@ World Politics 1994

Yasar F-15

WOMEN AND DEMOCRATIZATION
Conceptualizing Gender Relations in Transition Politics

By GEORGINA WAYLEN*

A VAST literature on democratization has been produced in recent years.[1] There is, however, increasing agreement that much of it fails to take account of the complexity of the process of transition to democracy and instead substitutes empiricism, simplistic voluntarism, and an ahistorical approach, which results in "a plethora of unrelated ad hoc generalisations grounded in macro-level case-studies."[2] What is needed, then, rather than abstracting separate cases, is broadly comparative and theoretically informed work that provides conjunctural explanations within a social, economic, and historical context.[3]

The orthodox political science literature on democratization has so far made very little mention of gender or more specifically women, despite evidence of the significant role women and women's movements have played, for example, in the return to democratic politics in much of Latin America.[4] This is one important aspect of the analytical inadequacy of much of this work. It is clear that any analysis of democratization that fails to incorporate a gendered perspective—that ignores the actions and impact of certain groups—will be flawed. The study of comparative politics can only be improved by creating a framework for analyzing the interplay between gender relations and democratization.

*I would like to thank Paul Cammack, Mike Goldsmith, Elizabeth Harvey, Scott McCracken, and Vicky Randall for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.

[1] See, e.g., Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Lawrence Whitehead, eds., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy*, 4 vols. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986); Enrique A. Baloyra, ed., *Comparing New Democracies: Transition and Consolidation in Mediterranean Europe and the Southern Cone* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1987); David Ethier, ed., *Democratic Transition and Consolidation in Southern Europe, Latin America and Southeast Asia* (Basingstoke, England: Macmillan, 1990); Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., *Democracy in Developing Countries*, 4 vols. (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1988); Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).

[2] Karen L. Remmer, "New Wine or Old Bottlenecks," *Comparative Politics* 23 (July 1991), 491.

[3] Paul Cammack agrees with Karen Remmer on this point; see Cammack, "Democratization and Citizenship in Latin America," in Michael Moran and Geraint Parry, eds., *Democracy and Democratisation* (London: Routledge, 1993).

[4] See Jane S. Jaquette, ed., *The Women's Movement in Latin America: Feminism and the Transition to Democracy in Latin America* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989); and Sonia E. Alvarez, *Engendering Democracy in Brazil: Women's Movements in Transition Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

The present paper therefore begins with an exploration of the orthodox literature to see why this omission occurs. It then examines the general themes and issues involved in developing a gendered analysis of democratization. The paper focuses mainly on women and starts from the premise that popular movements play an important role in the transition to democracy and that a gendered analysis of these movements is essential, as women often participate on the basis of the politicization of their social roles.

Four key questions emerge from the attempt to develop a framework for analyzing, first, the role played by women in the process of transition and, second, the impact of democratization on gender relations. These questions can be used to help explain the very different processes of transition and outcomes in Latin America and Eastern Europe: women's movements played an important role in the former and a minimal role in the latter.

The first three questions address the process of transition itself. The first two focus on the nature and role of women's political activities and women's movements, that is, on the "internal characteristics," and the third is concerned with the "external" context. The first question concerns why women choose to organize or not to organize in different contexts such as Latin America and Eastern Europe. The second question asks about the nature of these movements where they exist. Here the diversity and heterogeneity of women's movements is striking. It is important to find ways of analyzing this complexity, which reflects the absence of a unitary category "woman" undifferentiated by class, race, or nationality. One way of approaching this problem is to divide women's movements into those that organize primarily around what one may term practical gender interests such as economic survival, often "popular movements," and those that organize mainly around what can be categorized as strategic gender interests, epitomized, for example, by "feminist demands."[5] However, it is a mistake to turn this distinction into a rigid dichotomy, as there are links between the different movements, and some movements, such as popular feminism, defy easy classification in these terms.

The third question, which examines the "external characteristics," or context, considers the interaction between women's political activities and the process of transition. Here one must consider not only the different types of women's movements but also the very different processes of transition. What prompts change in coercive regimes and what is the

[5] See Maxine Molyneux, "Mobilization without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State and Revolution in Nicaragua," *Feminist Studies* 11, no. 2 (1985).

role of popular movements, particularly women's movements, in promoting that change? Why is it that women's movements appear to play a visible and instrumental role in certain contexts and stages of the process of the opening, transition, and consolidation, but not in others? As will become clear, the second and third questions are very important in the Latin American context but are less relevant in the East European case, where the central question is instead why women's movements played such a minor role. This can shed light on pretransition politics, particularly the nature of previous regimes and civil society, and on the process of transition itself.

The fourth question shifts the focus to the outcomes of transition and asks about the impact of democratization on gender relations. The premise is, first, that institutional democratization does not necessarily entail a democratization of power relations in society at large, particularly between men and women and, second, that there is no necessary connection between playing an important part in any stage of the process of democratization and having any particular role during the period of consolidation. To analyze outcomes, therefore, it is important to begin by determining exactly what is meant by democracy, to see whether the restricted definitions commonly used need to be expanded in order to incorporate a gendered approach. Next, the role of women in the new institutional politics must be explored and the fate of "women's issues" examined, particularly the extent to which these enter the policy agendas. Third, one must examine what happens to women's movements that were active prior to democratization: can they sustain their activities? This done, it is possible to assess the impact of democratization on practical and strategic gender interests in the very different contexts of Latin America and Eastern Europe.

This work thus does two things: it adds to the body of knowledge about the role of women in an important political process, and it helps to "gender" the study of political science.[6] These questions can be used to help explain the very different processes of transition and outcomes in Latin America and Eastern Europe: women's movements played an important role in the former and a minimal role in the latter.

The Orthodox View of Democratization

The political development literature has long been interested both in the conditions necessary for the establishment of democracies and in how

[6] See Helene Silverberg, "What Happened to the Feminist Revolution in Political Science?" *Western Political Quarterly* 43, no. 4 (1990).

they can be sustained.[7] These concerns, particularly of American social scientists working in the 1950s and 1960s, were confounded by the trend toward authoritarianism in much of the Third World, especially Latin America, evident in the late 1960s and 1970s.[8] However, with the advent of the "third wave" of democratization, which has brought a return to some form of democratic rule in much of Latin America and elsewhere in the Third World, interest has once again focused on democracy and the process of transition from authoritarianism to democracy.[9] Much of the literature of the 1980s evidences many continuities with work of the 1950s and 1960s, leading some analysts to claim that old frameworks are being dusted off to accommodate new facts.[10]

Although the corpus on democratization is now large, it is possible to make some general observations about its defining characteristics. First the focus is unashamedly normative. O'Donnell, for example, writes: "Our project had from the outset a normative bias, coupled and reinforced by an empirical generalization. We have considered political democracy as desirable per se."[11] Similarly, Diamond, Linz, and Lipset assert: "We (along with an increasing proportion of the world's population) value political democracy as an end in itself—without assuming that it is any guarantee of other important values."[12]

As democracy is seen as a good thing, much of the literature of the 1980s also focuses on the process of transition, primarily how to achieve and maintain democracy. While some writers such as Diamond, Linz, and Lipset tend to stress the preconditions necessary for a transition to occur, by examining different variables including political leadership and political institutions in a large number of cases, others such as O'Donnell and Schmitter concentrate on the nature of the process itself, in particular, on the actions of political elites.[13] Diamond also considers "tangible measures to move countries towards democracy" on the

[7] See, e.g., Dankwart A. Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy: Towards a Dynamic Model," *Comparative Politics* 2, no. 3 (1970). This kind of approach is also reflected in some of the classic works of this literature, e.g., Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman, eds., *The Politics of Developing Areas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962); and Leonard Binder et al., eds., *Crises and Sequences in Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971).

[8] E.g., Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, eds., *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978).

[9] See O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead (fn. 1); Samuel P. Huntington, "Will More Countries Become Democratic?" *Political Science Quarterly* 99 (Summer 1984); Diamond, Linz, and Lipset (fn. 1); Huntington (fn. 1).

