

**Introduction: Relevance of (research on) representation of women in politics
(Draft)**

Birgit Sauer

**Vortrag auf dem "Journée de travail "Genre et representation politique"
3.12.2004 Université de Genève**

1. What's the problem?

Since the 1970s it has been common sense in the women's movements of most of the European countries that representative democracy is male dominated, is an *androcracy* rather than *democracy*. Historically, women have been denied full political citizenship and they have been structurally excluded from political participation. Since the late 18th century gender became a political category, when military duty, property ownership and the capacity for rationality and political citizenship was extended to all male members of the polity. Since that time, women were not represented as individuals in the body politics but as part of a larger unit – the family. The "pater familias" represented the family, he represented women and women's interests.

Even after women have successfully been fighting for formal political equality and political citizenship the institutions of representative democracy weren't neither inclusive nor responsive to women. Suffrage and formal political citizenship didn't automatically increase the quantitative representation of women nor the responsiveness of policy makers towards women's issues. A hegemonic form of masculinity is inscribed in state institutions and in the procedures of representative democracy. The neologism of "gender democracy" points out these deficits of liberal representative democracy and the need to transform democracies in a women friendly way.

The second wave women's movements therefore was skeptical and opposing towards representative democracy and its institutions, organizations and rules. Parliaments, parties and election were not seen as a means to integrate women into the body politics. Emancipation, freedom and autonomy were seen as hardly achievable by representative democracy. Male dominated state institutions were seen as fundamentally unable and unwilling to improve the

situation of women and to represent women's interests. New forms of participatory and radical democracy were developed within women's groups: for instance consciousness-raising, rotating responsibilities, non-hierarchical dialogue and deliberative forms of decision-making (Squires 1999:198). The political strategy of the women's movement in the 1970s and early 1980s was not the integration in representative democracy but rather the organization in civil society.

The critique of liberal democracy was connected with the re-definition of the political. The political was extended to the personnel in order to demonstrate the political participation of women outside the formal institutions (Squires 1999: 195) and to prove, that women were not a-political. The feminist concept of the political was at the same time a rejection of a concept of representation, which is based on the liberal ideal of division of public and private, on the division between the public "citoyen" and the private "bourgeois". The delegation of voice to a representative and the notion to behave as "citoyen" only at specific times, for instance elections, was seen as a miniscule form of democracy and citizenship.

But the experience of the women's movement showed, that participatory forms of democracy were not per se non-hierarchical, inclusive, fair and equal. Rather, they had paradoxical outcomes: The forms of participatory democracy produced exclusion, inequality and domination between women.

Also, the emergence of state feminism since the 1980s by and by changed the perception of representative democracy in the feminist movements in western industrial societies. Women's movement critique of liberal democracy today envisions both: **First** the liberal equality approach to integrate women into politics under the same conditions as men. **Second** the claim to transform the institutions of representative democracy and to re-define the principle of representation. Put it different: To engage in the representative political system is seen as necessary, though not sufficient and should be completed by political activity in women's movements and groups (Lister 1997: 147-155; Squires 1999: 200f.). Anne Phillips and Iris Marion Young propose that the "dichotomous options of representative or participatory politics" should be "displaced" (see: Squires 1999: 214). In other words: The perspective of participatory democracy forms the reference point of critique of female political under-representation as well as the for the concept of a "gender democracy".

This strategic change of the women's movement built the background of new research in feminist political science: The first step was to answer the question: Why are women under-represented in representative democracies? How to explain the exclusion of women and the barriers for women in representative democracies?

Seven hypothesis have been developed to explain female political under-representation. Feminist political scientists did a lot of work in the last two decades to explain the complex mechanisms of keeping women away from politics, on the persistence of female under-representation. But still empirical research on the mechanisms of under-representation is necessary.

1. deficit hypothesis: Malestream political science took the hypothesis for granted that women are less politically interested than men. The "gender gap regarding interest in and identification with mainstream party politics" (Squires 1999: 196) leads to lower engagement in politics and to the under-representation of women.

