IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Women Rulers Of India And Their Administrative Works Including Reforms.

Shweta Singh

Assistant Professor

Delhi University

I. Introduction

Throughout the centuries, women have held positions of remarkable power in Indian history, often rising to leadership roles despite societal resistance and patriarchal conventions. Their reigns weren't always acknowledged with the same reverence as their male counterparts, but their impact on governance, military strategy, public administration, and social reform cannot be overlooked. From the medieval Delhi Sultanate to the Maratha Empire and beyond, India witnessed a unique group of women rulers who not only held symbolic authority but were also active decision-makers, policymakers, and reformers. Their leadership was not simply reactive or ceremonial—it was rooted in long-term statecraft, tactical governance, and people-centric reforms. Yet, their stories remain scattered across chronicles, ballads, and regional folklore, rarely integrated into mainstream narratives of Indian political history (Jayapalan, 2001).

It's important, then, not just to remember these women as exceptions, but to study them for what they were—rulers in their own right, not placeholders. Their policies shaped the regions they governed. Their foresight laid foundations for cultural resilience, military strength, and economic stability. Women like Razia Sultana and Jijabai, for instance, broke through the rigid barriers of medieval and early-modern Indian society. But they didn't do it for personal glory. They did it to protect their people, build their kingdoms, and sustain dynasties. That's what makes their stories worthy of academic exploration and public recognition. Not just for the drama and struggle, but for the quiet, consistent efforts they made in administration, justice, and reform. Ahilyabai Holkar, another queen of note, established a rule admired for fairness and religious tolerance, but again, history often pushes such figures to the margins (Mookerji, 1951).

In light of this, the objective of this paper is to dive into the administrative contributions of key women rulers of India. It's not just a historical retelling. It's an inquiry. How did Razia Sultana maintain political control in a court filled with men unwilling to see her as a legitimate ruler? What role did Jijabai play—not just as Shivaji's mother—but as the interim governor, decision-maker, and cultural leader during the Maratha Empire's formative years? How did these women work within the structures of patriarchy, and in some cases, reshape them entirely? These are the questions that this exploration aims to answer. It's also a way to reposition them—not as outliers or anomalies—but as integral parts of India's administrative evolution.

We'll examine the following: What administrative reforms did these women initiate to stabilize their kingdoms? What were their core leadership values? Did they follow the same patterns as male rulers, or did their governance reflect different priorities—perhaps shaped by their own life experiences? In looking for these answers, the paper won't only be reconstructing the past but offering new ways to read leadership through a gendered, yet equitable, lens. As Borthwick (2015) and Sarkar & Sarkar (2008) emphasized in their studies of Indian women, the complexity of women's public roles often challenges our assumptions about power and gender. By grounding the discussion in real political achievements—whether military resistance, legal reform, or administrative planning—this research aims to reclaim the space these women rightfully earned in Indian history.

So, this is not a glorification, nor a lament. It's a detailed examination. With every queen or female regent discussed, the focus will be on the work—not just the crown. From the strengthening of local panchayats under Jijabai's regency to Razia Sultana's restructuring of the military hierarchy and civic governance, the spotlight will stay on policies, programs, and political acumen. These women didn't just rule—they governed. And they did so with courage, insight, and, often, incredible foresight. The hope is that by engaging with these stories and reforms with seriousness and depth, future research can be encouraged to dig even deeper, perhaps finally giving these rulers the status they've long deserved in the canon of Indian political history (Kumari, 2018; Beaman et al., 2012).

II. Razia Sultana: The Sultan Who Governed Against the Grain

Razia Sultana's reign was not just an anomaly in Indian history—it was a defiance of deep-rooted patriarchal structures embedded in the heart of the Delhi Sultanate. When Razia ascended the throne in 1236 CE, she wasn't just taking on the title of Sultan; she was stepping into a battlefield of resistance, not just from external enemies, but from the very nobles and courtiers who had vowed allegiance to the throne. She was the **first and only female ruler of the Delhi Sultanate**, and that title came with immense scrutiny. Her rise was supported by her father, Iltutmish, who recognized her capabilities over her brothers. He had publicly acknowledged her potential to rule, which was, in itself, revolutionary during that era (Jayapalan, 2001). But even with the Sultan's endorsement, the road ahead was not paved with respect or ease. Her succession was bitterly contested by the Turkish nobles (the Chahalgani), who viewed her not as a ruler, but as a woman stepping out of her place.

