ZEUGS ZENTRUM FÜR EUROPÄISCHE GESCHLECHTERSTUDIEN

ZENTRUM FÜR EUROPÄISCHE GESCHLECHTERSTUDIEN
WORKING PAPER

No. 6 | 2014

Silke Schneider

Gender and Authoritarian Regimes – A Review

Kontakt
Zentrum für Europäische Geschlechterstudien
c/o Prof.'in Dr. Gabriele Wilde
Scharnhorststr. 100 | 48151 Münster

zeugs@uni-muenster.de
Fax: +49 251 83-25131

ifpol: Institut für Politikwissenschaft

WESTFÄLISCHE
WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNSTER

Gender and Authoritarian Regimes – A Review

Silke Schneider

1. Introduction

This review will overlook the research field "gender and authoritarian regimes". Political science has no central focus on this question yet. So case studies are incorporated in the following review as well as hints in and parts of studies with a quite different analytical focus. The review tries to develop a useful framework for the study of conditions of power between the sexes in authoritarian societies.

The "renaissance" (Bank 2009) or "revitalisation" (Köllner 2008) of authoritarianism research within political science is mostly located in comparative politics and regional studies. There is a great variety of recent studies concerning authoritarian regimes (see overview by Bank 2009; Köllner 2009; Goebel 2011; Kailitz/Köllner 2013). But most recent studies on authoritarian regimes do not focus on gender questions explicitly. A summary of gender related questions concerning authoritarianism and a first sketch of the research field was proposed in Femina Politica (Schneider/Wilde 2012), a recent overview about women's suffrage rights on basis of new results of research of processes of democratization can be found in Pickel (2013).

This structured overview on recent literature on authoritarianism and gender will list and analyze the central questions of the papers with the focus on gender questions. Gender relations, so the founding thesis, must be regarded as relations of power, in state but as well as in society. Traditionally, research on authoritarian regimes locate (political) power in a center – conceptions of power as social, more diffuse and more than top-down are quite new for research on authoritarianism (Frankenberger 2013). This explains the following structure of the review, which aims to broaden the perspective on authoritarianism research in some points.

The review focusses first on recent theoretical approaches to authoritarianism and authoritarian regimes. Then, the literature in the field of gender research which focusses on authoritarian regimes and authoritarian tendencies in democracies will be analyzed – here we find comparative studies as well as regional studies. Recently, political science research tends to leave the mainstreaming questions concerning political institutions in authoritarian regimes and asks for the factors which stabilize authoritarian regimes or connects with democratization research, which asks for factors which destabilize democracies and enforce tendencies towards authoritarianism. Which role does the factor gender relations play in this perspective? Another stream of research, on the contrary, does not give

attention to the question of democratization but concentrates empirically on the specific features within authoritarian regimes. The review focusses then once more on the research results, which can put some light on social processes of (gendered) power. These are often enough kind of collateral products of research with different central aims. The central perspectives of comparative studies on women's political representation (Bauer/Britton 2006; Bauer/Tremblay 2011; Derichs/Holike/Kindelberger 2011) will be analyzed, as well as regional studies which focus on women's rights and morality, family policy in autocracies or on gender relations and social change in autocracies.

The most interesting policies within a gender perspective and how they are looked upon in mainstream and feminist political science and in part recent historical research as well will be described: state formation and gender; political rights, suffrage rights and women's rights activism; women's representation; social hierarchies and social processes; family policy, the role of domestic violence and abortion rights as measuring degrees of women's autonomy and eventually the socio-economic gender orders. The review takes into account literature in the above mentioned field since the year 2000 and which represents recent disciplinary discussions – some exceptions are made, when significant older studies have not been updated by recent research.

2. Authoritarianism: Focus of Research

First, I will give an overview on recent research on authoritarianism, the modification of definitions and recent theoretical frames. What do we speak about, when we speak about authoritarianism and authoritarian regimes? What kind of conceptual approaches are used to describe and analyze the diagnosis of an increasing number and increasing influence of authoritarian regimes, the so-called "authoritarian rollback" (Burnell/Schlumberger 2010; Burnell 2011).

What can we learn about authoritarian systems, dictatorship, and hybrid states in recent political theory and which are the effects of authoritarian regime features on gender relations and gender images?

Recent case studies often work with a rather pragmatic definition of authoritarian regimes and concentrate on describing developments which can be described empirically (Heryanto/Mandal 2012).

Kailitz and Köllner (2013) offer a summary of recent theoretical approaches to analyze autocracies. The most prominent demarcation between autocracies and democracies was lost with while "defect democracies" or "hybrid regimes" are being established in transforming countries which held elections without a free and fair competition between different parties (Kailitz/Köllner 2013, 10). So their definition of authoritarian regimes focusses on the quality of elections – as not free, fair and compet-

itive. Furthermore the government's or leader's power is not controlled and restricted by parliament and justice (Kailitz/Köller 2013, 11). Thus, they confront definitions basing on scales of measuring democracy like Polity or Freedom House. That there are good reasons to use those scales, depending on the specifically analytical focus or even disregarding consistent theoretical approaches show, for example, the recent studies of Jamal and Langohr (2009) or Pickel (2013).

Kailitz and Köllner offer a range of classifications to differentiate between different kind of autocracies, referring to Linz (authoritarianism/totalitarianism), Geddes (power of the dominant leading figure: party dictatorship/military dictatorship/personalistic dictatorship) and Hadenius/Teorell (modus of maintaining power). According to Kailitz and Köllner, it depends on the leading research question, which classification may turn out mostly useful – so classifications may differ. Studies focusing on gender in authoritarian regimes, mainly case studies, confirm this point – whether they concentrate on women in executive power (Pinto 2011; Fleschenberg 2011), the degree of guaranteeing women's rights in authoritarian states (Manea 2011) or the space of women representatives (Bauer/Britton 2006; Disney 2006, Longman 2006; Burnet 2008; Derichs/Holike/Kindelberger 2011; Dutoya 2012). Most interesting for analyzing gender relations as relations of power is the one of Kailitz' and Köllners conclusions: they claim for "bringing society back in" (Kailitz/Köllner 2013, 25) – social relations of power and social science research on everyday life in authoritarianism have to be considered not only as recent research desiderata within autocracy research but as well as essential for gender analysis.

