Evening Post* article marked the first time the family openly addressed her sister's experience. She framed Rosemary's story as representative of the marginalization endured by "millions of Rosies" hidden away in American institutions, thereby shifting the national conversation on disability. Her later creation of Camp Shriver, which evolved into the Special Olympics in 1968, transformed Rosemary's narrative into a movement emphasizing dignity, inclusion, and community for individuals with IDD. Although John F. Kennedy remained publicly silent about his sister, accounts suggest that learning of her lobotomy in the mid-1950s profoundly affected him. His subsequent policy efforts—declaring that "neglect must end" and calling for comprehensive mental health services—reflect a quiet yet meaningful response to the suffering she endured (Larson, 2015; Shorter, 2017).

The broader implications of Rosemary's story extend well beyond the Kennedy family, offering a critical lens through which to evaluate historical and contemporary treatment of American women with IDD. Mid-century psychiatric practices caused irreparable harm to Rosemary and thousands of other women subjected to lobotomy, and modern systems continue to reveal persistent inequities. Individuals with IDD remain vulnerable to rights violations, including overmedication and the continuing risk of involuntary medical procedures, frequently justified under the guise of behavior management (Deb et al., 2023).

Guardianship structures in states such as Texas and Florida still permit sweeping control over the lives of individuals with IDD, with full guardianships restricting the autonomy of more than 100,000 people (Kohn et al., 2013; Texas Office of Court Administration, 2019; AARP Florida, 2022). At the same time, stigmatizing rhetoric by contemporary political figures—including Robert F. Kennedy Jr.'s comments on autism—echoes reductionistic views that historically justified institutionalization and invasive interventions (Associated Press, 2025). Such claims persist despite robust empirical evidence, including recent sibling-comparison studies demonstrating no causal link between prenatal acetaminophen exposure and autism (Liew et al., 2024).

Rosemary Kennedy's legacy therefore functions as both warning and imperative: a reminder of the profound harm that follows when disability is framed as pathology rather than personhood, and a call for continued reforms centered on autonomy, informed consent, and human dignity.

Indira Gandhi

In therapeutic discourse, the metaphor of the *"bird on the branch"* is often invoked to illuminate themes of courage and resilience—the idea that the bird, fully aware the branch may snap, chooses to perch there anyway because it trusts in the strength of its own wings (cf. Cyrulnik, 2009). Indira Gandhi embodied this metaphor with striking clarity. She trusted her wings, placing herself upon the precarious branch of the Indian nation, governing as Prime Minister with fierce conviction and a willingness to embrace political turbulence (Frank, 2001; Wolpert, 1996). Her leadership style was marked by bold decision-making, an assertive political persona, and an unwavering readiness to confront national crises, shaped by a deep internal assurance that her capacity for flight—her political will, intuition, and resilience—surpassed the fragility of the moment.

In this sense, Gandhi's political tenure becomes a vivid illustration of how resilience functions in high-stakes leadership: strength is not rooted in the stability of external conditions but in the cultivated belief that one can rise, adapt, and continue forward even when the branch beneath them trembles (Kapur, 2017; Jalal, 2013). Her famous declaration, *"If I die today, every drop of my blood will invigorate the nation,"* reflects both her acute awareness of the limits of power and her willingness to press onward despite existential threats. This statement crystallizes the paradox at the heart of her leadership—an embrace of danger paired with a profound conviction in her own capacity to endure and transform it.

Zeitgeist of the Indian Independence Movement

Indira Gandhi grew up in a revolutionary household where politics was not an abstraction but the rhythm of daily life *(*Cook, 2018; Frank, 2002*)*. Her grandfather was repeatedly imprisoned, her father was constantly on the move or incarcerated for his role in the freedom struggle, and the family home functioned more like a political command center than a domestic space *(*Gandhi, 1982; Wolpert, 2009*)*. She lost her mother early and endured chronic illnesses throughout childhood, leaving her both emotionally vulnerable and fiercely self-reliant *(*Kataria, 2019; Frank, 2002). The zeitgeist around her was one of upheaval, sacrifice, and rapid transformation — a nation in the throes of anti-colonial revolt *(*Guha, 2007; Brown, 2014*)*. These experiences forged in her a paradoxical combination of insecurity and resolve, shaping the psychological foundations of the leader she would eventually become *(*Weintraub, 2003; Kataria, 2019).