There was resistance in the court, whispers in the corridors of power, and open defiance in military ranks. Still, Razia didn't shrink. She dressed in male attire, sat in open court, and led military campaigns—everything her male predecessors had done. And yet, every decision she made had to fight past the fact that she was a woman in a world dominated by men. Her story isn't just about the crown she wore. It's about the authority she exercised in a time when women weren't even allowed a seat at the political table. Her strength wasn't only political—it was personal, internal, rooted in conviction that leadership wasn't gendered, but earned.

One of the most controversial yet telling moves Razia made during her reign was her **administrative appointments based on merit** rather than birth or nobility. She shook the power dynamics of the Delhi court by elevating individuals from diverse ethnic and social backgrounds to key positions of authority. The most debated of these was **Jamal-ud-Din Yakut**, an Abyssinian (Habshi) of slave origin, whom she appointed as superintendent of the stables—an important post, especially in a military-focused court. This wasn't just favoritism or naiveté, as her critics tried to portray. It was a calculated challenge to the Turkish elite who monopolized power for generations (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008). She wasn't afraid to take bold decisions. She trusted competence over lineage. This naturally bred animosity from the Turkish nobles, who saw her policies as not just unorthodox but threatening to their own positions. Her appointments, in that sense, were more than personnel changes. They were reformist acts aimed at decentralizing power and broadening the base of loyalty within the empire.

Her administrative talents went beyond mere personnel choices. Razia actively worked toward **strengthening civic administration and law enforcement** in the capital and across the Sultanate. She held open court sessions regularly, ensuring accessibility to justice—especially for the common people, who were often ignored under noble-centric rule. Under her leadership, market regulation and city security were improved. She emphasized order, routine, and predictability in governance. This wasn't merely good management. It was a demonstration that her legitimacy wasn't based on tradition or inheritance, but on capability. She strove to reduce corruption in the ranks, targeting officials who abused power or misappropriated funds. These anti-corruption measures, though difficult to enforce in a turbulent political environment, were a clear indication of her desire to create a functional, law-driven state—an ideal that many of her successors paid lip service to but rarely implemented with the same determination (Borthwick, 2015).

In addition to her administrative and legal reforms, Razia was deeply involved in **military and strategic affairs**, often personally leading troops into battle. This wasn't a ceremonial role. She was on horseback, in armor, commanding units. During her reign, she faced multiple rebellions—most notably from provincial governors like Altunia. These uprisings weren't just political in nature—they were gendered. Many of the revolts against her weren't only about power but about the discomfort with a woman issuing orders in a battlefield traditionally seen as masculine space. Yet, she did not back down. She led her forces with skill and even managed to suppress several insurrections. It was only when she was betrayed by Altunia—ironically, the same man who later married her—that she was temporarily captured. However, even then,

she returned to Delhi in an attempt to reclaim her power (Jayapalan, 2001). Unfortunately, the political climate, mixed with ongoing resentment from the Turkish nobility, led to her final downfall and death in 1240. But that doesn't take away from her achievements; it only highlights the immense odds she battled.

Razia's life and leadership were short-lived, yet the scope of her reforms and strength left an undeniable impact. She defied the very mold of what a ruler was expected to be. Her reign questioned the exclusivity of aristocratic privilege, the rigidity of gender roles, and the elitism of court politics. Her administrative efforts—particularly in the realms of merit-based appointments, justice accessibility, and military strategy—present a model of early reformist governance in India. Though her rule was not given the longevity it deserved, her political will continues to echo through the historical records, reminding us that leadership, real leadership, is rooted in vision and courage—not just lineage or gender (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008; Jayapalan, 2001).