Whereas Backes (2013) argues towards a return to and re-lecture of Juan Linz' categories, Frankenberger (2013) joins the social focus. According to Backes, there are good reasons to criticize Linz' subdivision of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes but he sees Linz' central question of legitimate power at the core of analyzing authoritarian regimes until today. Frankenberger, looking at the interaction of subject, power and technologies of power as core categories for analyzing logics and mechanisms of modern autocracies, wants to identify a "governmentality of autocracy" (Frankenberger 2013, 79). With Frankenbergers recent theoretical approach using perspectives and terms of Parsons and Foucault, he contributes to a new line of research on autocracies. He leaves the interpretation of power as localized and centralized as the term "regime" symbolizes, and comes to an interpretation of power as diffuse, defined by conflicts and contradictory – a research perspective on authoritarianism which is actually demanded (Bank 2009, 33).

Jenner (2005; 2009) links the question of distinguishing authoritarianism and conservatism at the central issue of tolerating diversity. For her, authoritarianism is nothing else than „social conservatism" (Jenner 2009, 142). Jenner, is a political psychologist (see next chapter below) who does not

connect her results with those from other fields of political science which had been focusing on autocracies, for instance comparative studies. But this connection seems to be important, to develop a epistemological perspective on questions of gender hierarchy / gender equality within authoritarian regimes. Not only the state and state violence on the one hand and individual predispositions on the other hand are important to explain the role of gender relations and gender images for authoritarian regimes but society and family structures are important as well.

3. Authoritarianism: Individual Predispositions and Political Culture

Definitions of Authoritarianism following Linz (2000), are emphasizing dominating diffuse mentalities and the lack of extensive and intensive political mobilization. For the analysis of gender relations, the processes in societies under authoritarian governance are an important feature.

The analysis of social processes, social sites of power and social power relations makes it then necessary to take a closer look on the relation of individuals, society and state and their gender impacts. Thus it is necessary to pay attention to recent research on authoritarianism in the field of political psychology (Stenner 2005, 2009; Feldman 2003). Some aspects of this political psychology approach have been continuing thoughts of the classic study of Adorno et. al., "The Authoritarian Personality. Studies on Prejudice" within the field of political culture research (Rippl/Seipel/Kindervater 2000; Rensmann/Hagemann/Funke 2011). For instance, what does the intolerance against social diversity mean for women's rights, women's range of freedom and the forming gender pictures and role models? Are inegalitarian attitudes affecting gender outcomes and how? Prejudice and intolerance, especially against homosexuals are related to authoritarian tendencies within the theoretical framework of authoritarianism and the authoritarian personality. Regarding authoritarian tendencies in democracies, traditional gender role models are a central feature, for instance in right wing party programs. However, conservatism does not automatically mean authoritarianism, as Stenner suggests: "predisposition to intolerance of difference that somehow brings together certain traits: obedience to authority, moral absolutism, intolerance and punitiveness toward dissidents and deviants, racial and ethnic prejudice" (Jenner 2009, 142).

For Jenner, authoritarianism is a timeless individual predisposition which influences individual attitudes and social behavior – fueled by a longing for "common authority (oneness) and shared values (sameness)" (Jenner 2009, 143). There are other personal predispositions like "openness to experience [...], verbal ability [...] intelligence and knowledge" (Jenner 2009, 145) – all influenced by education and social surrounding – which may reduce those authoritarian predispositions. But she underlines that in the end authoritarianism is a "normative 'worldview' about the social value of obedience

and conformity" (Jenner 2009, 143) and is therefore much more than a personal distaste. Even more, some expressions of authoritarianism, like racial intolerance, have to be analyzed according to definite social and historical conditions: "[s]o although I have argued that authoritarianism is a universal phenomenon that always produces the same characteristic attitudes [...] those same indications are bound to be expressed somewhat differently by majority and minority respondents" (Jenner 2009, 150). Whereas Jenner underlines her point of authoritarianism as universal and timeless individual predisposition, Rippl et.al. state how dependent the appearance of authoritarianism is from the context of family socialization, class and cultural background (Rippl/Kindervater/Seipel 2000, 24ff.; for context of class see Hopf 2000; for cultural background see Lederer 2000; Meloen 2000; for an international comparative perspective see Rensmann/Hagemann/Funke 2011, 199 ff.).

In an attempt to distinguish between conservatism and authoritarianism, Jenner points out that one of the main differences is how they look on social change. Authoritarianism does not turn down social change, on the contrary it may even claim social change. Jenners ideas seem quite convincing – they confirm the results of other branches of political science research. Although, a look on the broad research on fascist movements may be sufficient, we find a current and concentrated overview by Behrends (2012) – political scientists should thus not be surprised at all by Jenners results that "authoritarians are perfectly willing to embrace massive social change in pursuit of greater oneness and sameness" (Jenner 2009, 155). So one problem of research on authoritarianism seems to be a kind of mutual blindness – within the discipline of political science as well as in an interdisciplinary perspective.

Another important point at the core of authoritarianism is the question of social threat and social fear. Threat activates authoritarianism (Feldman 2003), a feature that can also prove authoritarian tendencies within democracies. Perceived threat of homosexual marriage and gay adoption has been taken to measure authoritarian effects in the USA and to analyze which political forces benefit from increasing public fears (Weiler/Hetherington 2013).

To sum up, regarding research history concerning dictatorship, autocracies and authoritarian regimes the central categorization and thus the core opposite is distinguishing between dictatorship and democracy (see chapter above). Traditionally, political science autocracy research focusses on how dictatorship rules and what kind of structures may support dictatorship. In the political science tradition of distinguishing and comparing patterns of rule, at least two different perspectives had developed: They can be summarized as "Leviathan" versus "Behemoth" (Behrends 2012, 10). Both perspectives are strongly initiated by the desire to explain the twentieth century totalitarian dictator-

ships in Europe, the German national socialism and the Stalinist soviet communism. Both perspectives are centered around the concepts "Leviathan" and "Behemoth" - how to conceive the state. Until today, both perspectives grant evidence to analytic categories of autocracy research, which are analytical. Due to two classic political theory explanations of national socialism, Behrends refers to "Leviathan" on the one hand, according to Ernst Fraenkel, who in "Der Doppelstaat" distinguished between "Normenstaat" und "Maßnahmenstaat" – the latter was characteristic for national socialist dictatorship. On the other hand, there is Franz Neumanns "Behemoth". Neumann argues that there is no state but an unruly kind of different authorities like leader, party, army. For Neumann, national socialism is a new kind of rule which destroys the state and which ignores frontiers between state and society. Neumann's perspective did influence Hannah Arendt's studies on totalitarianism (Behrends 2012, 12). Her view on destroyed privacy and destroyed social structures in totalitarianism is renewed recently by Gabriele Wilde (2012) who focusses on the destruction of political spaces as space for individual freedom and political agency.