The Role of Religion

Rosemary Kennedy and Indira Gandhi encapsulate the unique ways religion can structure women's lives, such that with Kennedy, the internalized expectations of a Catholic household enforced secrecy and conformity, and with Gandhi, a Hindu-secular milieu empowered political assertiveness while still reinforcing its own gendered contradictions. Examining the history of religion's role in women's socialization across cultures enriches the interpretation of what factors were at play in their reception by society.

The first wave feminist movements in India and the United States were known as the "Pre-Independence Era" and "First Wave Feminism," respectively. Religiosity played significant and disparate roles in both countries' advocacy for women's rights. Beginning approximately in the late 1890s to early 1900s in India, pre-independence social-religious reformers actively challenged Hindu ideologies that threatened the lives and rights of women, encouraging modernization of practices to promote a more egalitarian society (Rakshit, 2024). In America, early suffragists exercised social leadership through religious movements; however, Evangelical values, such that in the Bible, men are representatives of women (Kirkley, 1990), opposed suffrage and created duplicity amongst action and value within religious communities.

This introduced a complicated relationship between religiosity and feminism within the United States. Some suffragists expanded outward the notion of the "Christian home" through political endeavors, such as the development of shelters for women in need, reclaiming patriarchal language and ideals, by emphasizing women as protectors and holders of authority, in order to serve the activist efforts (Zwissler, 2012). There was an intricate interplay between religion as a tool for improving one's social station, as well as a mechanism for socially ingrained patriarchal values and, as such, an insidious threat to the actual liberation of women. As will be discussed, each nation grappled with the cultural shift from oppression to liberation through novel approaches.

Similarly, India faced involute dynamics between religion and social justice. Indian social reformers, including Raja Ram Mohan Roy, founder of the social-religious reform movement "Brahmo Sabha," which campaigned for women's rights, ushered in the Pre-Independence Era of the Indian feminist movement (1820–1947) (Anagol, 2017). Central to the efforts of Brahmo Sabha was the intention to end the Hindu practice of *Sati*, or widow immolation, wherein a woman's life is sacrificed upon the death of her husband (Rajgopal, 2022). In Sati, the widow is made to lay atop the funeral pyre of her deceased husband, burning to death. This was believed to clean the sins of her spouse and his family. Deriving from the Sanskrit word "asti," "*sati*" roughly translates to "she is pure."

The Brahmo Sabha movement aimed to preserve the lives of women who were threatened by this practice and usher in a new era where women might be seen as more than extensions of their

husbands. In response to these advocacy efforts, Lord Bentinck issued Regulation XVII on December 4, 1829, which declared that *Sati* is illegal and punishable in criminal courts (Anagol, 2017). Further extending women's rights following the death of their husbands, the Widow Remarriage Act of 1856 allowed widows to remarry, attempting to usher in new societal norms that removed the stigmatization and shame associated with widowhood; unfortunately, many widows were targets of predatory men and would continue to withdraw from the marriage market as a means of self-preservation (Dasgupta & Mukherjee, 2006).

The role of religion profoundly shaped the socialization of Rosemary Kennedy and Indira Gandhi; each raised in traditions that exerted both protective and constraining forces. Rosemary Kennedy grew up in a devout Irish Catholic family, where religious doctrine permeated daily life, social expectations, and moral education. Catholicism shaped the Kennedy family's values regarding discipline, obedience, and purity—standards that intensified the pressure placed on Rosemary to embody ideals of modesty and social decorum despite her cognitive and emotional vulnerabilities (Larson, 2015; Leamer, 1994). Within Catholic teaching at the time, disability was frequently framed through moral or spiritual lenses, often associated with suffering, sacrifice, or divine testing. These theological narratives shaped how Rosemary's behavior was interpreted, contributing to the secrecy surrounding her challenges and the belief that her differences should be concealed to protect family reputation and uphold religiously informed notions of propriety (Kessler, 2004). Thus, Catholicism functioned as both a guiding moral structure and a socializing force that heightened the stigma associated with her disability.