Women studies put the hypothesis of less developed political interests of women different as "distinctive perspective on and conception of politics" (Squires 1999: 196): Women "find the current form of party politics particularly unappealing, since it fails to represent their concerns or priorities" (Squires 1999: 196). Both hypothesis still need to be proven: Exploring women's interest in politics – explaining the gender gap in political interests are still tasks for feminist research in the field of political representation (Westle/Schoen 2002).

2. electorate's decision: Voters, including female voters, have conservative gender images and don't elect women as deputies

3. social structure hypothesis: The division of labor prevents women to be successful in politics as a job.

4. political structure hypothesis: "Institutional masculinity" of state institutions, of mechanisms of representation, like the electoral system, of political culture and media are barriers for women running for office.

5. party as gate keeper theory: The problem of female under-representation is not a problem of "supply" of women ("Women don't want to run for candidate", Norris/Lovenduski 1995), but a problem of "demand": Parties don't select and recruit women as candidates for election.

6. direct discrimination hypothesis: Male politicians exclude women, male resistance to women's presence in political elites, male bonding (Lovenduski 2000: 87)

7. indirect discrimination hypothesis: Gender images – images on female politicians and the perception of women to be less able than men to be in political leadership.¹

2. Gender sensitive concepts of democracy and representation

The next step in feminist research and theory was the "re-construction" of gender sensitive forms of democracy and representation. Let me briefly point out essentials of feminist democratic as a point of reference for the analysis and theory of women's representation.

The **main focus** of feminist critique of representative democracy is the **claim of universalism** and the conflation of the idea of political "equality" (one man – or woman – one vote) with universalism. Feminist theory detected the male particularism of universalist norms and institutions.

Feminist democratic theory therefore aims at **representing gender difference** – the difference between men and women. This is a heuristic tool to criticize the particularism of male universalism and "sexualize" the abstract political subject (Benhabib 1996: 5). The concept of difference connects political to social equality – which is disconnected in the concept of liberal democracy. The feminist claim is that social differences (for instance due to the social division of labor) must be politically recognized and institutionalized on the grounds of equal political rights of men and women. Such gender sensitive arrangements are a precondition for **political** equality between men and women (Rowbothom 1986: 80f.). Equality and universalist approaches should therefore be separated and social inequalities and differences should be recognized in the political sphere on the grounds of equal political rights of men and women. Ruth Lister calls this "differentiated universalism". The question

¹ Lea Sgier mentioned this seventh aspect in the debate at Geneva. Thanks for this thought.

then is how social differences can be politically expressed and represented in a way that these differences do not result in political inequality.

Gender sensitive dimensions of democracy

- Participation and active citizenship of women
- Quantitative representation of women/visibility/presence of women in politics:
Representation of difference
- Representation of women's needs and interests
- Representation of differences between women (intersection of gender, class, ethnicity in the political process)
- Differentiated and gender sensitive public sphere/discourse
- Responsiveness and women-friendly policy output

Given the fact that today a consensus on the necessity of representing women in representative democracy, four questions emerge for gender sensitive theory of representation.

1. **Why** should women be present in politics? Why should women be integrated in institutions of representative democracy? This entails the legitimation of instruments and mechanisms to overcome female under-representation and to make representative institutions and procedures more inclusive for women.

2. **How** to represent women without re-establishing power and hierarchies in politics on the grounds of gender difference?

Two more questions are related to this last question:

3. Do women make a difference in politics?

4. How can representative democracy be modified and completed, to make representative democracy more women-friendly and to realize active citizenship (participation) for women?

3. Why should women be represented in bodies of representative democracy?

In the feminist literature we find four arguments for the representation of women (Lovenduski 2000: 87ff.; Voet 1998: 100; Phillips 1995: 229-238):

1. *Justice argument* – unequal representation of women is unfair and undemocratic (Anne Phillips)

2. *Pragmatic argument* – women have special interests, which can only be represented and understood by women "The needs and interests peculiar to women will be better represented by other women" (Squires 1999: 205) – and not by men. "(W)omen have a distinct and separate interest as women; that is this interest cannot be adequately represented by men; and that the election of women ensures its representation (Phillips 1998: 234).

