EUROPE CRAWLS AHEAD…

By Megan Rowling

As Speaker of the Riksdagen, the Swedish parliament, Birgitta Dahl holds Sweden’s second-highest political office. But when she was first elected back in 1969, as a 30-year-old single mother, she was regarded as “very odd.”

“To be accepted and respected, you had to act like a bad copy of a man,” Dahl recalls of her early years in politics. “But we tried to change that, and we never gave up our identity. Now women have competence in Parliament, and they have changed its performance and priorities.”

Back then, women of her generation were eager for change. From the beginning, they based their demands on the right of the individual—whether male or female—to have equal access to education, work and social security. And as politicians, they fought hard to build a legal framework for good childcare and parental leave, for fathers as well as mothers. “We got this kind of legislation through,” Dahl says, “even though it took 15 years of serious conflict, debate and struggle.”

And their efforts paid off. Sweden now has the highest proportion of women parliamentarians in the world, at 42.7 percent—up from just 12 percent in 1969. Two of its three deputy speakers are also women. Other Nordic countries too have high levels of female representation: In rankings compiled by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), Denmark takes second place behind Sweden, with women accounting for 38 percent of parliament members, followed by Finland and Norway with around 36.5 percent. (Finland also has one of the world’s 11 women heads of state.) These nations’ Social Democratic and far-left governing coalitions have made impressive progress toward equality in all areas of society in the past 40 years. But the nature of their electoral systems is also very important.

Julie Ballington, gender project officer at the Stockholm-based International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), points out that the top 10 countries in the IPU ranking all use some form of proportional representation. This kind of voting system, in which parties are allocated seats in multi-member districts according to the percentage of votes they win, Ballington says, “offers a way to address gender imbalance in parliaments.” With single-member districts, parties are often under pressure to choose a male candidate. But where they can contest and win more than one seat per constituency, they tend to be more willing to field female candidates. And by improving the gender balance on their slates, they widen their appeal among women voters.

Most European countries now use proportional representation or a combination of proportional representation and majoritarian voting, the system in use in the United States and the United Kingdom. In Europe, the widespread use of proportional representation has boosted the number of women politicians—particularly in the past three decades. And in the Nordic countries, where left-wing parties have enjoyed long periods in power and feminism has received strong support, the combination of these factors has led to significant progress toward gender parity in politics.

But even within Europe, some countries continue to lag behind. In Britain, which uses a single-member district plurality system, women members of parliament make up just 17.9 percent of the House of Commons. In the general elections of 2001, the ruling Labour Party stipulated that half those on its candidate shortlists be women. But research conducted by the Fawcett Society, a British organization that campaigns for gender equity, showed that some female hopefuls experienced overt discrimination and even sexual harassment when interviewed by local party members during the selection process.

“You are told things like ‘your children are better off with you at home’… ‘you are the best candidate but we are not ready for a woman.’ They would select the donkey rather than the woman,” said one candidate. Another complained: “They are absolutely adamant they will not consider a woman.… It was said to me… ‘we do enjoy watching you speak—we always imagine what your knickers are like.’ It is that basic.” In light of such attitudes, it is not surprising that women candidates were selected for only four out of 38 vacant seats.

Thanks to new governmental legislation, however, the party is set to reintroduce the controversial method of all-women shortlists it used in the general election of 1997. The use of these shortlists saw the number of British women MPs double to 120 in that election, which swept
Labour to power with a landslide victory. The technique was later ruled illegal because it was judged to discriminate against men. But in early 2002, the government returned to the idea, passing a bill that will allow political parties to take measures in favor of women when choosing parliamentary candidates—what's often referred to as “positive discrimination.”

“Critical mass,” or the level of representation above which women make a real difference to the political agenda, is widely judged to be around 30 percent.

Judith Squires, a political researcher at Bristol University, believes that the new legislation got such an easy ride partly because it does not stipulate that parties must take action: “We had expected it to be a hard battle. But there has been a change of mood in the Conservative Party, and the fact that it is permissive, and there is a sunset clause [the legislation expires in 2015], all helped to push it through.”

In France, where until the recent election women accounted for only 10.9 percent of National Assembly members, the government opted for a more extreme method: a law aimed at securing political parity between men and women. Now half of all contesting parties’ candidates in National Assembly elections and most local ballots must be women. In National Assembly elections, which do not use proportional representation, parties that deviate from the 50 percent target by more than two percent are fined a proportion of their public financing.

The law’s first test in the municipal elections of March 2001 saw the percentage of elected women councilors in towns of more than 3,500 almost double, to 47.5 percent. But in June’s National Assembly elections, the proportion of women deputies increased by less than 1.5 points, to just 12.3 percent—way below expectations. The main factor behind this disappointing result was the success of right-wing parties that ignored the new law, says Mariette Sineau, research director at the Center for the Study of French Political Life. “The big parties decided it was better to incur the financial penalty than to sacrifice their ‘favored sons.’ And this was particularly so with parties on the right.”