4. State Formation

Studying gender-state-relations means to take a look at the social dimensions of state power. States play an important role in public order and private affairs, family life and individual relationships – through legislation as well as through social and economic policies. Law, social welfare and economic and social policy influence society as well as norms of public culture, which may be regulated as well (see following chapters). Studies on state formations as gendered processes show how transitions into authoritarian regimes and then into democracies are effected by social processes and gender relations. For instance, the examination of state formations in Latin-America, both comparatively and historically, identifies moments of transition in which gender relations were significant factors or changed significantly (Dore/Molyneux 2000). One aspect of these processes is that women's movements have contributed to ending military rule (Molyneux 2000, 63). Those processes of democratization and the different ways gender-state-relations may alter state formation itself are of interest not only in the Latin American region but recently in Arab Countries as well (Manea 2011, 18 ff.).

Gender research was inspired by Foucault's work to analyze social and decentered dimensions of power. Authoritarian states seek to form the ideal society with a kind of uniformity – mostly, the imagination of the ideal state goes along with an imagination of the ideal family. Studies on populist and socialist governments show how their climate of political mobilization affects women's political activism and women's political rights. According to Molyneux (2000) populist governments in Latin America not only directly appealed to women as political subjects but continued to support tradi-

tional family values – i.e. female dependency, service, and subordination (Molyneux 2000, 56) – the gender order was maintained. Moreover, some regimes "used familial and patriarchal symbolism as metaphors of state rule" (Molyneux 2000, 57). Military rule shows this effect in the extreme, as Molyneux convincingly describes. Military rule is a gendered rule of domination which produced gendered forms of resistance. Feminists were born enemies of military rule, because they were threatening the state and the order of the nation's life by their criticism of naturalized gender roles and family values. Feminists were considered to be subversives and were targeted by the state, this leads up to torture in form of sexual abuse and erotized violence against prisoners. In the view of the military the family should produce obedient citizens. Authority should be restored through retraditionalized, privatized families (Molyneux 2000, 62). The contradiction was the state's claim to form and control such ostensible private spaces.

Studies on democratization and how they deal with gender relations show the complexity ofrelationships between state and society and interactions are part of those developments. Valiente focusses on the influence of the state on the feminist movement and its organizational features, goals and strategies in Spain (Valiente 2003). Theoretically connected to Joan Scott's call to examine the mutual construction of gender and politics, Dore (2000) frames the (gendered) state formation in Latin America in a historical perspective. She points out that there was no development on a straight line basis in de-colonization and liberalization (Dore 2000, 26). But, so the conclusion of her historical overview of the nineteenth century state formation: "[...] it was the rise of organizations of and for women – feminist organizations – around the turn of the twentieth century that pushed states to move more consistently in the direction of dismantling patriarchal privileges" (Dore 2000, 26).

5. Women's Political Rights

Women's suffrage rights are a traditional field of gender research. Recent studies focus on the specific constellation in Arab States (Manea 2011) and women and women's rights activism in Islamic countries (Al-Ali 2003, 2013; Budianta 2003; Derichs et. al. 2011; Jamal/ Langohr 2009; Holike 2011). Studies on women's political rights in China (Edwards 2008; Howell 2003) grant access to recent research questions and theoretical approaches.

In which way are women allowed a voice in the political arena – if they are allowed at all to articulate themselves as political subjects – in autocracies and hybrid regimes where there is no egalitarian political culture.

Nadje Al-Ali analyses women's movements in the Middle East and she points out their close affiliation to nationalist movements and political fights against the repression of civil society and authori-

tarian structures (Al-Ali 2003; 2013). Women political activists in the Middle East do, according to Al-Ali, fight for increased social justice and gender equality as well as for "their rights and political space within a broader civil society" (Al-Ali 2003, 228). They thus work for an egalitarian political culture which depends on the social and political spaces constituting civil society which are restricted by authoritarian regimes. However, Al-Ali's main idea is that women's movements in the Middle East mostly fight in order to improve their situation mainly to be able to act politically. This conclusion is corresponding with Jamal and Langohrs argumentation. They point out that according to the fourth wave World Values Survey, gender attitudes in the Arab world are the most inegalitarian in the world (Jamal/Langohr 2009, 3; Fish 2002). But on the other hand, the authors underline that even the unelected leaders may be committed to particular pieces of more gender equality in legislation. While focusing on Jordan, Morocco, Kuwait and Yemen, Jamal and Langohr analyze how authoritarian regimes could improve the status of women by changing the degree of women's equality in the constitutions, women's personal status laws, laws against gender based violence or women's participation in politics and society. Interestingly, they found out that " unelected leaders are often more committed to more egalitarian legislation than members of lower houses elected in somewhat free elections [...]" (Jamal/Langohr 2009, 17). In Arab countries, so their conclusion, regimes – and not social movements – play central roles in advancing the condition of women (Jamal/Langohr 2009, 31). This result underlines the specific relation between democratization and women's liberation in the Arab world. In general, autocracies grant fewer political and social rights to women than democracies (Pickel 2013) but it may be worth to question this general truth.