III. Jijabai: The Regent and Nation-Builder

Jijabai, often respectfully addressed as Rajmata Jijabai or Jijau, is remembered not merely as the mother of Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj, but as a formidable political mind, administrator, and cultural visionary in her own right. Her influence stretched far beyond maternal guidance; she functioned as the philosophical foundation, tactical mentor, and early administrator who helped mold the political climate in which the Maratha Empire would rise. She wasn't ruling for glory. She wasn't wearing a crown or seated on a gilded throne. But she was governing—calmly, intelligently, and with a deep-rooted sense of civil duty that would shape not just her son's future, but that of Maharashtra and, by extension, India. Her life's work began in the early 17th century during a time of turmoil—both political and social. Her homeland, the Deccan, was torn between the Deccan Sultanates and the Mughal expansion, and amid this fractured landscape, Jijabai envisioned something radically new: Swarajya, or self-rule based on justice, dharma, and native pride (Kulkarni, 2000).

From Shivaji's early years, Jijabai took charge of his education—instilling not just literacy and military training, but more critically, a sense of purpose. She told him stories from the Ramayana and Mahabharata, not as bedtime tales, but as political parables, narratives designed to root him in Hindu ideals of kingship and moral governance. This wasn't simply domestic mothering; it was nation-building from the cradle. In fact, many scholars argue that Shivaji's lifelong vision of Swarajya was seeded and sustained by Jijabai's early teachings and unflinching support (Borthwick, 2015). It wasn't rare for her to personally accompany him to courtly discussions and public affairs, teaching him, through exposure and practice, how power is used wisely. Her impact on Shivaji was not emotional—it was structural. He absorbed from her the values of statecraft, justice, and spiritual strength, which he later applied to create a parallel political order in defiance of both the Mughals and the Sultanates.

But Jijabai wasn't only influencing Shivaji from the sidelines. While Shahaji, her husband, was occupied in faraway military duties under the Sultan of Bijapur, Jijabai was left with the responsibility of managing the **Pune Jagir**—a key region in the Maratha heartland. Pune at the time was more or less a neglected, war-ravaged territory. It wasn't the bustling urban hub it would later become. It was fragmented and unstable.

Jijabai took control and began **administering the region directly**. She oversaw revenue collection, made judicial decisions in local disputes, and ensured the rebuilding of public infrastructure like temples, roads, and marketplaces. This wasn't ceremonial governance. It was actual, day-to-day administration involving risk, political strategy, and negotiation with hostile local factions. She appointed trusted officers, organized a local military structure to fend off bandits and small enemy units, and ensured the people of the region had access to basic services. Essentially, she acted as a **regent** before the title was ever formally given. Many historical accounts recognize her efforts as foundational to the establishment of a functioning proto-state in Pune (Kulkarni, 2000; Jayapalan, 2001).

One of her lesser-known but vital contributions was in the **judicial and agrarian systems**. Jijabai insisted on fair land distribution and equitable tax practices, particularly at a time when feudal lords exploited villagers with arbitrary levies. She maintained records, listened to villagers' grievances, and upheld justice through community-centric dispute resolution. This often meant supporting the **village panchayat system**, which she believed fostered local accountability and grassroots governance. She wasn't introducing reforms in the way a legislative body might today, but her **practical, localized decisions were reforms in action**. They created a culture of transparency and responsiveness, which later became part of the Maratha administrative ethos. Her ability to stabilize Pune economically and socially allowed Shivaji to build his military and political base there without resistance from the local population. They trusted his rule because they had already trusted hers.

Beyond administration, Jijabai saw governance as deeply intertwined with **culture and moral revival**. She led a cultural resurgence grounded in Vedic and Dharmic values. At a time when temples were being razed or taxed by foreign rulers, she not only **patronized their rebuilding** but actively made them sites of community gathering and resilience. She revived cultural festivals, endorsed classical arts, and supported scholars and religious leaders who promoted ethical governance. This wasn't nostalgia. It was political wisdom. She knew that a population rooted in culture and belief was harder to conquer. Through her work, Hindu identity and self-worth were reaffirmed in a time of great suppression (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008). She was creating not just a political infrastructure, but a moral and cultural foundation for a nation-in-the-making.