3. *Difference argument* – women have particular experiences and qualities (female morals, ethics, new political style), which should be integrated in politics to change male-centered institutions and policies. Women can revitalize democracy; women could be a remedy against political annoyance and the representational crisis.

4. *Role model argument* – "the existence of women representatives will encourage" other women to "gain confidence" (Squires 1999: 204) in "politics as a job" (Weber).

4. How to represent women?

Does representation of women mean an adequate number of women in representative bodies? Does representation mean the representation of female identity, of interests and needs of women, which can only be represented by women? Or can men also represent women's interests and needs? Or does representation mean (moreover) a women friendly policy outcome, which is oriented towards the needs and interests of women? "The key difference ... is whether one looks at the composition of parliament to determine its representativeness, or whether one looks at the decisions made." (Squires 1999:203)

To answer these questions, the concept of representation has to be split into 2 questions with several dimensions (Hanna F. Pitkin 1967, Judith Squires 1999: 202ff.) (see attachment 1):

1. **What** should representatives represent? Women's ideas or beliefs, women's interests or identities (Squires 1999: 194, 202)?

To answer this question three dimensions of representation could be distinguished:

1.1 *ideological representation*: representation of ideas/beliefs of collectives via parties (representatives should be accountable for their party constituency)

1.2 *functional representation*: representation of interests: representatives act as spokespeople for interest groups – women's groups (substantive representation)

1.3 *social representation*: representation of identities: representatives mirror the social composition of the electorate in terms of presence (quantitative representation); representatives speak for groups they are part of, sharing common experiences and values (Squires 1999: 203).

2. **How** should women be represented? (Pitkin 1967) (attachment 2)

2.1 The *microcosm* conception indicates, "that a person shares some of the characteristics of a political significant group" – women share some characteristics as women with other women. In this dimension the representatives should be a "mirror" of the nation and women should be represented according to their share in the electorate (**quantitative, descriptive or social representation**), representatives are "standing for" a group of the electorate, for instance women.

2.2 *principal-agent concept*: the representative should act for the represented: "the representation of interests where a 'representative' denotes an agent who acts on behalf of his or her principal" (Squires 1999:203; "acting for" Pitkin) Should representatives who "happen to be women will be able to represent women" – to act in favor of women (Lovenduski)? Or should they "act as representatives of their constituents and parties" (Squires 1999: 205) (**qualitative, substantial representation**).

If we combine the two questions "what" and "how" should be represented we can distinguish **first** the representation of identities in a more microcosm concept (social representation) as quantitative representation of women. Female deputies are "standing for" women – and nothing more.

Second we can conceptualize representation as representation of interests (functional representation) in a principal-agent-concept of substantive representation as "acting for" women. While the representation of interests is more connected to the (liberal) equality approach, the representation of identity (social representation) is more connected with the difference approach in political theory. But here the question is: Do women have common interests?

In real life, women deputies are often "triple representatives" (Lovenduski 2000: 98): They represent their electorate (functional), their party (ideological) and a vague constituency of women or identity as woman – ascribed to female deputies by their inescapable sex (social representation).

In the last years the **aim of feminist theory of representation** was to combine the concepts of "politics of presence" (identity, social or quantitative representation) with functional representation (representation of women as an (interest) group). Anne Phillips and Iris Marion Young both claim that the "apparently dichotomous options within representative politics, of functional and social representation, ... (should) be displaced" (Squires 1999: 214).

"Proposals for fairer representative mechanisms include arguments for functional *and* social representation" and "modified defences of group representation" (Squires 1999: 195, emphasis added B.S.). But still the question is: How to define women as a group (identity or interest or "serial group)?"