[10] See Remmer (fn. 2), 487.

[11] Guillermo A. O'Donnell, "Introduction to the Latin American Cases," in O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead (fn. 1), 2:10.

[12] Diamond, Linz, and Lipset (fn. 1), 4:xxv.

[13] See Diamond, Linz, and Lipset's introductory chapters to their volumes on Asia, Africa, and Latin America in their series (fn. 1); and O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead (fn. 1), esp. vols. 3, 4.

part of both internal and external actors.[14] The emphasis is on the voluntaristic nature of the process; according to Remmer, "Democratic political outcomes are seen to depend on the choices of particular political elites and specific historical conjunctures."[15] Because of this emphasis on agency rather than structures, the literature concentrates on the nature of pacts and coalitions that need to be made between various elite groups and the military to facilitate a successful transition.[16] The need for effective leadership is stressed, as is the necessity of an opposition willing to negotiate with the authoritarian regime.[17] This top-down focus gives primacy to the actions and decisions of political leaders in the transition.

In contrast to some of the work of the 1950s and 1960s, however, some scholars such as Malloy recognize that "there is no unilinear tendency toward democracy or authoritarian rule. Rather, that the predominant pattern is cyclical, with alternating democratic and authoritarian 'moments.'"[18] Thus, the assumptions about the evolutionary nature of political change so characteristic of modernization theory have been replaced by an emphasis on a "pendular pattern" and the possibility of reversal.[19] These scholars stress the need for prudence and a "sequence of piecemeal reforms," to guard against the possibility of a backlash by hard-liners.[20] There is little concern about wider outcomes, over and above the establishment of a stable competitive party system.

This literature makes no mention of gender issues. Much of the explanation for this omission stems from the most common definition of democracy used in the literature. The majority of scholars working on democratization in the 1980s quite consciously adopted a narrow and restricted institutional definition of democracy. These definitions have a long intellectual history and are indebted to the work of Dahl, and particularly Schumpeter and the school of competitive elitism.[21] These restrictions in the conceptualization of democracy are sometimes justi-

[14] See Larry Diamond, "Beyond Authoritarianism and Totalitarianism: Strategies for Democratization," *Washington Quarterly* 12 (Winter 1989), 151.

[15] See Remmer (fn. 2), 483.

[16] The classic exposition of a structural analysis is Barrington Moore, Jr., *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (London: Allen Lane, 1967).

[17] See Diamond (fn. 14), 152.

[18] James M. Malloy, "The Politics of Transition in Latin America," in James M. Malloy and Mitchell A. Seligson, eds., *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America* (Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987), 236.

[19] See Mitchell A. Seligson, "Democratization in Latin America: The Current Cycle," in Malloy and Seligson (fn. 18), 3–4.

[20] Diamond makes these points, citing O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead in support of his arguments; see Diamond (fn. 14), 145, 153.

[21] Robert A. Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971); Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1943).

fied on pragmatic grounds. Huntington, for instance, writing in 1984, argues that broader definitions

> might be relevant to normative political theory, but they are not very useful for comparative political analysis. First, they are often so vague and general that it is virtually impossible to apply them in practice. . . . Second, democracy may also be defined in such broad terms as to make it identical with almost all civic virtues, including social justice, equality, liberty, fulfilment, progress and a variety of other good things. Hence it becomes impossible to analyse the relationship between democracy and other social goals.[22]

Diamond, Linz, and Lipset echo Dahl and define democracy as "a political system, separate and apart from the economic and social system to which it is joined."[23] A political system is defined as democratic insofar as "its most powerful collective decision-makers are selected through periodic elections in which candidates freely compete for votes and in which virtually all the adult population is eligible to vote."[24] Terry Lynn Karl adds yet another category to Dahl's three essential conditions for polyarchy: (1) contestation over policy and political competition for office; (2) participation of the citizenry through partisan, associational, and other forms of collective action; (3) accountability of rulers to the ruled through mechanisms of representation and the rule of law. To this is added (4) civilian control over the military.[25]

According to David Held, democracy defined in these ways becomes a "political *method*" simply an institutional arrangement to generate and legitimate leadership.[26] Not only does this view sidestep various classical meanings of democracy, but it also sidesteps many of the issues about democracy raised by feminist political theorists.[27] The two that are particularly relevant for this paper center on the definitions and uses of the terms *democracy* and *politics*.

First, the narrow concentration by analysts such as Diamond et al. and O'Donnell et al. on democracy as simply an institutional arrangement means that wider definitions of democracy couched in terms of the real distribution of power in society are considered illegitimate. Furthermore, because any discussion of social and economic inequality is deemed to be irrelevant to political equality and because citizenship is defined simply in terms of a restricted form of political citizenship (if it is mentioned at

[22] Huntington (fn. 9), 195.
[23] Diamond, Linz, and Lipset (fn. 1), 4:xvi.
[24] Huntington (fn. 9), 195.
[25] Karl, "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 23 (October 1990), 2.
[26] David Held, *Models of Democracy* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1987), 164–85.
[27] See the work of Carole Pateman, e.g., *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1989).

all), gender issues are effectively sidelined.[28] Only if women were denied the vote, and perhaps not even then, would gender relations become relevant. This excludes an analysis of the outcomes of democratization in any terms other than simply narrow institutional democracy; and as will become clear, democratization at the institutional level does not necessarily entail a more even distribution of power in society, particularly with regard to gender. Clearly, a wider definition of democratization is needed.

Second, within the 1980s model of the political transition to democracy, which has its roots in the competitive elitist view, "politics" is defined narrowly to include only the upper institutional echelons of the public sphere. Politics then becomes a largely male activity, as women are not part of political elites in great numbers and therefore do not appear as politically active.[29] This downplays the significance of exactly those sorts of wider political activities—social movements, for example—in which women are most likely to be involved. O'Donnell and Schmitter comment on the success of the military in depoliticizing society through the destruction of autonomous political spaces where political activity, whether oppositional or not, can take place. These are again defined very narrowly as lying within the arena of conventional politics, thereby allowing many forms of political activity to be ignored. According to O'Donnell and Schmitter, the initial opening is caused by the triumph of the soft-liners over the hard-liners within the controlling elites and not by popular pressure from below. This only pushes the transition further once it has begun. Despite the differences in their approaches, both O'Donnell and Schmitter and Diamond et al. are wary of popular pressure, arguing that it is a destabilizing force that needs to be tamed if the process of transition is to proceed.[30]

This sort of approach clearly limits the ability of orthodox theorists to examine women's activities in transition politics. Even when they do discuss human rights activists, O'Donnell and Schmitter talk of "gestures by exemplary individuals" with no real acknowledgment that many of the human rights campaigners were women often campaigning as mothers. Thus, a more fruitful approach requires wider definitions of politics and political activity that can incorporate the role of popular movements.

[28] See Kathleen Jones, "Citizenship in a Women-Friendly Polity," *Signs* 15, no. 4 (1990); and Carol Pateman, "Feminism and Democracy," in Graeme Duncan, ed., *Democratic Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[29] See Carole Pateman, "A New Democratic Theory? Political Science, the Public and the Private" (Paper delivered at the plenary session on Democratic Theory Today, IPSA Fifteenth World Congress, Buenos Aires, 1991).

[30] See Guillermo A. O'Donnell and Philippe C. Schmitter, in O'Donnell, Schmitter, and Whitehead (fn. 1), 4:48–56.