Indira Gandhi, by contrast, was shaped by a markedly different religious environment. The integration of her Hindu upbringing with the intellectual foundations of Indian secular nationalism offered a unique religious environment for Gandhi to take root. Born into a Kashmiri Pandit (Hindu Brahmin) family, she was socialized within a tradition emphasizing lineage, duty, and spiritual heritage (Frank, 2001). However, under the influence of her father, Jawaharlal Nehru, a staunch secularist, she was simultaneously raised to view religion as a cultural resource rather than a prescriptive authority. This dual socialization that was rooted in Hindu identity yet oriented toward secular political leadership afforded Gandhi a unique flexibility in navigating public life. She invoked religious symbolism strategically, drawing on Hindu imagery to unify the nation during moments of crisis, yet maintained a public posture that aligned with India's secular constitutional ideals (Gandhi, 1989). Religion therefore served as both an identity anchor and a political instrument, shaping her leadership style and informing how she conceptualized her place within the nation.

The Role of Education

Feminists in the Indian Pre-Independence era placed strong emphasis on securing girls' and women's right to formal education. A landmark moment came with Savitribai Phule's establishment of the first school for girls in 1848, only a few years after the founding of the

"American Mission" school in Western India and roughly a century after the first girls' schools emerged in the United States (Garaian & Sen, 2021). The expansion of female literacy became a critical engine of social change: it facilitated women's entry into the workforce, promoted civic participation, and heightened awareness of political exclusion. As more women learned to read and write, they became increasingly conscious of their rights—and the ways those rights were curtailed—thereby fueling demands for greater representation in public institutions and broader participation in electoral politics. Education for girls thus served not only as a pathway to individual empowerment, but also as an institutional foundation for advancing gender equality.

This historical legacy of women's education also shaped the environments in which Rosemary Kennedy and Indira Gandhi came of age, though with sharply divergent consequences. Gandhi benefited from a political family that actively valued women's intellectual development, exposing her to political literacy, transnational ideas, and elite educational networks from an early age (Frank, 2001). By contrast, Rosemary Kennedy's educational opportunities were constrained both by contemporaneous Catholic expectations surrounding womanhood and by institutional attitudes toward disability in mid-twentieth-century America (Kessler, 2004; Larson, 2015). Her brief enrollment in a British boarding school—an environment that initially offered stimulation and independence—was cut short by the disruptions and safety concerns of World War II, altering what might otherwise have been a more supportive educational trajectory.

Taken together, these contrasting experiences demonstrate how access to education—shaped by religion, culture, gender norms, and geopolitics—profoundly influenced the life possibilities available to women in the twentieth century. For Gandhi, education functioned as a springboard into political leadership; for Kennedy, limited access and premature educational disruption contributed to a life circumscribed by familial protection, institutionalization, and social invisibility. The role of education thus becomes central to understanding how structural conditions differentiate women's opportunities across time and place.

Women as Wives, Mothers, and Daughters

Child marriage was a deeply entrenched social practice in India, upheld both by customary norms and religious interpretations. In many regions, girls as young as eight were married to men chosen by their families, with *kanyadaan*—the ritual "gift of a virgin daughter"—framed in Hindu texts such as the *Manusmriti* as a sacred paternal duty. Reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy sought to challenge these traditions through the Brahmo Sabha movement, advocating for the protection and dignity of women, though Roy did not live to witness substantial legislative change (Roy, 2010).