I briefly want to point out the mosaic of feminist theories of representation:

4.1 Politics of presence – social representation of women (Anne Phillips)

Anne Phillips endorses the politics of presence (social representation). A "politics of ideas privileges accountability as the central measure of representativeness" and focuses on the responsiveness of representatives. As long as representatives are responsive it doesn't matter

who they are (and which sex they have). A "politics of presence privileges authenticity". It focuses on the messenger, on the identity (and the sex) of the representative. In politics of presence fair representation "regards the gender ... of the representative" to be important (Squires 1999: 209). And: "It is in the relationship between ideas and presence that we can best hope to find a fairer system of representation, not in a false opposition between one or the other." (Phillips 1995: 25).

Anne Phillips (1995: 145-165) also claims that this focus on politics of presence has to be put in a wider context of participatory democracy.

4.2 Are women an "interest group"? – Functional representation

The concept of representation as representing women's specific interests, demands and needs is one of the most common concepts in liberal feminism: Due to common experiences of exclusion, oppression, of male domination and male-centered politics women share common interests. These should be put on the political agenda and be represented in policy debates to gender policy processes and policy outcomes and make them more women-friendly.

While Virginia Sapiro (1981) claims that the functional representation of women is legitimized by the fact that women are an interest group with specific interests they have in common, Nancy Hartsock and Irene Diamond (1981) opposed the interest concept: To declare women an interest group means to treat women as men and to reduce gender inequality to labor market inequality. Their standpoint of difference claims that the issue of fair representation is not only an issue of including women in political bodies to the same conditions as men – being an interest group. Their concept of needs says that due to the sexual division of labor women invert male forms of politics and representation (Diamond/Hartsock 1998: 197).

The claim for common women's interests and needs is a highly problematic claim – do women's interests exist or are women differentiated by ideology, class, ethnicity? Do women share a set of experiences?

4.3 Group representation – Iris Marion Young

Young's concept is not a concept of strict microcosm representation (no strict social representation). She demands for accountable mechanisms for the articulation of voice of oppressed groups (Young 1990: 188). Young is endorsing a principal-agent representation based on groups rather than on individuals (Squires 1999: 212). In Young's concept, women are not seen as interest group, but as a social group (This differs from the interest-group pluralism approach in the liberal tradition). Social groups are defined by the experience of discrimination and oppression and they construct/define themselves through a vision of justice and an interest in a just political dialogue (Young 1990: 186). To avoid essentialist notions of "group", Young claims women to be a "serial collectivity".

Young's emphasis is on public discussion and decision-making, on deliberation and a diverse public sphere and less on an interest-representation (in the liberal-pluralist tradition) (Squires 1999: 213).

Representing differences requires constitutional guarantees of group participation within the parliamentary system. The mechanisms to give oppressed groups a voice are according to Young (1990: 184):

1. provision of public resources for the self-organization of groups to achieve empowerment and become a group " for themselves"
2. provision of public resources to generate policy alternatives and proposals
3. A certain number of seats in the legislature should be reserved for members of marginalized groups who have suffered oppression.
4. group veto power for specific policies which the specific group affect – for instance reproductive rights for women.

4.4 Radical democracy (Chantal Mouffe)

Post-structuralist theorists also point to the ambivalence of representation of women as a group or of women's interests and identities: Post-structuralist theorists deny that common interests and needs of women exist. They conceptualize interests and identities as being

constructed in the political process – in the process of representation. Concepts of social and functional representation are criticized because they construct identities, interests and political positions – and at the same time construct exclusion and positions of subordination. "Political representation is not solely instrumental or expressive but productive of power relations, constituting the subject" (Squires 1999: 215). "Any mechanism for representing women will, if adopted, also become a mechanism for constituting the category of woman." (Squires 1999: 215).

The deconstructivist approach of Chantal Mouffe (1996) conceptualizes democracy as an antagonistic and agonistic process, in which identities and interests are constructed and bargained and not only "represented". "Modes of representation are not relations of mirroring or of references: representation does not refer to a pre-given social subject. Modes of representation subjectify social relations and at the same time produce political subjects." (Niekant 1999: 41; Translation B.S.)