Some analysts whose work does not fall within the orthodox democratization literature have attributed greater significance to the activities of popular movements in bringing about a return to democratic rule.[31] Scholars are beginning to investigate whether civil society is reconstituted and popular movements begin to emerge *prior* to the transition rather than, as is commonly held, as a result of it.[32] Garretón has argued that while social movements are not the source of change, they can play a critical role and that the recomposition of civil society represented by their activities forms the invisible transition to democracy.[33] Taking a more radical view, James Petras has argued that such social movements have played an important role and provided the signal that the military regime, having failed to create an economic model with a substantial base of support, therefore faced a crisis of legitimacy.[34]

While much of this work on social movements provides a useful corrective to the top-down perspective of the democratization theorists, it also has problems. First, until recently the bottom-up focus meant that links between grassroots political activity and the wider context, particularly the relationship with political parties and the state, were ignored.[35] Second, and crucially important for this paper, the majority of writers fail to discuss gender issues, despite the frequent acknowledgment that the majority of participants in popular movements are women.[36] Because women often participate on the basis of the social roles associated with their gendered identities (for example, as mothers and household providers), the analysis of these movements will be incomplete if this is ignored.

It can therefore be seen how gender relations are rendered invisible and, indeed, marginal and irrelevant in the democratization literature. This is, I believe, inevitable given the framework within which the

[31] See Jean Grugel, "Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Lessons from Latin America," *Political Studies* 39 (June 1991). See also the work of Scott Mainwaring, e.g., "Urban Popular Movements, Identity, and Democratization in Brazil," *Comparative Political Studies* 20 (July 1987).

[32] Philip Oxhorn argues this in the case of Chile. See Oxhorn, "Democratic Transitions and the Democratization Process in Chile" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1989).

[33] Manuel Antonio Garretón, "Popular Mobilization and the Military Regime in Chile: The Complexities of the Invisible Transition," in Susan Eckstein, ed., *Power and Popular Protest: Latin American Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

[34] James Petras, "The Redemocratization Process," in Suzanne Jonas and Nancy Stein, eds., *Democracy in Latin America: Visions and Realities* (New York: Bergin and Garvey, 1990).

[35] See Judith Adler Hellman, "The Study of New Social Movements in Latin America and the Question of Autonomy," *LASA Forum* 21 (1990). This omission is beginning to be rectified; see e.g., Joe Foweraker and Ann Craig, eds., *Popular Movements and Political Change in Mexico* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1990).

[36] For a discussion of the ungendered nature of much of the social movement literature, see Yvonne Corcoran-Nantes, "Female Consciousness or Feminist Consciousness? Women's Consciousness Raising in Community-based Struggles in Brazil," in Sarah A. Radcliffe and Sallie Westwood, eds., *Viva: Women and Popular Protest in Latin America* (London: Routledge, 1993), 138–141.

democratization theorists work. Since it dictates both their approach and their conclusions about the nature of the process of transition, any consideration of gender issues is rendered impossible. The narrow definitions of democracy, politics, and citizenship, the concentration on the public sphere and the use of simplistic notions of civil society mean that these works are of little use for understanding the place of gender in the processes and outcomes of democratization. Furthermore, even those works that move away from the focus on elites and examine democratization from a bottom-up perspective tend to share this genderless approach and have yet to provide a better approach.

A new approach is therefore needed to address the questions of the role of women in the transition and the way that gender relations have changed as a result of the process. This would illuminate notions of citizenship, democracy, and civil society and the interaction of gender relations and the state. The comparison between the collapse of authoritarianism in Latin America and Eastern Europe can provide some preliminary answers to the question of why and under what conditions women organize and what impact this has in prompting change in coercive regimes. It also illustrates the ways in which a narrow focus on democratization is insufficient for understanding its interaction with gender relations, as institutional democratization does not necessarily entail any wider changes.

Transition Politics in Latin America

The 1980s saw the return to civilian rule in much of Latin America, although the mechanisms and circumstances of the transition varied from country to country. The slow and controlled transition from above in Brazil, for example, contrasts with the speedier move toward civilian rule catalyzed by the defeat of the Argentine military. Despite these differences, it is possible to outline some general themes regarding the role of women in different processes and outcomes of transition in Latin America and its impact upon them.

The first is the nature of women's movements active within the process of transition. The 1980s saw the emergence of a variety of women's organizations operating outside the conventional political arena. These movements have included both groups made up primarily of women and groups of women organizing specifically as women. They have made a variety of different demands on the state and military regimes and have influenced and been influenced by the nature of transition politics in different ways. Several major forms of women's move-

ments can be identified in the region.[37] To use Maxine Molyneux's distinction, these have organized around both practical and strategic gender interests, that is, to ameliorate immediate conditions and to challenge women's subordination.[38]

The first form is the human rights groups that became active in the late 1970s in countries such as Chile and Argentina and campaigned against the abuses perpetrated by the military regimes in their wars against subversion and communism. Women constitute the majority of their members pressing social demands, that is, advancing practical gender interests. The most famous of these are Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo (las Madres de Plaza de Mayo) who marched every Thursday afternoon around the plaza carrying pictures of their disappeared children and demanding their return.[39] In Chile the Agrupación de Familiares de Detenidos-Desaparacidos is comprised mainly of women campaigning against human rights abuses.[40] These symbolic mobilizations with their strong ethical component posed a direct challenge to dictatorship. It is a pattern repeated in other parts of the continent.[41]

The second form of women's involvement to become important in the 1980s was the popular urban community-based movement focusing on consumption issues. The majority of popular urban movements that emerged primarily in the last decade have included large numbers of women pressing social and economic demands. Corcoran-Nantes estimates that 80 percent of the participants in contemporary Brazilian movements are women.[42] Women's involvement in the "politics of daily life" has taken a variety of forms. They have led campaigns in poor neighborhoods for improved services, and they have organized collective survival strategies in the form of *organizaciones economicas populares*, as they are known in Chile. These have included organizations that focus on consumption such as *ollas comunes* (communal soup pots) common in Chile and Peru, artisanal workshops set up to generate incomes, and groups to provide social services. The cost-of-living movement and the day care campaigns in Brazil and other organizations in Argentina and

[37] Jaquette (fn. 4).

[38] See Molyneux (fn. 5).

[39] Marysa Navarro, "The Personal Is Political: Las Madres de Plaza de Mayo," in Eckstein (fn. 33).

[40] See Patricia M. Chuchryk, "Subversive Mothers: The Women's Opposition to the Military Regime in Chile," in Sue Ellen Charlton, Jana Everett, and Katherine Staudt, eds., *Women, the State, and Development* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989).

[41] See Jennifer Schirmer, "'Those Who Die for Life Cannot Be Called Dead': Women and Human Rights Protest in Latin America," *Feminist Review*, no. 32 (Summer 1989); and idem, "The Seeking of Truth and the Gendering of Consciousness: The Comadres of El Salvador and the CONAVIGUA Widows of Guatemala," in Radcliffe and Westwood (fn. 36).

[42] Yvonne Corcoran-Nantes, "Women and Popular Urban Social Movements in Sao Paulo, Brazil," *Bulletin of Latin American Studies* 9, no. 2 (1990).

Peru provide further evidence that these are not isolated examples.[43] By their very nature these movements assume an oppositional form, often making demands on the state for an improvement in well-being.

The third type of women's organization to (re)emerge during the period of authoritarianism has been avowedly feminist in orientation, comprising women organizing as women to press strategic gender-based demands.[44] Argentina, Chile, and particularly Brazil have seen feminist groups made up largely of middle-class, often professional, women campaigning around issues of gender inequality and women's subordination, many of whom had been active in left-wing politics prior to the military takeover.[45] Study groups, such as the Círculo de Estudios de la Mujer, set up in Chile in 1977, have flourished across the continent, and conferences such as the first Paulista Women's congress in 1979 drew nearly one thousand participants.[46]

Why did these women's movements emerge during the period of military rule? In general terms, they are commonly seen as a response both to authoritarian rule and to the economic crisis faced by the continent during the 1980s.[47] The economic problems, for example, those surrounding the debt crisis, have had a severe impact on the poor—and poor women in particular—a situation that has often been exacerbated by the implementation of adjustment programs.[48] In the face of high levels of unemployment and repression, urban popular movements found it easier to operate than did trade unions and political parties; they campaigned to improve living conditions in the face of extreme economic hardship. Feminist groups, in particular, have also made connections between authoritarianism in society generally and authoritarianism within the household and in relationships between men and women; they therefore see their task as a struggle against authoritarianism in all its forms.[49]

[43] See Teresa Caldeira, "Women, Daily Life and Politics," in Elizabeth Jelin, ed., *Women and Social Change in Latin America* (London: Zed Press, 1990); and Maria del Carmen Feijoó, "The Challenge of Constructing Civilian Peace: Women and Democracy in Argentina," in Jaquette (fn. 4).