What makes Jijabai's role particularly striking is that she operated almost entirely in a male-dominated world without ever formally declaring sovereign power. She didn't need a title; her actions gave her authority. When Shivaji later declared himself Chhatrapati, it was Jijabai who performed the ritual affirmations. That moment wasn't symbolic. It was full circle. The boy she raised, trained, and guided had become the king she always believed he would be. Her leadership was complete—not in terms of tenure, but in legacy. Without her, there might have been no Shivaji. Without Shivaji, no Maratha Empire. Her governance—executed while being a mother, a widow-in-waiting, and a devout Hindu woman—was nothing short of revolutionary.

IV. Other Prominent Women Rulers and Their Administrative Contributions

In Indian history, a few women rulers—though far apart in time, geography, and circumstance—stood out not only because they ruled in turbulent eras, but because they managed to govern with integrity, foresight, and a distinct sense of responsibility. They weren't just symbols of resistance or royal placeholders. They actively shaped the administrative and cultural frameworks of their kingdoms. Figures like **Ahilyabai Holkar**, **Rani Durgavati**, and **Rani Chennamma of Kittur** didn't just survive the political systems that often excluded women—they transformed them. Their stories speak of governance built on welfare, justice, and inclusivity, not power for its own sake.

A. Ahilyabai Holkar

Ahilyabai Holkar of Malwa is often remembered for her piety and devotion, but reducing her legacy to spiritual attributes overlooks her incredible administrative and infrastructural achievements. After her husband's death and the subsequent passing of her father-in-law Malhar Rao Holkar, she assumed power in 1767, at a time when women ruling independently was almost unthinkable. Her rule was not inherited with comfort. She had to earn every ounce of authority in a patriarchal court structure. Yet, once in power, she made the Holkar kingdom one of the most efficient and prosperous principalities in 18th-century India (Jayapalan, 2001).

One of her **most impactful contributions was her revenue and land reform**. Ahilyabai implemented a just and efficient taxation system, balancing royal revenue needs with peasant welfare. She personally inspected tax records, reduced unnecessary levies, and ensured that her officers did not exploit the agrarian class. At a time when revenue extraction often crippled farmers, her approach helped stabilize rural livelihoods. The result was improved agricultural productivity and public trust in her rule. But it wasn't only about numbers. It was about intention. She governed with the belief that the ruler is a caretaker, not a collector (Borthwick, 2015). Her administrative offices were known for their discipline and fairness, with documented accounts of her attending public court sessions daily, resolving disputes herself when needed.

Ahilyabai's governance extended into **infrastructure and religious harmony**. She commissioned the construction of roads, wells, rest houses, and ghats—not just in Malwa, but across the Indian subcontinent. From Somnath in Gujarat to Kashi in Uttar Pradesh, her contributions to temple restoration and religious site management were immense. But this wasn't mere religious propaganda. She supported **places of worship for all communities**, including mosques and gurudwaras. Her understanding of governance was holistic—it wasn't limited to tax or war. It included spiritual, social, and moral well-being. For Ahilyabai, a well-governed kingdom meant the prosperity of both the body and soul of her people (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008).

B. Rani Durgavati

Now, turning to Rani Durgavati of Gondwana—her story is often told as one of valor, but it's also deeply rooted in her **administrative and military brilliance**. Born into the Chandela dynasty and later married into the Gond royal family, Durgavati became regent after her husband's death in the mid-16th century. With

a minor son and a vulnerable kingdom, she didn't shy away from stepping into active governance. She led not as a protector alone but as a strategist. She moved the capital from Singorgarh to Chauragarh for better defense and oversight. That wasn't just geography—it was military logic. She reshaped Gondwana's **military structure**, forming a well-coordinated army with cavalry, archers, and infantry, many of whom were trained under her direct supervision.