Mouffe's concept of radical democracy doesn't reject the idea of representation, but she wants to make pluralism of representative democracy work better. Pluralism and antagonism are the central features of democracy. Mouffe's concept gives " a positive status to differences and ... refuses the objective on unanimity and homogeneity which is always revealed as fictitious and based on acts of exclusion" (Mouffe 1996: 246). Representation has to be conceptualized as an ongoing process, as "a struggle of a multiplicity of interest groups or of minorities for the assertion of their rights" (Mouffe 1996: 247).

In this struggle over representation identities and interests are constructed, they are not pre-given and only mirrored or acted for or standing for. Representation is the negotiation over identities and interests in the political sphere; representation is the negotiation of gender, is doing gender in the field of politics.

Gender sensitive accounts for representation therefore always should be aware of the pitfalls of "speaking for" and should be self-reflexive.

Research task: Analyzing processes of "doing gender"/constructing identity in political office (of men and women) – and counter-identity and counter-socialization in politics.

5. Representation and responsiveness: Do women make a difference?

One of the most exciting research questions still is: Do women make a difference? What do female representatives do when they represent? How to describe the connection between the two dimensions of quantitative and substantial representation? Does the representation of women in leadership position leads to a higher responsiveness of these institutions towards gender equity? How can we explain or measure the number of women (quantity) to the impact of women on policy making and on the outcome of parliamentary processes?

Women's research in political science assumed that there must be a connection between quantitative (passive) and substantive (active) representation, between increased access to leadership positions and policies, which improve the lives of women. The concept of a "critical mass" of 33 % is an interesting hypothesis, which has been rarely proofed. "At a minimum, the very presence of women in male environments increased gender awareness and altered expectations." (Lovenduski 2000: 104). For instance: Men behave different if only one woman is in the room.

Up to now, little empirical research exists on the topic of sex representation. John Hinderer (1993) and Sally Selden (1997) deny a link between quantitative representation of women and responsiveness of institutions, that is and gender sensible policy outcomes. Manon Tremblay and Réjean Pelletier are also "careful in establishing a causal relationship between the descriptive and the substantive representation of women" in the case of the Canadian parliament (Tremblay/Pelletier 2000: 384). Female politicians do *not* automatically identify as representatives of the group of women. They rather represent ideas, the ideologies of their parties. Tremblay and Pelletier conclude that it is not gender that has an impact on responsiveness, but "feminist consciousness": Increasing the number of women, therefore, might not be "the best strategy for meeting the needs, demands, and interests of women". It is probably "more appropriate to elect "feminists" (of both sexes) – although they show that those identified as feminists are more often women (Tremblay/Pelletier 2000: 397).

These questions show that representation cannot be "reduced" to the visibility of women in parliamentary bodies but has to be extended to policy processes. The RNGS projects

("Research Network on Gender Politics and State") analyzes the connection between women's movements and state institutions. The results of the RNGS project show that states have become "feminist", that state institutions – women's policy agencies like ministries – are mechanisms to promote women's movement aims and women's interests. Women's policy agencies are able to increase the procedural and substantial representation of women in policy processes.

RNGS analyzed four gendered issues in comparative perspective and shows that state institutions are responsive to women's movements demands if movements activists and femocrats are able to frame a policy issue in a gendered discourse (Mazur 2001; Stetson 2001, Outshoorn 2003; Lovenduski et al. forthcoming). In her comparative work, Amy Mazur concludes that policies achieved a high level of gender sensitive responsiveness within a "complex line-up of factors" (Mazur 2002: 4). One of the most important condition for the transformation of passive in active representation was the presence of a "strategic partnership" (Halsaa 1998) or a "triangle of empowerment" (Vargas/Wieringa 1998) between women in elected office, women's movements activists and organizations and femocrats in a specific policy arena (Mazur 2002: 4; 197)