[44] For a discussion of the development of the feminist movement in Latin America in the 1980s, see Nancy Saporta Sternbach et al., "Feminisms in Latin America: From Bogota to San Bernardo," *Signs* 17, no. 2 (1992).

[45] See Virginia Vargas, "The Feminist Movement in Latin America: Between Hope and Disenchantment," in Jan Nederveen Pieterse, ed., *Emancipations, Modern and Postmodern* (London: Sage, 1992).

[46] See Patricia M. Chuchryk, "Feminist Anti-Authoritarian Politics: The Role of Women's Organisations in the Chilean Transition to Democracy," in Jaquette (fn. 4); and Sonia E. Alvarez, "Politicizing Gender and Engendering Democracy," in Alfred Stepan, ed., *Democratizing Brazil: Problems of Transition and Consolidation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[47] Helen Safa, "Women's Social Movements in Latin America," *Gender and Society* 4, no. 3 (1990).

[48] For a discussion of this, see the collection of articles in Haleh Afshar and Carolynne Dennis, eds., *Women and Adjustment Policies in the Third World* (Basingstoke, England: Macmillan, 1992).

[49] See the work of Julieta Kirkwood, e.g., "Women and Politics in Chile," *International Social Science*

In more practical terms, Alvarez has isolated several other factors that helped the birth of these groups, the organization of women as women, and the emergence of a feminist consciousness in Brazil; these also shed some light on the experience in other Latin American countries.[50] Alvarez points first to the important role played by the Catholic church, particularly the Ecclesiastical Base Communities (the CEBs), in beginning the mobilization of poor women initially as citizens. This later developed into mobilization as women, not always with the church's continued support. Through mothers', women's, and wives' groups, women became organized—often for the first time—and campaigned for improved services such as day care.[51] This is the case for Chile, whereas in Argentina the church played a more conservative role. The second important factor identified by Alvarez is the way in which, after the military came to power, left-wing activists moved into the poor areas to organize, facilitating increased politicization. However, the decimation of the Argentine Left in the "Dirty War" meant that this could not happen to the same extent.

For the purposes of the paper, perhaps one of the most significant factors noted by Alvarez and other commentators is the "political space" that the authoritarian governments afforded women. Women found it easier than before to take on unaccustomed roles in the public sphere, contrary to the conservative ideologies espoused by most of the Latin American militaries, which saw women's role as being primarily in the domestic sphere as wives and mothers. This was partly facilitated by the military governments themselves, which often did not see women's activities as dangerous enough to warrant repression. Or as in the case of human rights protests, most notably the Madres, the protests were effective because women were using their traditional roles as the linchpin of the protests. This made it harder for a government that supposedly elevated motherhood to persecute women who argued that they were fulfilling their maternal roles by searching for their missing children.[52]

Clearly the attempts by military governments to abolish "politics" and repress such conventional political activities of the public sphere as political parties and trade unions moved the locus of much political activity from an institutional setting to community-based action. This actually

---

Journal 35, no. 4 (1983); and idem, *Ser Política en Chile: Los Nudos de la Sabiduría Feminista* (To be a política in Chile: The knots of a feminist knowledge) (Santiago: Editorial Cuarto Propio, 1990).

[50] See Sonia E. Alvarez, "Women's Movements and Gender Politics in the Brazilian Transition," in Jaquette (fn. 4).

[51] Sonia E. Alvarez, "Women's Participation in the Brazilian 'People's Church': A Critical Appraisal," *Feminist Studies* 16, no. 2 (1990).

[52] For a discussion of the nature of women's political protest, see Georgina Waylen, "Rethinking Women's Political Participation and Protest: Chile 1970–90," *Political Studies* 40 (June 1992).

gave those women's activities occurring outside the traditional arena of politics a greater prominence and significance. It has often been noted that women in Latin America feel so alienated from male-dominated politics such as trade unions and political parties that they do not take part and they see their own activities as by definition somehow not "political."[53]

Thus, contrary to O'Donnell and Schmitter's thesis, authoritarianism did allow one section of the population, women, the space to mobilize, and in the absence of conventional politics allowed them to develop new ways of "doing politics" and achieve greater visibility. In this way, an alternative analysis that looks at social movements from a gendered perspective highlights the mobilization of women under military rule.

What was the role of this mobilization in bringing about transitions to democracy? Women's mobilization appears to function differently at different stages of the process of transition. It was clearly very important in bringing about the initial breakdown and opening, as the political initiative lay outside the conventional political arena.[54] Frequently women's protests formed the first organized and open opposition to authoritarian governments, helping to bring about the "end of fear." The first important protest against the Argentine military government was that of the Madres, and in Chile one of the first mass protests against the Pinochet government was held to celebrate International Women's Day in 1978. The activities of social movements, particularly women's movements, therefore cannot be ignored in any analysis of the process of transition, especially its initial stages, since these activities often seized the political initiative and encouraged the military to begin negotiations with civilian elites.

Once the transition has begun, however, and political parties have reconstituted and are resuming their activities, the focus tends to shift away from women's organizations and social movements in general and toward more conventional forms of institutional politics, particularly when the opening is tightly controlled by the military.[55] Women's groups, in common with other groups operating outside this arena, are faced with a choice that has been summed up as the dilemma of "autonomy versus integration."[56] Should women's movements work with the new

[53] See Caldeira (fn. 43).

[54] For a discussion of these activities, see Jo Fisher, *Out of the Shadows: Women, Resistance, and Politics in South America* (London: Latin American Bureau, 1993).

[55] For a discussion of this in the Chilean context, see María Elena Valenzuela, "The Evolving Roles of Women under Military Rule," in Paul W. Drake and Ivan Jaksic, eds., *The Struggle for Democracy in Chile, 1982–1990* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991).

[56] For a discussion of this in the Chilean case, see Claudia Serrano, "Chile entre la autonomía y la integración," in *Transiciones: Mujeres en los procesos democráticos* (Santiago: Isis International, 1990).

institutions and parties and risk being co-opted and losing autonomy, or should they remain outside, preserving their independence but risking marginalization and loss of influence as power shifts toward the political parties?[57] No definitive answer has emerged.[58] The trend of marginalization is evidenced even more clearly once competitive party politics are resumed fully, making clear that playing a key part in the initial opening does not guarantee an important role in the outcome.

Gender Relations in Competitive Party Politics in Latin America

In order to analyze the relationship between gender relations and postauthoritarian rule, it is useful to distinguish between narrowly focused institutional-level democracy and broader conceptions of democracy. Looking at the former, it is important to ascertain the impact of the reconstitution of conventional political activity on women's political participation in the public sphere: have women converted the higher profile they had achieved into institutional representation; or has the end of authoritarianism brought the renewed exclusion of women from the public sphere? Furthermore, does institutional representation inevitably mean the co-optation and deradicalization of "women's demands"? If notions of democracy are expanded to include more diffuse notions of power, this allows for an examination of the mobilization of different groups of women following the return to civilian rule. What is the impact of the reconstitution of conventional institutional politics on the new forms of women's political activity that emerged under authoritarianism? Are these a temporary phenomenon made up of short-term sporadic protest movements? Or are they, as Safa believes, part of a progressive, long-term transformation?[59] One approach to these questions is to look at how gender interests, both practical and strategic, have fared since a return to democratic politics.

Looking first at institutional politics, there is evidence that "gender has become politicized," as Alvarez has described it. As a result of the perceived importance of women's mobilizations under authoritarian rule, it is clear that many political parties, particularly of the center and Left, have tried to gain women's support by placing women's issues on the political and electoral agenda. In Argentina, Alfonsin ended his 1983

[57] For one view of this, see the discussion by Virginia Vargas, "Women: Tragic Encounters with the Left," *Report on the Americas* 25, no. 5 (1992).