But her brilliance went beyond the battlefield. Durgavati was attentive to the **agrarian economy**, the backbone of Gondwana. She supervised **irrigation projects**, including canals and water reservoirs that improved crop yields and reduced dependency on monsoons. This showed a clear understanding of both ecological and economic needs. In addition to improving agricultural output, she **simplified land revenue systems**, made village-level administration more responsive, and fostered trust between the crown and cultivators. Her administration also protected tribal customs, respecting the diversity within her realm and integrating tribal leaders into the decision-making process. This approach allowed her to rule a culturally complex region with relative harmony (Kazi, 1999). She ruled not just with strength but with respect—for land, people, and governance.

C. Rani Chennamma of Kittur

Finally, we come to **Rani Chennamma of Kittur**, a queen from Karnataka whose rule was defined by resistance, but whose **administrative vision is often overshadowed by her confrontation with the British**. Chennamma became queen in the early 19th century and soon found herself at odds with the British East India Company over the Doctrine of Lapse. When the British refused to recognize her adopted son's right to succession and tried to annex Kittur, Chennamma refused to comply. She led a well-coordinated military defense, briefly managing to defeat the British forces—a feat remarkable in itself. But her genius wasn't only on the battlefield. She had already built a strong administrative system that could support such resistance.

Under her leadership, **justice and public welfare became administrative priorities**. She championed **local governance through panchayats**, supported agricultural development, and ensured **citizens' rights in judicial processes**. It was common for her to personally oversee legal hearings, especially in matters where land or caste-based injustice was suspected. The legal reforms she initiated attempted to reduce exploitation by local zamindars and intermediaries. It wasn't a complete system overhaul, but it was a deliberate move toward **citizen-centered governance**, a radical thought during the colonial transition period. She held the belief that rulership came with the duty of fairness, not fear. Her efforts to maintain internal order while challenging external domination illustrate how resistance and governance can go hand-in-hand (Kumari, 2018).

Rani Chennamma's administrative legacy also lies in how she balanced **traditional values with the demand for autonomy**. She didn't rule just as a rebel queen. She ruled as a capable administrator who managed land revenues, maintained civic stability, and ensured continuity of governance despite political instability. Her policies laid a foundation for future resistance movements in Karnataka and inspired figures like Sangolli Rayanna, who carried her legacy forward after her arrest and death.

V. Common Themes in Women's Governance

A closer look at the governance styles of women rulers in Indian history reveals that, despite different regional and temporal contexts, many of them were guided by remarkably similar values. These were not rulers consumed by conquest or wealth; instead, their rule was characterized by a persistent focus on **justice, public welfare**, and community-centric reforms. What set them apart wasn't just their gender—it was their approach to leadership. Whether it was **Ahilyabai Holkar**, **Razia Sultana**, **Jijabai**, or **Rani Durgavati**, their decisions consistently reflected a deliberate prioritization of the people over palace politics. These rulers often paid more attention to the needs of farmers, artisans, soldiers, and ordinary citizens than to the grandeur of courts or the expansion of empires (Jayapalan, 2001).

The thread that links these rulers is their **unflinching resilience**—the kind forged in fire, not inherited through dynastic tradition. Each woman faced challenges that tested her right to rule, from **Razia's constant battle with courtly elites** who dismissed her as "just a woman," to **Jijabai's burden of state-building in Shivaji's absence**, and **Ahilyabai's need to legitimize her rule in a male-dominated Maratha court**. But they endured—not because they were accepted, but because they made themselves indispensable. Their governance stood on merit. They solved real problems: water shortages, crop failures, poor road conditions, declining temples, and lawlessness. And they didn't outsource these tasks. They involved themselves directly, with routine inspections, open courts, and local consultation (Borthwick, 2015).

Another repeated emphasis was on **grassroots reform**—things that seem ordinary but are deeply political. Building **wells**, repairing **temples**, initiating **village schools**, supporting **public markets**, and constructing **roads** were not just public works. These were acts of claiming authority, of making the ruler visible and relevant in everyday life. Women like Ahilyabai funded temples across India, not as mere acts of piety, but as a way to unify a spiritually diverse land through shared symbols. Jijabai's support for **village panchayats** and local dispute mechanisms reflected a sharp understanding of decentralized governance long before the term became fashionable. Even **Rani Chennamma**, in her short rule, made judicial fairness and land access priorities, especially for the vulnerable. These women didn't just rule—they **listened**, they **mediated**, and they **built**. That made their rule participative, and that made it last in memory.