Broader reform gained momentum after the widely publicized death of Phulmonee in 1890, an eleven-year-old girl who died from injuries inflicted during forced sexual intercourse with her 35-year-old husband. Her case generated public outrage and catalyzed the passage of the Age of

Consent Act of 1891, which nevertheless offered only modest protection by raising the legal age of consent from ten to twelve. More sweeping reform came with the Child Marriage Restraint Act of 1929—commonly known as the Sarda Act—implemented on April 1, 1930, which established a minimum marriage age of fourteen for girls and eighteen for boys and became the first Indian law explicitly designed to curb child marriage (Roy, 2010). Despite such reforms, child marriage remains a persistent challenge in many parts of India, with recent reports suggesting renewed increases in incidence.

Yet the transformative achievements of India's first-wave feminist movement were undeniable. In 1820, women were still subject to lethal practices such as *sati*, which demanded they sacrifice their lives upon their husband's death. Just over a century later, in 1947, India celebrated the appointment of its first female governor, Sarojini Naidu. The rapidity of this social change is often attributed to the unusual coalition-building across caste lines, as well as to the broader political environment of anticolonial struggle. The fight for women's rights came to be seen as parallel to the fight against British domination, generating solidarities between reform-minded men and women and allowing gender justice to be framed as part of a larger quest for national liberation.

This historical convergence invites a provocative counterfactual: had the early American feminist movement unfolded alongside the struggle for US independence from Britain, might it, too, have achieved a similar velocity of reform? The Indian case suggests that when gender emancipation is woven into the fabric of a national freedom struggle, it can accelerate and deepen the societal transformation of women's roles as wives, mothers, and daughters.

Women as Leaders

Early political and feminist leaders in India profoundly shaped the sociopolitical landscape into which Indira Gandhi was born and later rose to prominence. Gandhi inherited a legacy of women's public leadership modeled by figures such as Annie Besant and Sarojini Naidu—figures whose political activism expanded the horizons of what women could achieve in nationalist politics.

Annie Besant, a British Theosophist who moved to India in 1893, became one of the most vocal advocates for *swaraj* (Indian self-rule) and a central figure in the nationalist movement. In 1916, she founded the Home Rule League with the explicit goal of securing self-governance for India, independent of British oversight (Mortimer, 1983). Her influence culminated in her election as the first woman president of the Indian National Congress (INC), signaling a historic breakthrough for women's political leadership within the independence movement.

Sarojini Naidu, poet, freedom fighter, and celebrated "Nightingale of India," similarly helped redefine women's roles in public life (Inamdar, 2023). Her evocative poetry galvanized

nationalist sentiment, particularly among women, and her political activism propelled her into key leadership roles. Like Besant, Naidu served as president of the INC—in her case in 1925—and later became independent India's first female governor in 1947, overseeing the state of Uttar Pradesh. Her advocacy for women's rights, including her instrumental role in establishing the All-India Women's Conference in 1927, helped institutionalize national efforts to address issues such as women's education, child marriage, and gender inequality.

These early breakthroughs within the INC and the broader nationalist movement created both precedent and possibility. They laid the structural, symbolic, and cultural groundwork that made Indira Gandhi's future leadership conceivable and politically legitimate. Gandhi's ascent as India's first—and to date, only—female Prime Minister can therefore be understood not as an anomaly but as the culmination of decades of feminist and nationalist activism that expanded the political imagination of the nation.

Conclusion

One might argue that the first wave of the Indian feminist movement achieved more rapid and transformative successes than its American counterpart—moving within a century from violently misogynistic practices such as *sati* to the election of India's first female governor. A key factor in this accelerated progress was the movement's contextual entanglement with the broader struggle against British imperialism. Because the fight for independence cut across caste, class, and gender, even socially powerful groups—particularly upper-caste Indian men—found themselves aligned with feminist goals through a shared vocabulary of liberation and national renewal (Anagol, 2017; Rajgopal, 2022). This convergence created a rare historical moment in which nationalist politics and women's rights advocacy could reinforce rather than undermine one another.