[58] Natacha Molina outlines the different policies and strategies adopted by various groups in Chile; see Molina, "La Mujer," in Manuel Antonio Garretón, ed., *Propuestas Políticas y Demandas Sociales*, vol. 3 (Santiago: FLACSO, 1989).

[59] Safa (fn. 47).

campaign with a speech criticizing machismo, and throughout the election contest the UCR used slogans reminiscent of the Madres.[60] During the long, drawn-out transition in Brazil all the political parties, particularly the opposition, influenced by the feminists working in their ranks, adopted policies expected to appeal to women voters.[61] In Chile and Argentina, too, there were wide-ranging discussions about the possibility of altering discriminatory civil codes, such as Patria Potestad, which limit a woman's control over her children. In Chile all major parties now pay lip service to women's equality, although the "renovated" Right does this in the context of women's special role in the family.[62]

There have also been a number of policy initiatives aimed specifically at women, including the creation in Chile of Servicio Nacional de la Mujer (SERNAM), a national governmental body of feminists from the Christian Democrats and socialists that oversees government policies concerning women and the creation in Brazil of some women's councils at the state and national levels.[63] SERNAM's initiatives have included employment training programs for women and programs directed at female heads of households and at incorporating more women into small businesses (*microempresas*).[64]

Nevertheless, the return to civilian politics has not put an end to the problems typically experienced by women active in the institutional context. There has been no significant increase in electoral representation: in 1987 women constituted only 5.3 percent of the parliament in Brazil, 5.6 percent in Peru, and in 1991 only 5 percent in Chile and 6.7 percent in Argentina. There is also a singular lack of women appointed to top government posts: in 1993 in Chile the only woman at cabinet level was the director of SERNAM, and only three out of the twenty-seven vice ministers are women; and in 1987 there were no women in ministerial positions in Argentina and Peru and only one in Brazil. The old clientalistic ways still act to exclude women. The election of Carlos Menem, a Peronist, was seen as a setback for women in Argentina. Many feminists, believing that they needed to engage with the political system, became active in political parties, particularly those of the center and Left such as the Christian Democrats and socialists in Chile and the new parties such as the left-wing Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT) in Brazil, the

[60] Maria del Carmen Feijoó and Monica Gogna, "Women in the Transition to Democracy," in Jelin (fn. 43).

[61] Alvarez (fn. 4).

[62] See Valenzuela (fn. 55), 179.

[63] See Ann Matear, "SERNAM: Women and the Process of Democratic Transition in Chile" (Paper delivered at the Society of Latin American Studies Conference, Manchester, April 1993).

[64] Ibid.

Humanist Party in Chile, and the Intransigent Party in Argentina.[65] However, there has been resistance to opening up the power structures to women.[66] There is some evidence that women find it difficult to maintain and increase political representation once an institutionalized party system is revived. Moreover, analysts have even disputed whether organizations such as SERNAM represent an advance for feminists or allow for the co-optation of some of the women's movement's less controversial demands. In this way they can be reduced to minor and largely ineffectual bodies that governments can then utilize by superimposing their own aims onto the "women's issues" policy agenda, leaving the outside power structures largely unaltered.[67]

If the vision is extended to include political activities beyond the institutional arena, the return to civilian rule has resulted in a complicated situation. It is clear that some social movements have been excluded and demobilized. This depends partly on the nature of the transition; the Chilean transition, for example, has seen the renewed dominance of rather conventional party and institutional politics and the exclusion of social movements.[68] It is also due in part to the nature of these movements themselves. There is no *one* conclusion as to whether the activities undertaken by women mobilized under authoritarian rule have been maintained and extended, as, if anything, the heterogeneity and diversity of women's movements has become more marked since the return to competitive electoral politics.[69]

Some women's movements, often those organizing around practical gender interests and choosing autonomy, have become increasingly marginalized as the processes of transition have continued.[70] This is particularly true of those popular organizations organized around social and economic demands.[71] Since the failure of more heterodox plans in

[65] See the case studies in *Transiciones: Mujeres en los Procesos Democraticos* (fn. 56).

[66] For a discussion of this in the Chilean context, see María Elena Valenzuela, "Mujeres y política: Logros y tensiones en el proceso de redemocratización," *Proposiciones* 18 (1990).

[67] See Georgina Waylen, "Women's Movements and Democratization in Chile," *Occasional Paper in Politics and Contemporary History* 31 (Salford, England: University of Salford, 1992).

[68] Jenny Pearce, "Disempowering Social Movements: The Chilean Transition" (Paper delivered at a symposium on Social Movements and Democratization, annual conference of the Society of Latin American Studies, Southampton, 1992).

[69] These issues were discussed in many of the papers on Latin America presented at the conference on Women and the Transition from Authoritarian Rule in Latin America and Eastern Europe, Berkeley, December 1992, for example, those by Teresa Caldeira, Maria Elena Valenzuela, Maruja Barrig, and Maria del Carmen Feijoó. See also Veronica Schild, "Struggling for Citizenship in Chile: A 'Resurrection' of Civil Society" (Paper delivered at the Latin American Studies Association congress, Los Angeles, September, 1992).

[70] See Hellman (fn. 35).

[71] See Cathy Schneider, "Mobilization at the Grassroots: Shantytowns and Resistance in Authoritarian Chile," *Latin American Perspectives* 18 (Winter 1991), 110.

Argentina and Brazil, civilian governments have maintained and implemented conservative economic policies of structural adjustment that have left little space for increasing welfare provision and satisfying the demands of the popular sectors, particularly poor women.[72] It is also true that those organizations concerned with human rights issues, such as the Madres in Argentina and the Agrupaciones in Chile, have had little success in getting civilian governments anxious to remain on good terms with the military to take decisive action on human rights abuses.[73] In contrast, other groups of women have achieved a limited role as members of the political elite. Many of them are middle-class feminist professionals, academics, and party activists who pressed gender-based demands of a more strategic nature and chose "integration." But the return to competitive party politics can also lead to a fracturing of women's movements along party lines, as sectarianism and the attempts by parties to control women's organizations spread.

The experiences of Argentina, Chile, and Brazil exhibit differences as well as similarities in terms of the impact on gender relations. Women's movements played an important role in the early stages of transition in all the countries. In Brazil the longer period of transition and the greater space for organization appear to have allowed women a greater impact on transition politics than was the case in Argentina. There the military's control of society and the rapidity of the transition seem to have militated against women's groups gaining significant influence. Thus, the differences in the nature of the transitions led to different interactions between the various women's movements and the state and political parties, particularly in the latter phases and after the return to civilian rule. Institutional democratization, however, has not made it easy for women to become active in the reconstituted conventional politics, and the reinstitution of political rights has not been accompanied by a widening of social rights.[74] Indeed, some women's movements have become increasingly marginal as the process of transition has continued. But even if the longer-term prospects appear bleak for women in political, social, and economic terms in the postdictatorial period, authoritarianism did leave some space for women's movements. As a result, gender issues have been

[72] See Christian Anglade and Carlos Fortin, "Accumulation, Adjustment and the Autonomy of the State in Latin America," in Anglade and Fortin, eds., *The State and Capital Accumulation in Latin America*, vol. 2 (London: Macmillan, 1992).

[73] See Brian Loveman, "Mision Cumplida? Civil Military Relations and the Chilean Political Transition," *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs* 33 (Autumn 1991).

[74] For a discussion of democratization in terms of rights, see Teresa Caldeira, "Justice and Individual Rights: Challenges for Women's Movements and Democratization in Brazil" (Paper delivered at the Conference on Women and the Transition from Authoritarian Rule in Latin America and Eastern Europe, Berkeley, December 1992).

placed on the political agenda to varying degrees. Before drawing any conclusions, it is necessary to look at the same questions in the very different context of Eastern Europe.