Judd (2003) focusses on the organizational changes concerning women's and gender interests in China and points out that women's political activism in China is divided between a strong, officially designed party mass organization, the All- China Women's Federation (ACWF) and more limited new women's organizations emerging since the 1980s and 1990s. Those organizations have, according to Judd, an "implicit political agency" and are "symbolically important" (Judd 2003, 191) even if they do not primarily act for political change. Regarding the issues, the diversity between women in Chinese society gets clear. This diversity increased in the years of economic reforms, Judd summarizes the following effects: pluralization and diversification of social interests, increased social differentiation and stratification, breakdown of urban- rural barriers and new forms of associational life (see Judd 2003, 193). Whereas rural migrant women were confronted with poor employment conditions, sexual harassment and urban prejudices, female workers formerly employed by state and collective enterprises before the reforms were established were confronted with age and gender discrimination in the free labour market. Finally the growing Chinese sex-industry confronted female sex work-

ers with male violence, sexually transmitted diseases and economic exploitation (see Judd 2003, 194). Some of these issues got on the agenda of ACWF, which, according to Judd, is "the best placed of all women's organizations to influence policy-making (Judd 2003, 207) because it is located within the party structure. As a result, legislative changes of benefit to women were introduced. But the political space for non-governmental actors widened in the mean time of the reform period.

The rights of rural Chinese women, their participation and community development as well as the effects of changing rural work patterns on the gender division of labour have been analyzed since the late 1990s (Judd 1998/99, 2002, 2007). Juanhong (1998/99) concludes that the "current educational, scientific, and technical levels of our rural women are not sufficient for the requirements of rural modernization; they lag behind that of men" (Juanhong 1998/99, 56). This reflects the patriarchal nature of current rural social structure including the patrilineal system and prejudices against women. Fragile gains of women as political subjects may increase within authoritarian regimes if selectively incorporated into projects of states, for instance via women's party organizations.

The different elements of citizenship, civil, political and social rights did not develop in an evolution on a straight line basis, they evolved a rather variable and contingent process. The result of Dore's overview on Latin American development in the twentieth century (Dore 2000) seems to be correct for democratic political developments in general – a crucial point will remain to analyze this processes in a historical and cultural specific manner.

6. Women's Representation and Participation

Recent studies on women's political representation look at African Countries, (Bauer/ Britton 2006). Moreover, authoritarian regimes are a topic in analytical approaches which ask less specific questions (Bauer/Tremblay 2011). Does a high number of women representatives in national parliaments improve the situation of women in those countries? Is a high number of women representatives in parliaments an indicator for highly developed participation of women? Or does it give evidence for future processes of moving social hierarchies between the sexes (Burnet 2008).

Studies on women's representation in Asia want to clarify the complexity of gender, politics and democracy in a very diverse region (Fleschenberg/Derichs 2011). How did failed democratization and authoritarian regression in Asia influence gender relations? The role of heterogeneous identity politics is important to understand the specific discussion of women's rights and religious standards (Holike 2011; Grossmann 2011). How could women seek representation and participation, taking into account their diversity, their age, ethnicity and socio-economic status (Fleschenberg/Derichs

2011, 2). Case studies on Malaysia (Budianta 2003; Lee 2011) and Cambodia (Chap 2011) show how specific hurdles to women's political representation are supported by a connection of patriarchal, sexist and authoritarian structures which affect the motivation and the chances of women's participation and representation.

The role of prominent women as political leaders in Asia, as Megawati Sukarnoputri or Aung San Suu Kyi state, is judged differently. Whereas some authors see them as "main feminist issue", others do not consider those chairwomen as "indication of feminist advances" (Budianta 2003, 143) in the region. But, as Fleschenberg and Derichs point out, "the importance of visible and audible women politicians and women activists cannot be underestimated, because they open up the political space for other women and even grant them socially acceptable access to politics and state institutions in highly gender-segregated and/or violent ridden political contexts" (Fleschenberg/Derichs 2003, 11).

Studies on women's representation in Africa confront us with a different picture. There are much less leading women as part of domestic elites, but a high percentage of women representatives. With the election of thirty-nine women to the chamber of deputies in post-genocide Rwanda in 2003, the East African country "displaced Sweden as the country with the world's highest percentage of women in its lower or single house of parliament" (Longman 2006, 133). High percentages of women's representation in general show the development of increasing gender equality in society and state over time – as in the Scandinavian countries and other Western democracies. Secularization of society, extended welfare states, educational attainment and labor force participation on the one hand, strong women's pressure groups and gender quotas in political parties on the other hand are seen as factors to promote such

development, as Dahlerup (2004) had pointed out (see Bauer/Britton 2006, 1). But, as case studies on Rwanda show, it is unclear what increasing participation of women in politics and increasing representation of women in national parliaments mean in authoritarian, single-party states (Longman 2006; Burnet 2008). Burnet explores the dramatic increase in women's participation in public life and representation in governance and the increasing authoritarianism of the Rwandan state under the guise of 'democratization'. She concludes that in the short term, women's participation has increased meanwhile their ability to influence policy making has decreased. However, as Burnet claims, in the long term the increased female representation in government could prepare the path for their meaningful participation in a genuine democracy because of a transformation in political subjectivity (Burnet 2008, 361). While the leading party RPF had linked gender to nationalism, women may not only be able to influence character and content of political debates but this linkage contributed to trans-

10

form the collective cultural imagination of wives and daughters into a wider range of social and political agency (Burnet 2008, 386).

Those questions emerging in recent case studies on women's representation in autocracies raise basic questions discussed within feminist political theory for long. Here, the presence of women in national parliaments is the first step to female representation, followed by women's political agencies and systematic integration of gender equality in the political process – at the same time, feminist scholars criticized essentialist categories of (gender) identity in concepts of representation and refer to the diversity of needs and interest among women (Squires 2007).

7. Privacy and Authoritarianism

This chapter will concentrate on the degrees of privacy in authoritarian regimes. With the focus on gender relations that means to have a look on studies about family policy, households, domestic violence, divorce and abortion rights in autocracies. The private or reproductive sphere, lying at the interface between state and civil society, is the social terrain upon which gender divisions and inequalities are constituted – this knowledge is the core of feminist criticism. This also means that one has to look behind the naturalization of gender relations and work within the private sphere. This has been a central aim of women's movements up until today. As already described (see chapter 4), authoritarian regimes used to refer to traditional family (and thus gender) order as metaphors for their government. To construct an ideal family at the bottom of an ideal society was and is one core of authoritarian legitimation strategy. Women's reproductive right contradicts such strategies. One of General Pinochets last acts of legislation, as Molyneux' (2000, 62) illustrates, was a constitutional change aiming to enshrine the principle of protecting life in order to stop a liberalization of abortion law.