VI. Societal and Structural Challenges

No conversation about women rulers in India can avoid the heavy shadow of **patriarchal resistance**. Their authority was always questioned—not for their decisions, but simply because of who they were. Courts, temples, and even familial circles often acted as gatekeepers, attempting to regulate or restrict female power through social norms and religious orthodoxy. Razia Sultana, for example, was never accepted fully by the Turkish nobility. Her downfall wasn't due to a lack of political skill—it was rooted in the discomfort her presence created among male courtiers who couldn't reconcile the idea of a woman commanding armies and issuing orders (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008). Even her appearance—choosing to wear male garments and ride horses—was scrutinized more than her policies.

Similarly, **Ahilyabai Holkar's assumption of power after the deaths of her husband and father-in-law sparked resistance** among Brahmins and courtiers alike. They considered her unfit not just because she was a woman, but because widowhood was seen as incompatible with power. These societal assumptions weren't abstract—they had real consequences. Women had to expend significant energy legitimizing their rule, often relying on religious symbolism, personal austerity, and appeals to dharma to win public trust. In essence, they had to "earn" authority that male rulers received automatically by birth or bloodline (Jayapalan, 2001; Kumari, 2018).

Another limitation came from within religious institutions themselves. Positions of spiritual or judicial influence were dominated by male scholars and priests who used scriptures selectively to deny women political autonomy. But many of these rulers flipped this script. Ahilyabai used her deep knowledge of Hindu texts to **justify her leadership as righteous**, not radical. Jijabai infused religious education with civic lessons, turning **moral instruction into political strategy**. Rani Durgavati worked with tribal leaders and respected their customs, showing that you didn't need to dismantle tradition to lead—you just needed to expand its scope.

What's most impressive is how **these rulers resisted through action, not confrontation**. They didn't waste time arguing their right to power. They governed. They delivered results. They turned skepticism into respect by building functioning courts, collecting fair taxes, launching military defenses, and creating thriving towns. Resistance never stopped—it just became irrelevant in the face of their success.

VII. Legacy and Relevance Today

Today, the legacy of these women rulers survives in ways both tangible and symbolic. You can still **walk the ghats built by Ahilyabai Holkar in Kashi**, **see the forts restored under Jijabai's supervision**, and **visit the schools and water tanks constructed during Rani Durgavati's reign**. These aren't just historical relics; they're **living testaments to public leadership rooted in service**. These women didn't lead by dominating—they led by building. That's why their **administrative and cultural legacy** endures centuries later.

But beyond architecture and local memory, their stories carry a **powerful message for modern governance**. At a time when discussions about leadership often focus on charisma and authority, these women remind us that **sustainable governance is about inclusion, justice, and humility**. They operated with limited resources, minimal political legitimacy, and constant gender-based opposition. Yet they left behind **models of ethical leadership** that continue to inspire. For instance, Ahilyabai's open court system and community audits could inform today's calls for transparency. Jijabai's emphasis on early education and cultural identity resonates in conversations around grassroots reform. Even Chennamma's defiance offers lessons in resistance grounded in law and legitimacy (Kumari, 2018; Borthwick, 2015).

Their relevance is especially vital in **contemporary gender discourse**. In a political landscape still struggling with female representation, these rulers serve not as tokens of the past, but as **prototypes for the future**. They show us that leadership isn't inherently male or inherently aggressive. It can be empathetic,

collaborative, and still effective. Their stories challenge modern India to **rethink what political power looks like when it's shaped by care, community, and commitment—not ego or exclusion**.

And maybe that's their greatest gift—not just the monuments or policies, but the idea that women, when given the chance, don't just match men in leadership. Often, they redefine what good leadership means. Their legacy isn't history—it's a **blueprint**, waiting to be taken seriously in every debate on governance, justice, and equality in India today (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008; Jayapalan, 2001).