Lael R. Keiser et al. (2002) are asking for the conditions in which female bureaucrats **might** "act for" women (Pitkin 1967). They set up a framework to explore "when female bureaucrats are likely to identify as women rather than as agency employees or a myriad of other roles." (Keiser et al. 2002: 554). Keiser et al. focus on two necessary conditions for gender sensitive responsiveness of political institutions: *First*, bureaucrats must have "discretion in how they carry out their jobs". *Second*, responsiveness is more likely in policy fields, which are salient for "women's issues" (Keiser et al. 2002: 556) and which therefore can easily become "gendered". That is: not only women, but also institutional contexts matter for the transformation from passive to active representation and responsiveness (Keiser et al. 2002: 562).

6. The TINA principle – or is there an alternative? Participatory democracy, active citizenship and direct democracy. Models for the institutionalization of gender difference in representative democracies

If we agree that women are not a homogeneous group with common interests, that the idea of pre-given and pre-discursive interests and identities cannot grasp the reality of women's lives and experiences we still must ask: How can the process of construction of identities, interests and needs be transformed in a just form of representation? Meanwhile the analysis of frames and policy processes show that also men can "act for women", can represent women, but that female policy entrepreneurs, femocrats and equal opportunity institutions which reflect the process of construction of women's interests and needs are necessary mediators for the substantial representation of women.

I want to suggest to separate heuristically the quantitative representation of women from the substantive representation of women. According to the idea of just distribution of power, of positions/seats in democratic bodies of decision making, a parity representation of women and men should be the aim and claim for all parliaments, organizations, committees – to give women a voice in politics. Women are not representing women in this model, they are "symbols" of gender sensitivity of the society and the body politic and the acceptance of women in politics. Their only "feminist" task is to present female role models in politics.

This would be the first two "tracks" of Joni Lovenduski's "three-track strategy" (Lovenduski 2000: 101) for the representation of women:

- political parties nominate women for winnable seats (by internal quota, with a zipper-system on election lists), networks and caucuses of women politicians; legislation which punishes parties if they don't nominate women for electoral lists (parité in France as a model), mentoring of women by senior women politician to encourage them to run for political office
- procedural mechanisms for parliaments (working hours of parliaments, speech lists, rules of debate)

The other task to raise the substantial representation of different women should not be immediately connected to these elected women, but should be dealt separately. In other words, special mechanisms for a better functional representation of women as a serial collective, of women's movements demands should be institutionalized.

This is the third track Joni Lovenduski suggests:

- legislation to ensure that women's interests are represented in the policy process and in legislation, parliamentary commissions for women's issues which have a mandate on all legislation to watch the gendered content (idea of gender mainstreaming).

Institutional mechanisms to represent women

a. Is "small democracy" an alternative?

Is "small democracy" on regional and local level more inclusive for women. "women have greater potential to participate in local politics both because the geographic constraints on their mobility are less material than for national politics and because women's political concerns are most often centered on the locality and the community" (Lovenduski 2000: 95).

If we look at Germany and Austria for instance, parliaments in small communities are often more male dominated than on the central level due to the fact that networks, the "adequate" profession, membership in local associations and symbolic capital is much more important in smaller, more personal units – and these capitals are male-coded (Geißel/Sauer 2002).

b. Are instruments of direct democracy a women-friendly alternative to representative democracy?

In the feminist movement the idea of radical and participatory democracy was connected to the concept of "direct democracy" – often without looking closer to the reality of mechanisms of direct democracy. Compared to representative mechanisms of democracy, direct instruments like referenda and people's initiatives, are more women-friendly than representative mechanisms. With respect to participation, representation and presence, plural and gender sensitive public sphere, responsiveness and outcome of politics, they are more inclusive for women. Instruments of direct democracy are able to raise gender reflexivity of policy processes (Sauer 2001: 251).