Studies on central gender relations political fields as family policy in different regions show developments within different authoritarian regimes and how different role models contribute to stabilize or destabilize those regimes. Recent case studies on Latin-American countries and their transformation give an overview of the constellation of public and private sphere, changing gender relations and feminist policies (Haas 2010, Macdonald/ Mills 2010). Family and body politics in Arab countries show that in spite of granted suffrage rights, women are often discriminated against by the state in their private life (Manea 2011). Studies on gender-relations politics, in family and society show how civil society women's organizations can achieve an improvement of women's power within those relations by interaction with women representatives in legislation (Britton 2006; Disney 2006;

Schäfer 2012). Central issues are households and property rights within marriages and families, divorce, domestic violence and abortion rights.

Research to the effect of family law reforms on gender relations was recently focused on in international studies especially on African, Arab and Latin American countries. Disney focusses on the Mozambique new family law of 2004. Mozambique had one of the highest percentages of women in parliament in the 2000s but one of the lowest Gender-Related Development Indexes (Disney 2006, 31). The new family law challenged traditional family structures on the one hand. It overturned patriarchal privilege and shared property in the family, reformed divorce, acknowledged non-civil marriages (Disney 2006, 44 ff.). On the other hand, the new family law tried to respect the cultural diversity of mozambiquan society which Disney discusses on the example of polygamy – the law does not judge polygamy but tries to protect the rights of women and children of polygamous marriages (Disney 2006, 48). During the transition from a one-party state into a liberal-democratic state the new family law has established women's legal equality and expanded their power in family and society. The women representatives and the interaction between women's organizations in civil society had been crucial to initiate and put through the reform (Disney 2006, 53).

Other studies eventually identify sexual violence (and the racialization of sexual violence) as the crucial point of putting women's rights on the political agenda and negotiating gender equality as well as equality in general terms (Budianta 2003, 162; Dhawan 2013).

8. Socio-economic Development and Gender Equality

Persistence of authoritarian regimes depends on cultural and political attitudes but as well on economic conditions. This part will focus on studies about the relation of the level of socio-economic development and gender equality and how the role of women change as societies develop economically. Better education and work outside the home, smaller families and the right to vote are features of industrialized countries, as argue Inglehart and Norris (2003). That means, economic changes result in shifts of attitude. This evidence is contradicted by recent studies on Arab countries (Jamal/ Langohr 2009).

Economic benefits empower women as well as (higher) education, knowledge, improvement of skills and confidence in their own capacities. This can result in political activism and political demands to more power in families and society as well as political rights and political representation (Ong 1991; Chap 2011; Kreile 2012; Pickel 2013).

Sometimes, dictatorship was associated with a transition towards neoliberalism – Molyneux (2000, 63) calls it a "new political economy" of dictatorship. She points out that the burden of restructuring

the economy fell disproportionately on poor women, which leads to radical criticism by feminist economists like Diane Elson (1991).

According to those dynamic effects of gender inequality in socio-economic terms, women's activism in economic crisis got in the focus of research. Even connected to traditional role model aspects as "motherhood, nutrition of the family and charity" (West/Blumberg 1991, 15, cited according to Budianta 2003, 152), women's activism in economic crisis questions the male bread-winner model, as Budianta worked out for the case of Indonesian post-1998 democratization process, the "reforma-si years" (Budianta 2003, 152-158). Budianta sees motherhood in this case as "discursive strategy [which] was not only adopted in the face of state paternalism and militarism, but also makes activism more acceptable to a wider spectrum of women" (Budianta 2003, 158).

Finally, the case of state socialism may illustrate the persisting traditional gender or despite more socio-economic equality between the sexes. State socialism proposed to remove the basis of the traditional gender order by giving women new rights and the means to achieve economic autonomy through employment, as Molyneux (2000a) points out in her case study on Cuban women's party organization FMC (Federación de Mujeres Cubanas). Cuban socialism has, according to Molyneux, changed in social relations, it has mobilized women into considerable activity in public life and thus "created a distinctive kind of women's movement, albeit one that was a creature of the state" (Molyneux 2000a, 313). At once, the social division of labor with its inequal gender order did not change. This is why feminist criticize Cuban socialism with its regard to gender policies as maintaining patriarchal privileges, sexual inequality and machismo and that it lacks the aim of really transforming society (Molyneux 2000a, 314).

9. Conclusion

Gender inequality as part of authoritarianism means to strengthen traditional gender relations and naturalizing gender roles. The connection between liberalization and gender can be localized at the line between public and private sphere and in the space which women's liberalization movements get to articulate their aims.

The review has listed how diverse the research about authoritarianism is and where one can find the connections between authoritarian and feminist studies. In order to go further, some works give us evidence for future research.

13

Recent studies about African, Arab and Latin American countries show the important role of women's civil society organizations for the promotion of women's rights, women's representation and the improvement of women's positions in family and society in authoritarian and transition systems. There is a connection between liberalization and gender equality, but there is no development on a straight line basis, as studies with historical perspective worked out. If we consider one of the newest branches of studies about authoritarianism, the question of "exporting" authoritarian structures (Vanderhill 2013), a gendered perspective is one, which still has to evolve. Is it possible that regimes change through social and humanitarian aid? If we follow Vanderhill – regarding Iranian support for Hezbollah – that "Hezbollah's civil society organizations have paid off politically" and that "providing social services to underserved communities can be a very effective path to power" (Vanderhill 2013, 153) then how does the programmatic gender inequality of islamistic political organizations work back on the relations within families and society, in this case in Lebanon? If external support for elites make the "development of authoritarianism much easier" (Vanderhill 2013,181) which effect can be shown on domestic gender relations?

At least, it would be interesting to ask about the relationship between international norms like women's human rights and state behaviour in authoritarian countries. Do particular norms diffuse into authoritarian regimes? Savery (2007) worked out, how international norms of sexual non- discrimination do diffuse into particular states despite of their gender-biased corporate identity as result of international and/or domestic pressure. She examined four democratic countries, but we could easily broaden this perspective for the examination of authoritarian or hybrid states. As in the case of Spain, the authoritarian regime until 1975 "fiercely resisted incorporating international norms of sexual non-discrimination" (Savery 2007, 115) but in the process of democratization those norms were incorporated, as an important part of this process – "supported partly by domestic feminists intervention" (Savery 2007, 115).