Another problem with the law, Sineau explains, is that it does not apply to regional assemblies, “which is a shame, because most National Assembly deputies are recruited there.” And the recent victory of the right suggests that France’s ruling—and predominantly male—elite are in no hurry to change the system that has allowed them to hold on to power up until now, law or no law. As Chantal Cauquil, a French deputy at the European Parliament and member of the Workers’ Struggle Party, argues, other aspects of French society must change before real parity can be achieved. “There’s no doubt that economic and social conditions—which weigh on women earning the lowest salaries, in the most precarious situations, and with the biggest problems caused by a notable lack of childcare infrastructure—have a negative impact on women’s political participation,” she says. Moreover, governing parties of both the right and left are influenced by social prejudices and are not inclined to regard women as full citizens. It requires real political will to go against such prejudices and allow women to take on the same responsibilities as men.”

Such deep-rooted but hidden obstacles, faced by women everywhere, are precisely why proponents of the use of gender quotas on lists for both party and national elections believe positive discrimination is essential. “Everybody hates quotas, and everyone wishes they weren’t necessary,” says Drude Dahlerup, professor of politics at the University of Stockholm. “But we have to start from the point that there are structural barriers. Then quotas can be seen as compensation.” Currently, political parties in some 40 countries appear to agree, with quota systems in operation from Argentina and India to Uganda.

The use of quotas in Europe varies significantly from country to country and from party to party, but where a quota system is applied, it tends to lead to a rise in women’s representation. In 1988, for example, Germany’s Social Democrats adopted a system of flexible quotas, under which at least one-third of all candidates for internal party election must be female—and between 1987 and 1990, the number of Social Democratic women in the German parliament, the Bundestag, doubled. In Sweden, parties didn’t introduce quotas until the ‘90s, but the principle of “Varannan Damernas” (“Every Other Seat A Woman’s Seat”) has been widespread since the ‘80s. Dahl, the Swedish speaker, argues that “it is not only legislation that changes the world, but convincing people that change is necessary.”

Yet, as Dahlerup notes, women in some Scandinavian countries have worked to improve gender equality since the end of World War I, and “other countries are not going to wait that long—they are showing impatience.” “Critical mass,” or the level of representation above which women make a real difference to the political agenda, is widely judged to be around 30 percent. And in countries such as France and the United Kingdom, where that is still a long way off, measures such as parity laws and all-women shortlists are a way to speed up progress.

Even in countries that are close to achieving political parity, however, women are quick to warn against complacency. Dahlerup emphasizes the case of Denmark, where quotas have been abandoned. “Young women say they don’t want and don’t need quotas. The discourse is that equality has already been achieved. But I think Denmark could go backward again, and that is dangerous.”
Squires of Bristol University also talks about a backlash in Britain’s Liberal Democratic Party against what younger women regard as “old-fashioned feminist policies.” At the party conference last year, she says, many women in their twenties and early thirties lobbied against any form of positive discrimination, wearing pink T-shirts emblazoned with the words “I’m not a token woman.” But Squires suggests that this attitude is somewhat misguided: “All parties [in the United Kingdom] have set criteria that discriminate against women. It is not a supply-side problem, it is a demand-side problem.”

“People are waking up and saying that it’s not right that there are so few women in politics.”

In an attempt to address this “demand-side problem,” activists are targeting not only national political institutions, but also those of the European Union. The number of women members of the European Parliament increased from 25.7 percent in 1994 to 29.9 percent in the 1999 elections—not very impressive considering that some countries introduced proportional representation voting, and some parties alternated women and men on their lists to boost women’s chances. More worrying perhaps is the gender imbalance in the convention on the Future of Europe, a body charged with the important task of drafting a new treaty for the European Union. Its presidium includes only two women among its 12 members, and the convention itself only 19 out of 118 members.

“The establishment of the convention is a response to the need for transparency and democracy. How can we explain the fact that women are not included?” asks Denise Fuchs, president of the European Women’s Lobby. “It is simply not coherent.” The EWL has launched a campaign to rectify the problem and is lobbying to achieve parity democracy across all other European institutions as well.

Yvonne Galligan, director of the Belfast-based Center for Advancement of Women in Politics, points out that “there has been a groundswell of support for women in political life across Western Europe, but this has not yet translated into numbers in the United Kingdom, Ireland and the European Union.” In May’s elections in the Irish Republic, for example, women parliamentarians in Ireland’s Dail gained just one seat, and are now at 12.7 percent, according to the IPU.

Galligan is now working with political parties to set targets for Ireland’s local elections in a couple of years’ time—a tough job, because most parties oppose any form of positive discrimination. Parity in Ireland isn’t likely to happen for a long while yet, but Galligan believes the social backdrop is improving. She cites a controversial referendum in March, in which the Irish electorate narrowly voted against a proposal to tighten the country’s strict abortion laws even further. “That raised the status of women,” she explains. “The underlying question was, how do we perceive the role of women? Now that is carrying over into elections. People are waking up and saying that it’s not right that there are so few women in politics.”

But where a sea-change in attitudes has not already occurred, it is almost certainly emerging. Naturally, there are fears that the apparent resurgence of the right in Europe could reverse the trend. But most of those interviewed for this article say women have already progressed far enough to prevent a significant decline in representation.

As Linda McAvan, deputy leader of Britain’s Labour MEPs, argues: “If we look at how things were 20 years ago, they have changed enormously. Young women are different now. They see what has been done by women politicians before them, and they want to do it too.”