Transition Politics in Central and Eastern Europe

In many cases, the process of transition in Central and Eastern Europe has been much more rapid and fundamental in its scope than anything that has occurred in Latin America. Countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia have moved from a form of totalitarianism, not just to a new type of political system, but also to a profoundly different economic and social system. Not only has the political and ideological dominance of the Communist Party been replaced by multiparty systems, but the command economy, too, is being dismantled and the free market substituted. Thus, it is not possible to examine the political changes in isolation from the simultaneous economic liberalization. In addition, both nationalism and external factors have had a profound impact in Central and Eastern Europe.[75] Indeed, the Soviet Union's loss of will to maintain an empire opened the way to the breakup of the Eastern bloc. This makes the Central European experience different from that of both Latin America and the Soviet Union, where the impetus for transition was more internally created and came from above. Despite these important differences, there have already been some attempts to analyze the experiences of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union in a comparative framework, often on the basis of the work of the democratization theorists.[76]

There were no appreciable women's movements active in the processes of transition in any of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Why was this so? To understand the constraints on women organizing, the role of women's movements in the transition in Eastern Europe, and the impact of the transition on gender relations requires some discussion of the role of women under the old system. The communist governments were officially committed to equality between the sexes; indeed, they declared the "woman question" to be solved with the emancipation of

[75] See Adam Przeworski, "The 'East' Becomes the 'South'"? The Autumn of the People and the Future of Eastern Europe," *PS* 24 (March 1991), 21.

[76] See, e.g., Russell Bova, "Political Dynamics of the Post-Communist Transition: A Comparative Perspective," *World Politics* 44 (October 1991); Giuseppe Di Palma, "Legitimation from the Top to Civil Society: Politico-Cultural Change in Eastern Europe," *World Politics* 44 (October 1991); Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Joan M. Nelson, "The Politics of Economic Transformation: Is Third World Experience Relevant in Eastern Europe?" *World Politics* 45 (April 1993).

women under socialism. Following Marx's and Lenin's analysis of women's oppression, governments argued that women would be liberated through their incorporation into the labor market.[77] By 1980 women made up about 50 percent of the workforce in Central and Eastern Europe, but they were concentrated in low-paid, low-status, and gender-segregated occupations. This economistic analysis of the subordination of women did nothing to change men's roles and left family and gender relations within the private sphere untouched. Therefore, despite some important legal gains such as divorce legislation that were instituted as part of the package of what Dölling has termed "patriarchal-paternalistic policies," women were faced with a double (if not triple, if one counts attending meetings and being active in the public sphere) productive and reproductive burden in societies that gave little priority to providing the population with consumer goods.[78] As Einhorn has argued, the rights that women enjoyed in these societies were "given" rather than won through struggle and therefore were taken for granted.[79] In the face of "emancipation from above," which made entering the labor market almost obligatory for women, the family and the private sphere were often seen as a haven from the demands and interference of the state and a site of resistance, a place of autonomy and creativity in the absence of a full-fledged civil society.

The control that the Communist parties exercised over the political systems extended into civil society and further constrained the emergence of women's movements. Few autonomous organizations were allowed and other institutions of civil society such as the church were seriously restricted in their activities. No independent women's organizations were tolerated, and those women's organizations that did exist were essentially part of the Communist Party apparatus. Indeed, it has been claimed that a large number of women's organizations that had flourished in the interwar period in countries such as Poland were suppressed when the communists came to power.[80] Hence, claims of equality and quota systems that gave women considerable numerical representation were often important for symbolic purposes only (such women were often known as "milkmaid" politicians)—there were very few

[77] There are many analyses of women under socialism. See, e.g., Sharon L. Wolchik and Alfred G. Meyer, eds., *Women, State, and Party in Eastern Europe* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1985); Sonia Kruks, Rayna Rapp, and Marilyn Young, eds., *Promissory Notes: Women in the Transition to Socialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1989).

[78] See Irene Dölling, "Between Hope and Helplessness: Women in the GDR after the 'Turning Point,'" *Feminist Review* 39 (Winter 1991).

[79] See Barbara Einhorn, "Where Have All the Women Gone? Women and the Women's Movement in East Central Europe," *Feminist Review* 39 (Winter 1991).

[80] See Malgorzata Fuszara, "Legal Regulation of Abortion in Poland," *Signs* 17 (Autumn 1991), 128.

women in the top decision-making ranks of the party.[81] While women made up 35 percent of ordinary members of the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED) in the GDR, women comprised only 13 percent of central committee members in 1986, and no woman ever entered the politburo.[82]

Despite the attempts of the Communist parties to minimize dissent, opposition to the regimes did emerge prior to the late 1980s and women were active within it. Barbara Jancar has analyzed the role of women in two very different opposition movements, Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and Solidarity in Poland in the 1970s: the former was made up predominantly of intellectuals and writers, and the latter was a mass movement of both workers and intellectuals. According to Jancar, despite the very different character of both movements, "women in the opposition appear more marginal to the organizational structure of the opposition movements, with visibility in leadership depending on male endorsement."[83] Jancar also notes that women were less likely than men to get elected to leadership positions. Although they constituted about half the rank-and-file members of Solidarity, women made up only 7 percent of the delegates attending the first Solidarity conference in 1981.

None of the women involved saw themselves as feminists, however. Rather, as Jancar notes, they saw themselves as protesting about social and human rights issues. Hence, among the women active in the opposition movements, few organized primarily as women or as feminists around gender issues. There are some notable exceptions to this. In 1979 an independent feminist group in Leningrad published a samizdat, *The Almanac: Women and Russia*, but the group was soon accused of producing anti-Soviet propaganda and forced to disband. Perhaps more successful was the women's peace movement that emerged in East Germany in 1982. These were exceptions, however; in the fifteen years up to 1985 there was in general no widespread emergence of feminist organizations.[84]

Although mass opposition movements were prevented from emerging in most of the Soviet bloc until the end of the 1980s, there was nonetheless a growing perception that these societies were in the throes of eco-

[81] For a discussion of this process in Poland, see R. Siemienska, "Polish Women and Polish Politics since World War II," *Journal of Women's History* 3 (Spring 1991).

[82] Barbara Einhorn, "Emancipated Women or Hardworking Mums? Women in the Former German Democratic Republic," in Chris Corrin, ed., *Superwoman and the Double Burden* (London: Scarlet Press, 1992).

[83] Barbara J. Jancar, "Women in the Opposition in Poland and Czechoslovakia in the 1970s," in Wolchik and Meyer (fn. 77).

[84] See Maxine Molyneux, "Marxism, Feminism and the Demise of the Soviet Model," in Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland, eds., *Gender and International Relations* (Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 1991).

nomic and social crisis. This had a number of consequences, not least being the adoption of perestroika and glasnost in the Soviet Union and the subsequent pressure placed on the Eastern bloc as a whole to liberalize.[85] The woman question was also reopened in the Soviet Union in hopes of solving more general problems.[86] Rising rates of alcoholism, divorce, and abortion and the falling birthrate were attributed in part to a crisis in family life, and in much of Eastern Europe measures were introduced to make it easier for women to spend longer periods at home with children and to strengthen the family. In addition, Gorbachev lamented the absence of women at the top of the party hierarchy, and attempts were made to revive the women's councils in the Soviet Union.[87] Despite this and the liberalization associated with glasnost, few feminist groups were among the large number of unofficial groups that emerged in the late 1980s as part of the "resurrection of civil society."[88]

Despite the presence of large numbers of women in the demonstrations, the lack of feminist and women's groups organizing in the late 1980s meant that women were not in a good position to influence the state and the newly active political parties during the very rapid collapse of the old order that has taken place in much of Eastern Europe.[89] Women's movements therefore never played a significant role in bringing about the transition, nor were they poised to play an active role in the postcommunist period. This does not mean that the transition and subsequent events have not had a huge impact on gender relations.