Political science research on autocracies and authoritarianism partly begins to change its focus towards analyzing social and familial relations of power. We find this focus namely in case studies about Latin America, China, African and Arab States as described above. Recent Studies propose forming a link between feminist authoritarian studies and poststructuralist work towards a „microphysics of power", inspired by Foucault. This perspective with its connection of subjectivity and power in different social and political contexts may generate specific insights concerning power relations between the sexes and their connection with other forms of social and political power.

However, there seems to be at least one more option for feminist research to join in the traditional research on dictatorship. Political science gender studies may develop the concept of „Behemoth"

and analyze structures and relations in regimes, were there is no longer a frontier between the society and the state. As a result, feminist political science has to describe the interference of political and social interventions and the modes of influencing gender relations of the regimes and at once going beyond the understanding of regime as a localized center of (political) power.

References

Al-Ali, Nadje, 2003: Gender and Civil Society in the Middle East. In: International Feminist Journal of Politics (5) 2, 216-232.

Al-Ali, Nadje, 2013: Iraq: Gendering Authoritarianism. In: http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/nadje-al-ali/iraq-gendering- authoritarianism (02.08.2013)

Alpermann, Björn, 2013: Soziale Schichtung und Klassenbewußtsein im Chinas autoritärer Modernisierung. In: Zeithistorische Forschungen (10) 2, 283-296.

Art, David, 2012: What Do We Know About Authoritarianism After Ten Years? In: Comparative Politics (44) 3, 351–373.

Backes, Uwe, 2013: Vier Grundtypen der Autokratie und ihre Legitimierungsstrategien. In: Kailitz, Steffen/ Köllner, Patrick (Hrsg.): Autokratien im Vergleich. PVS Sonderheft 47. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 157-175.

Banaszak, Lee Ann/ Beckwith, Karen/ Rucht, Dieter, 2003: When Power Relocates: Interactive Change in Women's Movements and States. In: Banaszak, Lee Ann/ Beckwith, Karen/ Rucht, Dieter (Eds.), 2003: Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-29.

Bank, André, 2009: Die Renaissance des Autoritarismus. Erkenntnisse und Grenzen neuerer Beiträge der Comparative Politics und Nahostforschung. In: Hamburg Review of Social Sciences, Vol. 4, Iss. 1, 10-41.

Bauer, Gretchen/ Britton, Hannah E. (Eds.), 2006: Women in African Parliaments. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bauer, Gretchen/ Tremblay, Manon (Eds.), 2011: Women in Executive Power. A Global Overview. London, New York: Routledge.

Behrends, Jan C., 2012: Diktatur: Moderne Gewaltherrschaft zwischen Leviathan und Behemoth, Version: 1.0. In: Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte, 6. 6.2012. http://docupedia.de/zg/ (24.06.2013)

Brandt, Mark J./ Henry, P.J., 2012: Gender Inequality and Gender Differences in Authoritarianism. In: Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 2012, 38 (10): 1301-1315.

Britton, Hannah E., 2006: South Africa: Mainstreaming Gender in a New Democracy. In: Bauer, Gretchen/ Britton, Hannah E. (Eds.), 2006: Women in African Parliaments. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 59-84.

Browers, Michaelle, 2012: Staat und Zivilgesellschaft im arabischen politischen Denken: Liberale, sozialistische und islamistische Interventionen. In: Zapf, Holger/ Klevesath, Lino (Hrsg.), 2012: Staatsverständnisse in der islamischen Welt. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 117-140.

Budianta, Melani, 2012: The Blessed Tragedy: The Making of Women's Activism During the Reformasi Years. In: Heryanto, Ariel/ Mandal, Sumit K. (Eds.), 2012: Challenging Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia. Comparing Indonesia and Malaysia. New York: Routledge, 145-177.

Budianta, Melani, 2002: Gender, Culture and Security: Old Legacies, New Visions. In: Asian Exchange 2001/2002.

Burnell, Peter/ Schlumberger, Oliver, 2010: Promoting Democracy – Promoting Autocracy? In: Contemporary Politics (16) 1, 1–15.

Burnet, Jennie E, 2008: Gender Balance und the Meanings of Women in Governance in Post-Genocide Rwanda. In: African Affairs 2008 (107): 361-386.

Chap, Sopanha, 2011: Women's Involvement in Polical Implementation: Experiences from Gender Mainstreaming Policy on Community Fisheries Management in Cambodia. In: Fleschenberg, Andrea/ Derichs, Claudia (Hrsg.), 2011: Women and Politics in Asia. A Springboard for Democracy? Zürich u.a.: Lit-Verlag, 149-165.

Derichs, Claudia (Ed.), 2010: Diversity and Female Political Participation: Views on and from the Arab World. Heinrich Böll Stiftung. Publication Series on Democracy,Vol. 21, Berlin.

Derichs, Claudia, 2010: Introduction. Diversity and Political Participation in the Arab World. In: Derichs, Claudia (Ed.), 2010: Diversity and Female Political Participation: Views on and from the Arab World. Heinrich Böll Stiftung. Publication Series on Democracy,Vol. 21, Berlin, 9-26.

Dhawan, Nikita, 2013: Postkoloniale Gouvernementalität und „die Politik der Vergewaltigung": Gewalt, Verletzlichkeit und der Staat. In: Femina Politica 22 (1): Gender und politische Partizipation in Asien, 85-104.

Disney, Jennifer Leigh, 2006: Mozambique: Empowering Women Through Familiy Law. In: Bauer, Gretchen/ Britton, Hannah E. (Eds.), 2006: Women in African Parliaments. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 31-57.

Dore, Elizabeth/ Molyneux, Martine (Eds.), 2000: Hidden Histories of Gender and the State in Latin America. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Dutoya, Virginie, 2012: Féminisation des parlements, quotas et transformation de la représentation au Pakistan et en Inde », Critique Internationale 55, 137-158.