VIII. Conclusion

When revisiting the lives and leadership of India's historic women rulers, it becomes evident that their power was never a matter of coincidence—it was earned through resilience, moral strength, and a remarkable ability to govern amid hostile circumstances. Women like **Razia Sultana**, **Jijabai**, **Ahilyabai Holkar**, **Rani Durgavati**, and **Rani Chennamma** didn't just exist on the periphery of Indian politics. They were at the heart of governance, often taking charge during periods of extreme volatility and uncertainty. But what's striking isn't just that they ruled—it's **how** they ruled. These were women who didn't inherit functioning systems; they built them. They weren't simply managing empires; they were crafting visions, many of which were grounded in justice, economic stability, religious harmony, and deeply localized models of leadership (Jayapalan, 2001; Borthwick, 2015).

Each of these rulers faced different adversities, but there was a shared thread in their administrative styles—a commitment to the people. **Ahilyabai Holkar's economic reforms and infrastructural vision**, for example, laid a foundation that not only stabilized Malwa but also elevated it into a symbol of just governance. Her reign didn't revolve around military expansion or courtly luxury; it was grounded in practicality—temple reconstructions, road networks, irrigation plans, and public welfare systems (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008). And then there's **Razia**, whose struggle wasn't merely with rebellious provinces but with a court that refused to see her as a legitimate ruler because of her gender. Still, she persisted, issuing orders, leading troops, and administering justice with discipline. She wasn't tolerated by her court—but she was respected by her subjects, and that makes all the difference.

Meanwhile, **Jijabai**, often reduced in historical discourse to the role of Shivaji's mother, was a formidable administrator in her own right. She governed the Pune jagir during a time of near-political vacuum, built strong local institutions, restored temples, mentored a future king, and did all this without any official title. She was a regent in action if not in name. And **Rani Durgavati's military reforms**, her irrigation work, her resistance to the Mughals—it all adds up to an image of a ruler who was both warrior and economist, protector and planner. **Rani Chennamma's refusal to surrender Kittur** to the British wasn't just a protest—it was a call to defend indigenous legal rights against foreign manipulation, and her attempts at preserving judicial fairness within a crumbling political framework reveal just how modern her thoughts were (Kumari, 2018).

These rulers did not operate in supportive environments. Their power was contested at every turn—by patriarchal court systems, religious orthodoxy, male military elites, and even at times by their own allies. And yet, they governed not with brute force but with thoughtful reforms, people-first policies, and a visible moral compass. The **common theme** in all their reigns was a quiet but profound revolution in governance—one where the emphasis was on **ethics, inclusivity, and empowerment rather than dominance**. They took on the state not just as rulers but as **custodians**, and that sense of responsibility shaped their policies and public conduct (Beaman et al., 2012; Sarkar & Sarkar, 2008).

In today's discourse around gender and leadership, these women offer more than inspiration—they offer blueprints. Their legacies serve as reminders that **power does not need to be loud to be effective**, that statecraft can be built on empathy, and that women are not only capable of ruling, but capable of redefining rule itself. Their contributions, still under-acknowledged in mainstream historiography, challenge the conventional masculine narratives of governance. If studied more widely and seriously, they could inform modern governance reforms, especially in local governance models, rural development policies, and inclusive leadership structures that India continues to grapple with (Jayapalan, 2001; Kumari, 2018).

This isn't about rewriting history to make space for women—it's about **correcting an omission**. These women were not accidental figures—they were pivotal ones. And their administrative legacies, if integrated into educational curricula and policy debates, could shift how we think about political leadership in India—not just in the past, but for the future. The empires they led may no longer exist, but the ideas they stood for—fair governance, welfare-led reform, inclusive justice—are timeless. Their stories remind us that leadership shaped by compassion, intellect, and integrity is not gendered. It's simply good governance.