What, then, are the outcomes of democratization? Viewed from a narrow institutional perspective, it can be seen that the political changes have had several implications for women. Overall, the crude numerical role of women in institutional politics has been reduced. First, the elimination of quota systems has led to a huge decline in the number of women elected to representative bodies. Across the region as a whole, this had led to a decline from an average of 33 percent to about 10 percent, often with further falls where second elections have been held. This masks quite wide discrepancies between countries. In mid-1990 women constituted only 3.5 percent of elected representatives in Romania, 8.6

[85] For a discussion of this process, see Stephen White, *Gorbachev in Power* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[86] Mary Buckley, "The 'Women Question' in the Contemporary Soviet Union," in Kruks, Rapp, and Young (fn. 77).

[87] Carol Nechemias, "The Prospects for a Soviet Women's Movement: Opportunities and Obstacles," in Judith B. Sedaitis and Jim Butterfield, eds., *Perestroika from Below: Social Movements in the Soviet Union* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1991).

[88] For a description of the groups that did exist then, see Laurie Essig and Tatiana Mamonova, "Perestroika for Women," in Sedaitis and Butterfield (fn. 87), 107.

[89] See, e.g., Yudit Kiss, "Women and the Second 'No': Women in Hungary," *Feminist Review* 39 (Winter 1991).

percent in Czechoslovakia, 7 percent in Hungary, and 13.5 percent in Poland. The largest drop has occurred in Romania (and Albania), and the smallest in Poland. There are also important variations between different types of parties. With the exception of Romania, the former Communist parties often tend to have relatively high numbers of women representatives; for example, women constitute 15.1 percent of the elected members of the Hungarian Socialist Party, as they do some of the smaller issue-based parties such as the Romanian Ecology Party. By contrast, some the more right-wing and nationalist parties tend to have fewer women members.[90] There is also evidence from Poland and Hungary that more women are active in local politics.

In addition, recent opinion polls in the former Soviet Union have shown that "being a man" is considered a desirable characteristic by many voters, making it hard for women to get elected. Although there are limited numbers of women in high office, it can be argued that those women who are involved in politics in the postcommunist period have more genuine influence than women in top positions had under communist regimes. However, on the whole it is the men and not the women who have moved from the dissident opposition groups into high-ranking office in the public sphere in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Slovenia, leading Peggy Watson to argue that Eastern Europe is witnessing the rise of masculinism and the political empowerment of men in the public sphere and civil society.[91]

Second, there is evidence that even on the occasions where women have tried to influence the outcome of the transition in the formal arena, they have met with resistance. The most concerted attempt to do this took place in the GDR in December 1989, after the Berlin Wall had come down, with the establishment of the UFV, the Independent Women's Organization.[92] Ina Merkel, a founder of the UFV, described how the women hurriedly formed an organization in order to get some representation on the roundtable then being set up. Even then, the host, an official of the Lutheran church, argued that if they let women in they might have to let in the pet breeders associations, too![93] The women managed to gain seats at the roundtable but then found it difficult to make themselves heard.[94]

[90] For figures, see Mira Janova and Mariette Sineau, "Women's Participation in Political Power in Europe: An Essay in East-West Comparision," *Women's Studies International Forum* 15, no. 1 (1992).

[91] See Einhorn (fn. 79), 17; and Peggy Watson, "The Rise of Masculinism in Eastern Europe," *New Left Review* 198 (March–April 1993).

[92] For a discussion of this, see Dorothy J. Rosenberg, "Shock Therapy: GDR Women in Transition from a Socialist Welfare State to a Social Market Economy," *Signs* 17 (Autumn 1991), 140.

[93] Unpublished interview by Patricia Harbord with Ina Merkel, April 5, 1990.

[94] For a discussion of this whole episode, see B. Schaeffer-Hegel, "Makers and Victims of Unification: German Women and the Two Germanies," *Women's Studies International Forum* 15, no. 1 (1992).

The political parties have certainly not felt it necessary to court women voters by advocating policies seen as furthering strategic gender interests as part of a feminist agenda. The opposite, if anything, is the case. Some of the strongest resistance to ideas associated with feminism came from Civic Forum.[95] The only mention of women in its initial manifesto was in the section on social policy, which read as follows: "A differentiation of incomes will gradually help to reduce the disproportionate economic activity of women, a rehabilitation of the family and the creation of better conditions for raising children."[96] Many male candidates in the 1989 Soviet elections were campaigning for "a return of women to their maternal duties."[97]

If organized women's movements have not had much impact on the new political systems or policy agendas to further women's practical or strategic interests, what has been the impact of the changes on gender relations? To answer this question it is necessary to broaden the notion of democratization and examine social and economic equality and the distribution of power within society. It can then be seen that changes introduced so far have important and often negative implications for gender relations.[98] The search for new values to replace those associated with the discredited communist system has led to a resurgence of the "old values" of family, God, and nationalism.[99] Therefore, policies enacted to reinforce these have an important impact on women. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the resurgence of the power of the Roman Catholic church and, despite a lack of public support for such measures, the concomitant attacks on abortion rights, particularly in Poland but also in Hungary.[100] A long-running dispute over abortion rights has also occurred in the reunified Germany. This has been accompanied by widespread encouragement of women to return to the home. National and ethnic identities, with their particular vision of women's roles, are likely to remain key determinants in political events in Central and Eastern Europe for the foreseeable future. The resurgence of "traditional" values is in some ways complemented by the economic changes taking place.

Market liberalization is proceeding in much of Eastern Europe, particularly Poland. Included in the rollback of the state is much state pro-

[95] See Einhorn (fn. 79), 29.

[96] Quoted in Mita Castle, "Our Woman in Prague," *Catalyst* 4 (July–September 1990).

[97] See Cynthia Cockburn, "Second among Equals," *Marxism Today* (July 1989).

[98] See, e.g., Barbara Einhorn, *Cinderella Goes to Market: Gender, Citizenship and the Women's Movement in Eastern Europe* (London: Verso, 1993).

[99] Barbara Einhorn, "Women in Eastern Europe" (Paper delivered at the British Sociological Association/Political Studies Association conference on Women and Citizenship, London, February 1991).

[100] See Jacqueline Heinen, "Polish Democracy Is a Masculine Democracy," *Women's Studies International Forum* 15, no. 1 (1992); and Fuszara (fn. 80).

vision of child care.[101] The removal or reduction of food subsidies and the high rates of inflation hit women hard in their roles as household managers and providers. Enterprises are being privatized or simply going bankrupt, and there is evidence that women form a high and in some places disproportionate number of the unemployed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania, as textile factories and other employers of women go out of business and as state bureaucracies are drastically reduced.[102] However, women are already active in the informal sector in Hungary, and there is speculation that perhaps with the expansion of consumption in the restructured economies of the future, new "women's" jobs might be created in a burgeoning service sector.[103] Another result of the new economic and social liberalization, perhaps more a reflection of Westernization than of a return to "traditional values," is the development of a sex industry. In what was Czechoslovakia, for example, sex shows and pornography are now readily available on the streets, and in Hungary, a country with a population of ten million, an estimated one million copies of pornographic magazines are produced each month.[104] Alongside increasing overall levels of crime, there is also evidence of a rising incidence of rape and violence against women in many parts of Central and Eastern Europe.[105]

So far therefore women's movements have not played a significant role in the destruction of the old communist order, nor have they influenced the policies of the new governments, either in terms of numerical representation or policies. There are several explanations for why this is so. The answer lies in part in the nature of the previous regimes. Because rights had been granted from above, women had no tradition of grassroots activism—of struggling to achieve or defend rights—on which to fall back. Feminism and notions of women's emancipation are now associated with the discredited old order, as Maxine Molyneux argues: "Ironically it seemed that socialist state policy on women, which had not achieved their emancipation, succeeded instead in alienating the population from any serious commitment to a feminist programme."[106] The

[101] Much of the new literature discusses the impact of these changes, particularly in the former GDR. See, e.g., Hanna Behrend, "Women Catapulted into a Different Social Order: Women in East Germany," *Women's History Review* 1, no. 1 (1992); and Marina Beyer, "The Situation of East German Women in Post-Unification Germany," *Women's Studies International Forum* 15, no. 1 (1992).