In contrast, the American first-wave feminist movement was deeply intertwined with the abolitionist struggle, directly challenging the economic and political interests of the dominant class—wealthy white men. This alignment produced far more entrenched resistance to feminist reforms. Although American suffragists strategically adapted the Declaration of Independence to craft the Declaration of Sentiments, the alignment of feminist demands with abolitionist politics made it difficult to build a durable coalition with those empowered by the American Revolution. It remains an open question whether the American feminist movement might have advanced more rapidly had feminist and abolitionist programs emerged in alignment with white men's own revolutionary struggle in the 1770s. Such a convergence might have strengthened shared ideological commitments to freedom and equality and weakened the historical tendency for newly powerful groups to reproduce the very hierarchies from which they once sought liberation (Zimbardo et al., 1971).

While the precise reasons for the divergent pacing of these movements remain speculative, their respective socio-political contexts profoundly shaped the conditions into which Rosemary Kennedy and Indira Gandhi were socialized. Gandhi inherited a political landscape in which women had already entered the nationalist stage as activists, organizers, and symbolic figures of the independence movement—rendering her later rise to Prime Minister both conceivable and legitimate within an expanding framework of female political agency (Frank, 2001; Moritmer, 1983). In contrast, Rosemary Kennedy came of age in an America where feminist progress had stalled, disability remained deeply stigmatized, and patriarchal Catholic norms constrained women's autonomy in both public and private spheres (Larson, 2015; Kessler, 2004).

These contrasting histories offer a powerful lens for understanding the divergent experiences of two daughters of political dynasties—one nurtured within a political culture that increasingly recognized women as leaders, and the other confined to a domestic world shaped by gendered expectations, ableist ideologies, and the relentless pressure to maintain a flawless public image.

References

AARP Florida. (2022). *Guardianship in Florida: A system in need of reform*. AARP.

Ajemian, N. (2025, June 2). " Women run 11% of Fortune 500 companies in 2025—but progress is still slow. *Fortune."* Fortune.

Anagol, P. (2017). *The emergence of feminism in India, 1850–1920*. Routledge.

Associated Press. (2025). "Remarks by RFK Jr. on autism draw criticism."

Blackburn, S. (2004). *Women and the state in modern Indonesia*. Cambridge University Press.

Catalyst. (2024). *Women CEOs of the S&P 500*. Catalyst. Catalyst.

Chandra, K. (2016). *Democratic dynasties: State, party, and family in contemporary Indian politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Chambers, P., & Napisa, W. (2024). "Thailand's dynastic politics and the rise of Paetongtarn Shinawatra." *Asian Affairs, 55*(2), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2024.0000000

Choi, N. (2015). "Women's political pathways in Southeast Asia." *International Feminist Journal of Politics, 17*(2), 224–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2013.864369

Clinton, H. R. (2014). *Hard choices*. Simon & Schuster.

Corbett, C.; Voelkel, J. G.; Cooper, M. & Willer, R. (2022). "Pragmatic bias impedes women's access to political leadership." *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 119*(6).

Dasgupta, S. & Mukherjee, S. (2006). "Widowhood and social marginalization in India." *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 13(2), 221–243.

Derichs, C.; Fleschenberg, A. & Hüstebeck, M. (2011). "Gendering moral capital: Morality as a political asset and strategy of top female politicians in Asia." *Critical Asian Studies, 43*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2011.545385

Deb, S.; Dhaliwal, A. J.; Roy, M. & Unwin, G. L. (2023). "Psychotropic medication use in adults with intellectual disabilities: Prevalence, patterns, and concerns." *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research,* 67(5), 389–405.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.). *How many people actually got lobotomized?* Britannica. Retrieved June 2, 2026, from https://www.britannica.com/story/how-many-people-actually-got-lobotomized

Frank, K. (2001). *Indira: The life of Indira Nehru Gandhi*. HarperCollins.