Dutoya, Virginie, 2013: From Women's Quota to "Women's Politics": The Impact of Gender Quotas on Political Representations and Practices in the Pakistani National Parliament. In: Femina Politica 22 (1): Gender und politische Partizipation in Asien, 17-34.

Elson, Diane, 1991: Male Bias in the Development Process. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Edwards, Louise P., 2008: Gender, Politics, and Democracy: Women's Souffrage in China. Standford: Stanford University Press.

Erdmann, Gero/ Bank, André/ Hoffmann, Bert/ Richter, Thomas, 2013: International Cooperation of Authoritarian Regimes:Toward a Conceptual Framework. Hamburg: GIGA Working Papers 229/2013.

Feldman, Stanley, 2003: Enforcing Social Conformity: A Theory of Authoritarianism. In: Political Psychology 2003 (24) 1: 41- 74.

Fish, Steven, 2002: Islam and Authoritarianism. In: World Politics, Vol. 55, Iss. 1, 4-37.

Fleschenberg, Andrea, 2011: South and Southeast Asia. In: Bauer, Gretchen/ Tremblay, Manon (Eds.), 2011: Women in Executive Power. A Global Overview. London, New York: Routledge, 23-44.

Fleschenberg, Andrea/ Derichs, Claudia (Hrsg.), 2011: Women and Politics in Asia. A Springboard for Democracy? Zürich u.a.: Lit-Verlag.

Fleschenberg, Andrea/ Derichs,Claudia, 2011: Women and Politics in Asia: A Springboard for Democracy? A Tentative Introduction & Reflection. In: Fleschenberg, Andrea/ Derichs, Claudia (Hrsg.), 2011: Women and Politics in Asia. A Springboard for Democracy? Zürich u.a.: Lit-Verlag, 1- 17.

Frankenberger, Rolf, 2013: Mikrophysik und Makrostruktur. Überlegungen zu einer Analytik der Macht in Autokratien. In: Kailitz, Steffen/ Köllner, Patrick (Hrsg.): Autokratien im Vergleich. PVS Sonderheft 47. Baden- Baden: Nomos Verlag, 60-85.

Goebel, Christian, 2011: Authoritarian Consolidation. In: European Political Science, 10, 176-190.

Haas, Liesl, 2010: Feminists Policymaking in Chile. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Haussmann, Melissa/ Sawer, Maria/ Vickers, Jill (Eds.), 2010: Federalism, Feminism and Multilevel Governance. Farnham: Ashgate.

Heryanto, Ariel/ Mandal, Sumit K. (Eds.), 2012: Challenging Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia. Comparing Indonesia and Malaysia. New York: Routledge.

Heydemann, Steven/ Leenders, Reinoud, 2011: Authoritarian Learning and Authoritarian Resilience: Regime Responses to the "Arab Awakening", in: Globalization, 8, 5, 647–653.

Holike, Christine, 2011: The State of Islam – Negotiating Democracy, Muslim Women's Rights and Morality in Indonesia and Malaysia, in:

Fleschenberg, Andrea/ Derichs, Claudia (Hrsg.), 2010: Women and Politics in Asia. A Springboard for Democracy? Zürich u.a.: Lit-Verlag ,90 – 122.

Holike, Christine/ Scheiterbauer, Tanja, 2012: Feministische Perspektiven auf Islam, Staat und Geschlecht. In: Zapf, Holger/ Klevesath, Lino (Hrsg.), 2012: Staatsverständnisse in der islamischen Welt. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 253-274.

Hopf, Wulf: Soziale Schichtung und Autoritarismus. Oder: Sind Arbeiter besonders autoritär? In: Rippl, Susanne/ Seipel, Christian/ Kindervater, Angela (Hrsg.), 2000: Autoritarismus. Kontroversen und Ansätze der aktuellen Autoritarismusforschung. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 93-118.

Inglehart, Ronald/ Norris, Pippa, 2003: Rising Tide. Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacka, Tamara, 2006: Rural Women in Urban China: Gender, Migration, and Social Change. New York: East Gate.

Jamal, Amaney/ Langohr, Vickie, 2009: Moving Beyond Democracy: What Causes Variations in the Level of Gender Equality across Arab States? (Paper was prepared for the Middle East Politics Working Group Workshop, Cornell University, March 27-28, 2009 (please do not cite without the authors permission). http://www.princeton.edu/~ajamal/Jamal_Langohr.pdf (2.8.2013)

Juanhong, Fei, 1998/99: The Rural Reform of Our Country and the Gender Division of Labor. In: Judd, Ellen R. (Ed.), 1998-99: Rural Women in Reform Era China. Chinese Sociology and Anthropology, Winter 1998/99, (31) 2, 42-56.

Judd, Ellen R. (Ed.), 1998-99: Rural Women in Reform Era China. Chinese Sociology and Anthropology, Winter 1998/99, (31) 2.

Judd, Ellen R., 2002: The Chinese Women's Movement between State and Market. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Judd, Ellen R., 2007: No Change for Thirty Years: The Renewed Question of Women's Land Rights in Rural China. In: Development and Change. 38 (4), 689–710.

Kailitz, Steffen/ Köllner, Patrick (Hrsg.), 2013: Autokratien im Vergleich. PVS Sonderheft 47. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag.

Kailitz, Steffen/ Köllner, Patrick: Zur Autokratieforschung der Gegenwart: Klassifikatorische Vorschläge, theoretische Ansätze und analytische Dimensionen. In: Kailitz, Steffen/ Köllner, Patrick (Hrsg.): Autokratien im Vergleich. PVS Sonderheft 47. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 9-34.

Keller, Franziska, 2012: (Why) Do Revolutions Spread?, Paper prepared for Presentation at the 2012 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, 30 August - 2 September.

Köllner, Patrick, 2008: Autoritäre Regime – Ein Überblick über die jüngere Literatur. In: Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft 2, 351-366.

Kreile, Renate, 2009: Transformation und Gender im Nahen Osten. In: Beck, Martin/ Harders, Cilja/ Jünemann, Annette/ Stetter, Stephan (Hrsg.): Der Nahe Osten im Umbruch. Zwischen Transformation und Autoritarismus. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 253-276.

Kreile, Renate, 2012: Neoliberalismus, Staat und Gender in der Türkei. In: In: Femina Politica 21 (1): Falsche Sicherheiten. Geschlechterverhältnisse in autoritären Regimen, 73-85.