But instruments of direct democracy are only partly able to change patriarchal political hegemony and they fulfill feminist claims for equal representation, for participation and active citizenship only to some degree. Direct democracy alone is not able to alter, transform and

change the gender deficits of liberal representative democracy. Mechanisms of direct democracy can be modeled as means for anti-patriarchal democratization – but imposed from above (like referenda) it is likely that they can be misused for strengthening male hegemony. Direct democracy needs to be completed by new forms of institutionalized representation of civil society and women's movements. In the following I want to present some institutional ideas on this.

c. Institutionalizing the idea of group representation

1. state funding of women's groups, of public campaigns of women's groups according to the financing of parties or of instruments of direct democracy to construct a deliberative surrounding of parliamentary representation (Pollak 2004)
2. More feminists in politics: "(M)ore Feminists are also needed – women and men – so that the needs, demands, and interests of women find expression and satisfaction within the political arena." (Tremblay/Pelletier 2000: 398) The "critical mass" of women must be accompanied by their "vocal critical mass" (Tremblay/Pelletier 2000: 398).
3. more feminist experts in hearings in parliament and parliamentary committees, in the process of evaluation of bills
4. Consultant experts of women's groups, women's expertise in policy processes
5. establishing an additional chamber of parliament – a "consultative chamber" of movements and NGOs
6. building a "feminist partnership" – according to the institutions and rules of the social partnership. A model of institutionalization of gender difference could be the difference between capital and labor in the arrangements of the welfare state or the corporatist arrangements.
7. new forms of deliberation and governance: networks roundtables (which should have quota)

8. quotation of expert committees and the new forms of informal democracy
9. establishing routines of cooperation between movement groups and women's policy agencies – "triangle of empowerment" (female politicians, femocrats, women's movements)
10. Connection of social citizenship and political citizenship: We need research on the social situation of women and their motivation, willingness to participate in politics. Is a change towards de-politization realistic in the age of dismantling welfare states?

Who should push these ideas forward: I think, the parties should play a dominant role in this process of "engendering" representation.

7. Post-national democracy and the representation of women. Further research questions

Since the implosion of real-socialist states and with the process of internationalization of capital and finance representative democracies suffer from a " crisis of representation" (Hall).

The transformation of nation states, the denationalization and trans-nationalization of democracy leads to a hollowing out of national democratic institutions and elected bodies of decision-making. New forms of governance, of a network state emerge on the national and international level (self-regulation, governance). Are these new structures chances for the representation of women for the social representation of different women's groups (representation of civil society groups in governance structures), for inclusion of women's groups (new form of social representation – women's groups as women) for the representation of migrant women?

Or does the "feminization" of representative bodies (on the national level) indicate a shift of power to transnational democratic bodies and governance structures with low or no input legitimation but only output legitimation? Are these changes indicating a "feminization of powerlessness" in the process of transformation of politics and the representational crisis? (For instance: Problem of representation in multi-level governance like European Union).

Given the fact that parties are important for the political representation of women we have to ask: What is the future role of political parties in the multi-level-governance (in the European Union)? How do they interact with NGOs and lobbies?

Given the fact that national state feminism is responsive to women – is there a chance for an international state feminism?

References:

- Benhabib, Seyl 1996: Towards a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy, in: Dies. (Hg.): *Democracy and Difference. Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, S. 67-94
- Diamond, Irene/Hartsock, Nancy 1981: Beyond Interests in Politics: A Comment on Virginia Sapiro's "When are women's interests interesting? The problem of political representation of Women", in: *American Political Science Review* 3, S. 717-721
- Ferguson, Kathy 1984: *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*, Philadelphia: Temple UP
- Geißel, Brigitte/Sauer, Birgit 2001 Transformationsprozess und Geschlechterverhältnisse in den neuen Bundesländern. Auswirkungen auf der lokalen politischen Ebene, in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 39-40, S. 32-38
- Halsaa, B. 1998: A Strategic Partnership for Women's Policies in Norway, in: Lycklama à Nijeholt, G./Vargas, V./Wieringa, S. (Hg.): *Women's Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean*, New York: Garland
- Hindera, John J. 1993: Representative Bureaucracy: Imprimis Evidence of Active Representation in the EEOC District Office, in: *Social Science Quarterly*, No. 74, S. 95-108
- Immergut, Ellen 1998: The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism, in: *Politics and Society*, Vol. 26, No. 1, S. 5-34
- Kanter, Rosemary K. 1977: Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex ratios and Responses to Token Women, in: *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82, No. 5, S. 965-990
- Keiser, Lael R. et al. 2002: Lipstick and Logarithms: Gender, Institutional Context, and Representative Bureaucracy, in: *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 3, S. 553-564