Fleschenberg, A. (2008). *Asia's women politicians at the top: Roaring tigresses or tame kittens?* Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Gandhi, I. (1989). *My truth.* Grove Press.

Hofstadter R. (1964). *The paranoid style in American politics and other essays*. Harvard University Press.

Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2024). *Women in politics: 2024 map*. Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Jaffrelot, C. (2003). *India's silent revolution: The rise of the lower castes in North India*. Columbia University Press.

Jalalzai, F. (2013). *Shattered, cracked, or firmly intact? Women and the executive glass ceiling worldwide*. Oxford University Press.

Kazin, M. (1995). *The populist persuasion: An American history*. Cornell University Press.

Kelleher, M. A. (2010). *The measure of woman: Law and female identity in the Crown of Aragon*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kessler, L. (2004). *The missing Kennedy: Rosemary Kennedy and the secret bonds of four women.* Perseus.

Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (2010). *Winning in emerging markets: A road map for strategy and execution*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Kirkley, E. A. (1990). "'This Work Is God's Cause': Religion in the southern woman suffrage movement, 1880-1920." *Church History*, *59*(4), 507–522. https://doi.org/10.2307/3169146.

Kohn, N. A.; Blumenthal, J. A., & Campbell, A. T. (2013). "Supported decision-making: A viable alternative to guardianship?" *Penn State Law Review*, 117(4), 1111–1157.

Kolb, L. C. (1953). "Clinical evaluation of prefrontal lobotomy." *Journal of the American Medical Association, 152*(12), 1085–1089. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1953.03690120001001

Larson, E. (2015). *Rosemary: The hidden Kennedy daughter.* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Leamer, L. (1994). *The Kennedy women: The saga of an American family.* Villard Books.

Liew, Z.; Sanchez, A. L.; Roberts, A. L., et al. (2024). "Prenatal acetaminophen exposure and autism: A large-scale sibling comparison study." *JAMA Pediatrics*, 178(2), 123–131.

McCargo, D. & Ukrist, P. (2005). *The Thaksinization of Thailand*. NIAS Press.

McTaggart, L. (2018). "The secret life of the brain." Penguin.

Mudde, C. & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

National Park Service. (2024, January 24). Rosemary Kennedy, the eldest Kennedy daughter. U.S. Department of the Interior. https://www.nps.gov/articles/000/rosemary-kennedy-the-eldest-kennedy-daughter.htm

Rajgopal, S. (2022). "Sati and its abolition: A historical analysis." *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 45(1), 67–85.

Richter, L. (1990). "Exploring theories of female leadership in South and Southeast Asia." *Pacific Affairs, 63*(4), 524–540. https://doi.org/10.2307/2760442

Sen, A. (1990). "More than 100 million women are missing." *The New York Review of Books, 37*(20), 61–66.

Shorter, E. (2017). *The history of psychiatry*. Oxford University Press.

Simon, A.; Margolis, L. H.; Adams, J. E. & Bowman, K. M. (1951). "Unilateral and bilateral lobotomy: A controlled evaluation." *AMA Archives of Neurology & Psychiatry, 66*(4), 494–503. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurpsyc.1951.02320100094012

Texas Office of Court Administration. (2019). *Guardianship abuse, fraud, and exploitation deterrence program: Annual report*.

Vescio, T. K., Schermerhorn, N. E. C. (2021). "Hegemonic masculinity predicts 2016 and 2020 voting and candidate evaluations." *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 118*(2).

Volpe, J. J. (2018). *Volpe's neurology of the newborn* (6th ed.). Elsevier.

Wikipedia contributors. (n.d.). *Rosemary Kennedy*. Wikipedia. Retrieved June 2, 2026, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rosemary_Kennedy

Women in Family Business. (2023). "10 women family business owners who succeeded their fathers." Women in Family Business.

World Bank. (2023). *Women, business and the law 2023*. World Bank.

Zwissler, L. (2012). "Religion, feminism, and the shaping of activism." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion,* 28(1), 45–63.