Langohr, Vickie, 2004: Too Much Civil Society, Too Little Politics: Egypt and Liberalizing Arab Regimes. In: Comparative Politics 16 (2), 181-204.

Lederer, Gerda: Autoritarismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit im deutsch-deutschen Vergleich: Ein Land mit zwei Sozialisationskulturen. In: Rippl, Susanne/ Seipel, Christian/ Kindervater, Angela (Hrsg.), 2000: Autoritarismus. Kontroversen und Ansätze der aktuellen Autoritarismusforschung. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 199-214

Levitsky, Steven/ Way, Lucan, 2010: Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linz, Juan J., 2000: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Longman, Timothy, 2006: Rwanda: Achieving Equality or Serving an Authoritarian State? In: Bauer, Gretchen/ Britton, Hannah E. (Eds.), 2006: Women in African Parliaments. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 133-150.

Manea, Elham, 2011: The Arab State und Women's Rights. The Trap of Authoritarian Governance. London, New York: Routledge.

Macdonald, Laura/ Mills, Lisa, 2010: Gender, Democracy and Federalism in Mexico: Implications for Reproductive Rights and Social Policy. In: Haussmann, Melissa/ Sawer, Maria/ Vickers, Jill (Eds.), 2010: Federalism, Feminism and Multilevel Governance. Farnham: Ashgate, 187-198.

Meloen, Jos D., 2000: Die Ursprünge des Staatsautoritarismus. Eine empirische Untersuchung der Auswirkungen von Kultur, Einstellungen und Politik im weltweiten Vergleich. In: Rippl, Susanne/ Seipel, Christian/ Kindervater, Angela (Hrsg.), 2000: Autoritarismus. Kontroversen und Ansätze der aktuellen Autoritarismusforschung. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 215-236.

Merkel, Wolfgang, 2010: Are Dictatorships Returning? Revisiting the "Democratic Rollback" Hypothesis. In: Contemporary Politics (16) 1, 17– 31.

Molyneux, Maxine, 2000: Twentieth-Century State Formations in Latin America. In: Dore, Elizabeth/ Molyneux, Martine (Eds.), 2000: Hidden Histories of Gender and the State in Latin America. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 33-81.

Molyneux, Maxine, 2000a : State, Gender and Institutional Change. The Federatión de Mujeres Cubanas. In: Dore, Elizabeth/ Molyneux, Martine (Eds.), 2000: Hidden Histories of Gender and the State in Latin America. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 291-321.

Molyneux, Maxine/ Razavi, Shara (Eds.), 2002: Gender Justice, Development, and Rights. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ong, Aikwa, 1991: The Gender and Labor Policys of Postmodernity. In: Annual Review of Anthropology, 1991 (20): 279-309.

Pickel, Susanne, 2013: Demokratie, Andokratie, Autokratie und die Verwirklichung der Rechte von Frauen. Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Gender Empowerment, Wertestrukturen und Regimepersistenz. In: Kailitz, Steffen/ Köllner, Patrick (Hrsg.): Autokratien im Vergleich. PVS Sonderheft 47. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 438-476.

Rensmann, Lars/ Hagemann, Steffen/ Funke, Hajo, 2011: Autoritarismus und Demokratie. Politische Theorie und Kultur in der globalen Moderne. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag.

Rippl, Susanne/ Seipel, Christian/ Kindervater, Angela (Hrsg.), 2000: Autoritarismus. Kontroversen und Ansätze der aktuellen Autoritarismusforschung. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.

Savery, Lynn, 2007: Engendering the State. The International Diffusion of Women's Human Rights. New York: Routledge.

Schäfer, Rita, 2012: Gender und autoritäre Herrschaft in Zimbabwe. In: Femina Politica 21 (1): Falsche Sicherheiten. Geschlechterverhältnisse in autoritären Regimen, 86-97.

Schneider, Silke/ Wilde, Gabriele, 2012: Autokratie, Demokratie und Geschlecht: Geschlechterverhältnisse in autoritären Regimen. In: Femina Politica 21(1): Falsche Sicherheiten. Geschlechterverhältnisse in autoritären Regimen, 9-16.

Spendzharova, Aneta B., and Milada Anna Vachudova, 2012: Catching Up?

Consolidating Liberal Democracy in Bulgaria and Romania after EU Accession, in: West European Politics, 35, 39–58.

Squires, Judith, 2007: The New Politics of Gender Equality. Basingstoke/ New York: Houndsmills.

Stenner, Karen, 2005: The Authoritarian Dynamic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stenner, Karen, 2009: Three Kinds of "Conservatism". In: Psychological Inquiry, 20: 142–159.

Thayer, Millie, 2010: Making Transnational Feminism: Rural Women, NGO Activists, and Northern Donors in Brazil. New York: Routledge.

Valiente, Celia, 2003: The Feminist Movement and the Reconfigured State in Spain (1970s-2000). In: Banaszak, Lee Ann/ Beckwith, Karen/ Rucht, Dieter (Eds.), 2003: Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 30-47.

Vanderhill, Rachel, 2013: Promoting Authoritarianism Abroad. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Vanderhill, Rachel, 2012: Learning to Be Bad: How Autocratic Leaders Adopt Strategies from Abroad to Maintain Power, New Orleans (Conference Paper).

Weiler, Jonathan/ Hetherington, Marc J., 2013: Authoritarianism and the American Political Divide. http://www.thedemocraticstrategist.org/archives/0609/weilera.php (2.8.2013)

West, Guida/ Blumberg, Rhoda Lois, 1991: Women and Social Protest. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilde, Gabriele, 2012: Totale Grenzen des Politischen: Die Zerstörung der Öffentlichkeit bei Hannah Arendt. In: Femina Politica 21 (1): Falsche Sicherheiten. Geschlechterverhältnisse in autoritären Regimen, 17-28.

Wischermann, Jörg, 2013: Civic Organizations in Vietnam's One-Party State: Supporters of Authoritarian Rule? Hamburg: GIGA Working Papers 228/2013.

Zapf, Holger/ Klevesath, Lino (Hrsg.), 2012: Staatsverständnisse in der islamischen Welt. Baden-Baden: Nomos.