- Lister, Ruth 1997: *Citizenship. Feminist Perspectives*, London: Macmillan
- Lovenduski, Joni 2000: *Change in Women's Political Representation*, in: Rossilli, Mariagrazia (ed.): *Gender Policies in The European Union*, New York et al.: Peter Lang, pp. 87-105
- Lovenduski, Joni/Norris, Pippa 1995: *Political recruitment: Gender, Race and Class in the British Parliament*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lovenduski, Joni et al. (forthcoming): *Political Representation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Mazur, Amy G. (Hg.) 2001: *State Feminism, Women's Movements, and Job Training. Making Democracies Work in a Global Economy*, New York/London: Routledge
- Mazur, Amy G. 2002: *Theorizing Feminist Policy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mouffe, Chantal 1996: *Democracy, power and the "political"*, in: Benhabib, Seyla (Hg.): *Democracy and Difference. Contesting the boundaries of the political*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, S. 245-257
- Niekant, Renate 1999: *Zur Krise der Kategorien "Frauen" und "Geschlecht". Judith Butler und der Abschied von feministischer Identitätspolitik*, In: Bauhardt, Christine/von Wahl, Angelika (Hg.): *Gender and Politics. "Geschlecht" in der feministischen Politikwissenschaft*, Opladen: Leske und Budrich, S. 29-45
- Outshoorn, Joyce 2003: *The Politics of Prostitution. Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP
- Phillips, Anne 1995: *The Politics of presence*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Pitkin, Hannah F. 1967: *The Concept of Representation*, Berkeley: The University of California Press
- Pollak, Johannes 2004: *The Convention Hype: Visions of Representation*, paper presented at the CIDEL Workshop, London, November
- Rowbotham, Sheila 1986: *Feminism and Democracy*, in: Held, David/Pollitt, Chris (Hg.): *New Forms of Democracy*, London et al.: Sage, S. 78-109
- Sapiro, Virginia 1981: *When are Interests Interesting? The Problem of Political Representation of Women*, in: *American Political Science Review* 3, S. 701-716
- Selden, Sally Coleman 1997: *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy: Diversity and Responsiveness in a Government Agency*, Armonk: ME Sharp
- Squires, Judith 1999: *Gender in Political Theory*, Cambridge/Oxford: Polity press
- Stetson, Dorothy McBride (Hg.) 2001: *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements, and the Democratic State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Tremblay, Manon/Pelletier, Réjean 2000: More Feministst or More Women? in: International Political Science Review, Vol. 21, No. 4, S. 381-405

Vargas, V./Wieringa, S. 1998: The Triangles of Empowerment: Processes and Actors in the Making of Public Policies, in: Lycklama à Nijeholt, G./Vargas, V./Wieringa, S. (Hg.): Women's Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Carribean, New York: Garland

Westle, Bettina/Schoen, Harald 2002: Ein neues Argument in einer alten Diskussion:

"Politikverdrossenheit" als Ursache des gender gap im politischen Interesse. In:

Brettschneider, Frank/van Deth, Jan W./Roller, Edeltraud (Hg.): Das Ende der politisierten Sozialstruktur? Opladen: Leske + Budrich, S. 215-244

Voet, Rian 1998: Feminism and Citizenship, London et al.: Sage

Young, Iris Marion 1990: Justice and the Politics of Difference, Princeton: Princeton UP