[102] For figures, see Watson (fn. 91), 78.

[103] See Julia Szalai, "Women and Democratization: Some Notes on Recent Trends in Hungary" (Paper delivered at the Conference on Women and the Transition from Authoritarian Rule in Latin America and Eastern Europe, Berkeley, December 1992). For an analysis that disagrees with this argument, see Ruth Pearson, "Questioning Perestroika: A Socialist Feminist Interrogation," *Feminist Review* 39 (Winter 1991).

[104] Kiss (fn. 89), 51.

[105] See figures published in the *Guardian*, January 26, 1993, p. 8.

[106] Molyneux, "The 'Woman Question' in the Age of Perestroika," *New Left Review* 183

small group of active Russian feminists must find new language not tainted by the old order.[107] This association of feminism with the old order, combined with the control over civil society exerted by the old regime for so many years, which eliminated almost all political space, has clearly helped to inhibit the growth of significant feminist movements or large-scale women's movements organizing around practical gender interests. However, there is evidence that in Poland, Hungary, and what was Czechoslovakia there are now emerging small-scale women's organizations that do not call themselves feminist, as well as small feminist groupings, comprised mainly of academics and intellectuals.

The speed of the transition in most of Central and Eastern Europe, spurred on as it was by outside events, has also worked against the emergence of organized women's movements. It is too early to speculate whether those countries experiencing longer, more drawn-out processes of liberalization, such as Poland and Hungary, will exhibit differences in this respect or whether the picture will be significantly different in the so-called southern tier, that is, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania. The general trends have also been exacerbated by the domination by men of much of the already existing opposition, which often focused on narrow political rights rather than on social and economic rights. There is perhaps more room for optimism in the Russian Republic.[108] Evidence of this can be seen in the submission by some feminist academics of a policy document to the Supreme Soviet in 1990 and the Dubna Women's Forum held in March 1991.[109] The more drawn-out nature of the transition in the Russian Republic, if that is what it turns out to be, may allow autonomous women's movements more time to organize, gain representation, and influence the policy agenda, despite the forces arrayed against them.[110] So far, however, democratization has not brought increased political representation for women and indeed has coincided with a reduction in social and economic rights for the majority of women.

(September–October 1990), 53.

[107] Seminar given by Anastasya Posadskaya, "Women and Perestroika," Manchester, September 1990.

[108] See Valentina Konstantinova, "The Women's Movement in the USSR: A Myth or a Real Challenge," in Shirin Rai, Hilary Pilkington, and Anne Phizacklea, eds., *Women in the Face of Change: The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China* (London: Routledge, 1992).

[109] "Concept of Government Program for the Improvement of the Position of Women and the Family and the Protection of Mother and Child" (Manuscript, Moscow, 1990).

[110] See Mary Buckley's preliminary discussion of the development of women's organizations in the former USSR in "Gender and Reform," in Catherine Merrivale and Chris Ward, eds., *Perestroika: The Historical Perspective* (London: Longman, 1991).

Conclusions

A gendered analysis of democratization gives a fuller understanding of the processes involved and their impact on gender relations, whereas the orthodox work on democratization simply cannot provide this, due to its limited definitions of democracy and virtual exclusion of those activities in which women play an important role. The narrow focus on institutional democratization and the (re)establishment of political rights favored by analysts such as Huntington, who use an "elitist" perspective on democracy, cannot help the analysis of the relationship between gender relations and transitions. Also needed is a wider analysis that considers social movements and civil society, as well as a notion of democratization that includes social and economic rights in addition to political ones.

A preliminary analysis of the role of women in transition politics has demonstrated that in some contexts women's movements have played a significant role in bringing about the transition. Any explanation of why women's movements appear in some contexts and not in others must take account of important external factors, such as the relationship of state and civil society. In Latin America the absence of conventional politics under authoritarian regimes gave different groups of women a certain space from which to press both practical and strategic gender-based demands. Despite repression, heterogeneous women's movements were able to emerge and play an important short- and medium-term role in the transition—in contrast to the arguments of the democratization theorists. Women's movements were therefore among the first protesters to play a significant part in the resurrection of civil society and the initial breakdown of authoritarian regimes. The Catholic church, in particular, aided this process.

In Central and Eastern Europe several factors worked against the emergence of women's movements organizing around either strategic or practical gender interests. The more concerted suppression of civil society by the state meant that the same degree of political space did not exist in Eastern Europe. The church has also played very different roles in Eastern Europe and Latin America. Only parts of the Lutheran church in the GDR allowed women's groups, such as lesbians, to operate under its auspices. However, while the Catholic church in Central and Eastern Europe is much more clearly associated with the return to "traditional" values, it must be remembered that in most of Latin America the support of the church has important limits. Because of the influence of Catholicism, feminist groups have felt that some measures, such as the decriminalization of abortion, are an almost impossible

dream. In addition, the emergence of autonomous women's movements in Central and Eastern Europe was hampered by the history of rights granted from above and the apparent identification of feminism with the old order rather than as an oppositional movement. So far, the speed of much of the transition and the role of external catalysts also appear to have worked against the development of women's movements.

Even in Latin America—despite the role that women played in transition politics—it is clear that participation, particularly in the early stages of the transition, does not guarantee any particular role in the outcome. Indeed, the development of the process itself may limit their ability to influence subsequent events. From a narrow focus on instrumental politics, there is evidence that women find it hard to convert their activities into political representation once conventional political activity resumes. Relatively few women are active in institutional politics, partly because democratization has not been accompanied by moves toward the wider social and economic equality that would enable women to participate in greater numbers. Indeed, looking at more broadly defined political activity, it is clear that some women's movements, particularly popular movements organizing around practical gender interests, have become increasingly marginal as the transition continues. At the same time, some, often middle-class, feminists do appear to have gained limited entrée to the political elite and some influence during the period of consolidation. Again, the speed of the transition appears to be a factor: a slow transition allows women's movements more opportunities to organize and influence outcomes, as, for example, in the Brazilian context. But Safa argues that, despite the problems, the emergence of the women's movements represents the breakdown of the traditional divisions between the public and the private and that fundamental changes in gender relations are therefore taking place in Latin America.[111]

It is perhaps too early to make judgments about the processes of change in Eastern Europe and their impact on gender relations, but several trends are clear. In narrow institutional terms the restoration of political rights has led to a "masculinization" of the public sphere and a decline in the numerical representation of women in institutional politics. The wider changes associated with democratization, such as market liberalization and the assertion of "traditional" values of God, family, and nation, often have a negative impact on women, particularly in terms of their strategic gender interests. This is particularly marked in the sphere of reproductive rights, child care, and women's role in the private sphere.

[111] Safa (fn. 47), 355.

Support for these changes is in part a reaction to emancipation from above, the double (if not triple) burden, and anything associated with the old order. Unlike Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe have not yet seen the emergence of mass movements organized around consumption issues that have allowed the politicization of women's domestic roles. But perhaps the erosion of social and economic rights such as abortion, which were taken for granted for so long, and widespread disillusionment with the harsh social and economic implications of market liberalization will catalyze future mass protest movements around both practical and strategic gender interests. Some women's organizations are emerging, and it appears that the attack on abortion rights has produced a wide coalition opposing it and is proving a spur to nascent feminist movements in Poland and in other Eastern European countries.[112] Indeed, Watson believes that "the development of feminism in Eastern Europe is simply a matter of time."[113]

As the very different cases of Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe have demonstrated, a narrow political focus is entirely insufficient for any meaningful analysis of the relationship between gender relations and democratization. Social and economic dimensions of citizenship and democracy must also be considered. In none of the cases considered above, for example, has institutional democratization extended to the democratization of relations between men and women.

[112] See Hanna Jankowska, "Abortion, Church and Politics in Poland," *Feminist Review* 39 (Winter 1991), 176.

[113] Watson (fn. 91), 82.