References

1. Sarkar, S., & Sarkar, T. (Eds.). (2008). *Women and social reform in modern India: a reader*. Indiana University Press.
2. Bhalodia-Dhanani, A. (2012). Princes, diwans and merchants: education and reform in colonial India (Doctoral dissertation).
3. Jayapalan, N. (2001). *Indian Administration* (Vol. 1). Atlantic Publishers & Distri.
4. Mathur, K. (2018). *Recasting public administration in India: Reform, rhetoric, and neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
5. Beaman, L., Duflo, E., Pande, R., & Topalova, P. (2012). Female leadership raises aspirations and educational attainment for girls: A policy experiment in India. *science*, *335*(6068), 582-586.
6. Kazi, S. (1999). *Muslim women in India* (Vol. 92). Minority Rights Group.
7. Borthwick, M. (2015). The changing role of women in Bengal, 1849-1905.
8. Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an era of school reform*. Sage.
9. Dutt, R. C. (2013). *The economic history of India under early British rule: from the rise of the British power in 1757 to the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837*. Routledge.

10. Anand, A. (2014). *Remarkable Contributions: India's Women Leaders and Management Practices*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
11. Strobel, M. (1991). *European women and the second British empire* (Vol. 631). Indiana University Press.
12. Langer, A., Meleis, A., Knaul, F. M., Atun, R., Aran, M., Arreola-Ornelas, H., ... & Frenk, J. (2015). Women and health: the key for sustainable development. *The Lancet*, *386*(9999), 1165-1210.
13. Williams, R. B. (2019). *Introduction to Swaminarayan Hinduism*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Klugman, J., Hanmer, L., Twigg, S., Hasan, T., McCleary-Sills, J., & Santamaria, J. (2014). *Voice and agency: Empowering women and girls for shared prosperity*. World Bank Publications.
15. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2001). Women and democracy: Cultural obstacles to equal representation. *Journal of democracy*, *12*(3), 126-140.
16. Aufrecht, S. E., & Bun, L. S. (1995). Reform with Chinese characteristics: The context of Chinese civil service reform. *Public Administration Review*, 175-182.
17. Kumari, M. V. (2018). Women Leadership in Municipal Local Institutions: A Study of Elected Women Leaders in Haryana. *Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, *3*(9).
18. Boxberger, L. (2012). *On the Edge of Empire: Hadhramawt, Emigration, and the Indian Ocean, 1880s-1930s*. State University of New York Press.
19. Hoobler, J. M., Masterson, C. R., Nkomo, S. M., & Michel, E. J. (2018). The business case for women leaders: Meta-analysis, research critique, and path forward. *Journal of management*, *44*(6), 2473-2499.
20. Kaur, M., & Bhardwaj, N. (2013). Constraints analysis of women leaders. *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, *83*(7).
21. Ashta, A., Stokes, P., Hughes, P., Tarba, S., Dekel-Dachs, O., & Rodgers, P. (2024). The expression of compassion in leadership in intercultural organizational situations: The case of Japanese leaders in India. *European Management Review*.
22. Wong, A., & Sixl-Daniell, K. (2020). Empowering Women Leaders for Work-Integrated e-Learning: Social Changes and Persistent Challenges. *International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning*, *13*(4).
23. Bahmani, S., & Sawariya, M. D. (2024). Understanding Human-Political Agency Amongst Dalit Women Leaders in Panchayat Administration from Haryana: A Critical Social Work Enquiry. *Social Work Chronicle*, *13*(1).
24. Alagaraja, M., Cumberland, D. M., Anne, M., & Arghode, V. (2018). Women leaders in corporate India. *Indian women in leadership*, 133-154.
25. Sharpe, J. (1993). *Allegories of empire: The figure of woman in the colonial text*. U of Minnesota Press.
26. Levine, P. (2013). *Prostitution, race and politics: policing venereal disease in the British Empire*. Routledge.
27. Ahmad, A., & Aijaz, I. Empire and Progress: Tracing the Beneficial Outcomes of British rule in India. *Journal homepage: www. ijrpr. com ISSN*, *2582*, 7421.

28. Caiden, G. E. (2014). *Administrative reform comes of age* (Vol. 28). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

29. Nedungadi, P., Ramesh, M., Govindaraju, V., Rao, B., Berbeglia, P., & Raman, R. (2024). Emerging leaders or persistent gaps? Generative AI research may foster women in STEM. International Journal of Information Management, 77, 102785.